



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2015

No. 180

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 14, 2015, at 12 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause in

Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House.

Enable them, O God, to act on what they believe to be right and true and just and to do so in ways that show respect for those with whom they disagree.

Send Your Spirit of peace upon our Nation. Endow the Members of this

House and all our governmental leaders with the wisdom to respond with whatever policies and laws might be needed to ensure greater peace and security in our land.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

NOTICE

If the 114th Congress, 1st Session, adjourns sine die on or before December 24, 2015, a final issue of the *Congressional Record* for the 114th Congress, 1st Session, will be published on Thursday, December 31, 2015, to permit Members to insert statements.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-59 or S-123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Wednesday, December 30. The final issue will be dated Thursday, December 31, 2015, and will be delivered on Monday, January 4, 2016.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the *Congressional Record* may contain subject matter, or relate to any event, that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be formatted according to the instructions at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/Departments/Reporters_Debates/resources/cong_record.pdf, and submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Record@Sec.Senate.gov".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at <https://housenet.house.gov/legislative/research-and-reference/transcripts-and-records/electronic-congressional-record-inserts>. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT-59.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the *Congressional Record* may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Publishing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

GREGG HARPER, *Chairman*.

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.

H9273

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.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NORCROSS 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

EAST BEND SMALL TOWN
CHRISTMAS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 28, residents in Yadkin County gathered for the annual Small Town Christmas celebration at the East Bend fire station.

Although East Bend is a small community, its citizens know how to start the holiday season off right. The firefighters and Ladies Auxiliary group worked hard to get the station ready, and their efforts were appreciated by everyone who attended.

The evening began with a devotional and the lighting of the Christmas tree. While the chicken stew and pinto beans that followed were certainly delicious, the focus on faith was the real draw.

It is easy to get distracted during the days and weeks leading up to Christmas. So it was uplifting to see the community of East Bend once again take time to reflect on this season of grace and let the Lord's infinite joy fill their hearts.

It was a pleasure to be a part of their celebration, and I commend them for it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KATE
MCCARTHY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday friends, family, and admirers of Kate McCarthy will gather in the shadow of Mount Hood that she loved. They will share stories of young Kate as a smart, free-spirited woman, educated at Portland's Reed College, working on Mount Hood's historic Timberline Lodge the day it opened in 1937 with President Roosevelt. Her family will regale with tales of challenges of managing four interesting children, shall we say.

The central narrative will be her knowledge, stewardship, and love of special places like the Columbia River Gorge, her advocacy and leadership for sound land use and above all, Mount Hood.

She challenged me to focus on the entire responsibility for protecting that mountain, leading not just to 120,000 acres of wilderness, but enacting a comprehensive vision for its protection.

She was a passionate, committed visionary whose influence will be felt and seen for generations.

DON'T FUND UNESCO BECAUSE IT
HAS RECOGNIZED A NON-EXISTENT
PALESTINIAN STATE

(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, Secretary Kerry has been pressuring the Israeli Government to relent in its opposition to U.S. funding for UNESCO.

It is a shame Secretary Kerry isn't using the full weight of his office to hold Abu Mazen and the corrupt Palestinian Authority accountable for their incitement to violence and their continued efforts to de-legitimize and isolate the Jewish state at the U.N. while pursuing unilateral state recognition.

But, with all due respect to the Israeli Government's newfound position, which undoubtedly was achieved under duress, this is a matter of U.S. law and Congress' clear desire to force fundamental reforms at the broken U.N. system.

Our laws are clear. No taxpayer dollars can be used to fund any agency at the U.N. that admits a nonexistent state of Palestine. UNESCO did, so, therefore, no U.S. dollars.

I urge Congress not to relent, but to stand with me and defend our jurisdiction and continue to uphold both the letter and the spirit of the law.

TERRORIST GUN LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, these are very anxious times here in America with good reason. We have an urgent national security issue at hand that allows somebody who is on the terrorist watch list to legally purchase a firearm.

How can somebody who pledges allegiance to ISIS be allowed to purchase a gun here in America?

We would never give a set of keys to somebody who was drunk to get behind the wheel. How is it that we allow someone a license to go and purchase a firearm?

We allow them to go and purchase a firearm in this country who are on the terrorist watch list. Would the same fight be taking place if they wanted to get onto an airliner, saying: Hey, let's let he or she on. They are on the terrorist watch list. I want them to fly with me.

That is the insanity we are dealing with. Over the course of the next few weeks, we have the ability to make a commonsense, simple approach to reducing the chance of terrorism here in America; that is, to keep those who are on the terrorist watch list from purchasing a firearm.

Let's come together, bipartisan, and pass this approach.

PRESIDENT OBAMA BROKE THE
LAW WITH THE BERGDahl DEAL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in May 2014, the President shocked the world by announcing that he had negotiated with terrorists to secure the disgraced Sergeant Bergdahl's release from the Taliban.

Yesterday the House Armed Services Committee, led by Chairman MAC THORBERRY, issued an in-depth report dealing with the President's secret negotiations. The report verified that the transfer violated several laws.

The American public was misled about the efforts to arrange the terrorists' pardon before it took place. Senior officials within the Department of Defense that were best equipped to evaluate the national security risk with this specific transfer were excluded from the process.

The President failed to take significant precautions to eliminate the risks posed by the Taliban Five, putting all American families as targets of more murderous attacks.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

We should all appreciate the six American heroes from the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne), 25th Infantry Division, who were killed in action while searching for Bergdahl to leave no one behind.

REAUTHORIZE THE JAMES
ZADROGA ACT

(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, the James Zadroga Act, the 9/11 Victims Health and Compensation Act, is up for renewal, surprise to everyone. It passed 5 years ago with a 5-year limit to be re-enacted in this Congress.

What has happened? Absolutely nothing. We keep waiting. We were told that the 9/11 victims compensation bill, the Zadroga Act, would be on the transportation bill. It was mysteriously withdrawn at the last moment. We don't know when this bill will pass.

What has happened to this place? What has happened to the spirit of bipartisanship to get this bill passed?

How can you, on the Republican side, go so low as to use this bill as grease to pass other legislation? That is what is being done right now.

The 9/11 Victims Act is being used as grease to pass other bills. It is outrageous. It is disrespectful to the men and women who gave all to serve this country, people who have stage 4 cancer today and are dying. It gives them no more solace to know that their country is not standing by them.

We continue to say "never forget," yet we continue to forget in this Christmastime, in this holiday season, those who are suffering.

Give them peace of heart and mind, and pass this bill.

A TRIBUTE TO MEG MECCARIELLO

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Meg Lawyer-Meccariello, who fought a hard battle against mesothelioma, an asbestos-related cancer.

Early in my term I met Meg in my office in Washington when she came to share the story of her sister, Mary Jo Lawyer Spano, who lost her life in her courageous battle with mesothelioma.

Meg shared how mesothelioma had tragically impacted her family, claiming the lives of Mary Jo and her father and leaving Meg and her sisters with unnerving diagnoses.

I vividly remember Meg's frustration and disparity by the information and lack of awareness about mesothelioma.

Despite all of this, Meg was a tremendous advocate for finding a cure for this terrible disease. Meg was instrumental in the introduction of legislation named in her sister's honor which would create the Nation's first mesothelioma patient registry.

I will continue to champion this legislation in Congress, now in memory of both Mary Jo and Meg. Meg lived with hope, strength, and grace, and she left this world a better place.

The Meccariello and Lawyer families are in our prayers.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, Sandy Hook, Colorado Springs, San Bernardino. How many mass shootings or terrorist attacks will it take for Congress to act to reduce gun violence?

We are not talking about infringing upon our important Second Amendment rights, no gun registries, or privacy evaluations. No. We are talking about commonsense reforms to make it harder for terrorists and criminals to get the weapons that allow them to kill people: universal background checks, closing the gun show loophole, making sure that people on the terrorist watch list can't quietly assemble arsenals to do the American people harm.

No congressional action can end gun violence, but we can reduce it. We can save lives. We can prevent mass shootings. We can prevent terrorists from assembling the weapons they need to kill innocent Americans.

Enough is enough.

NO-FLY LIST AND SECOND
AMENDMENT RIGHTS

(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, well, they are at it again. Earlier this year we saw the administration work to deny veterans because they may be on an arbitrary list for having sought financial help services, be threatened as incompetent to exercise gun ownership rights.

Now, with the left seeking any excuse to deny Second Amendment rights to Americans, there is much effort underway to use a no-fly list or even a selectee list to not only deny travel and flight rights to falsely listed American citizens with little or no due process to remove one's name from that list, but to extend denial of gun ownership rights as well.

The no-fly list can and should be a good tool for protecting against terror strikes, but needs criteria revision for a due process for those that have been wrongly listed to have an open chance to face their accusation.

As it is now, First, Fourth, and Fifth, let alone now the Second, Amendment constitutional protections are in danger of being denied for those citizens that are falsely listed because their name sounds like the name of someone actually who bears being watched or, in the hands of an aggressive gun control administration, the use of IRS-type tactics against people the powers that be don't like.

Such lists are dangerous to basic liberty. Let's first fix the process for how the no-fly list tool is used and revised before adding more restrictions, ones

that would not have even captured the San Bernardino shooters, to this list being added, the Democrat gun control Christmas or holiday period list.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON
H.R. 644, TRADE FACILITATION
AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT
OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR
CONSIDERATION OF SENATE
AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2250, LEG-
ISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIA-
TIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 560 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 560

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 644) to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes. 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 it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 644,

the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, and the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250, a continuing resolution which runs through December 16, 2015.

The resolution provides a standard conference report rule for consideration of H.R. 644, with 1 hour of debate divided pursuant to clause 8(d) of rule XXII.

In addition, the rule makes in order a motion from the chair of the Committee on Appropriations to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250, with 60 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations on the motion. In addition, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, first, this resolution allows for consideration of the conference report on the Customs bill. I think it is important to put the work of this House in perspective. As Speaker RYAN noted yesterday, in the entirety of the last Congress, only three conference reports became law. However, with the passage of this conference report, this Congress will have passed three conference reports in 10 days. I am pleased that Speaker RYAN's commitment to regular order is already bearing fruit.

This conference report is a good product. One provision especially important to me is the establishment of new tools for Customs and Border Protection, the CBP, to effectively act against the evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties. I was first introduced to this issue in 2009, when the Chinese dumped literally tens of thousands of tires on the U.S. market, leading to devastating job losses at tire factories across America. I helped to lead the charge at that time to ensure that the Department of Commerce would impose antidumping and countervailing duties. The ENFORCE Act language included in the conference report provides a mechanism and incentive for the CBP to properly investigate and apply appropriate duties to ensure that U.S. companies can compete on a level playing field.

In addition, I am encouraged that the conference report includes language which permanently bans States and localities from imposing a tax on Internet access. Initially enacted in 1998, this prohibition has enabled greater access to Internet services and information. It is estimated that if Congress fails to continue the ban on taxes on Internet access, consumers could end up paying more than \$16.4 billion annually. This moratorium has been law since 1998 on a temporary basis, and I am pleased this conference report reflects our intention to make it permanent.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Customs measure, this legislation contains a 5-day continuing resolution to allow the Appropriations Committee to continue its work towards an omnibus appropriations measure. It is simple,

straightforward, and extends funding for all government agencies through December 16, 2015, at current funding levels.

I urge all Members to support this short-term CR, which will allow the Appropriations Committee the time to conclude negotiations on a full-year funding measure with its Senate counterparts and the White House. I am encouraged by the hard work of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, whose leadership on this cannot be overstated.

One of the preeminent responsibilities we are tasked with, as Members of Congress, is to ensure that government continues to function. While a CR is not the ideal vehicle, the alternative of a government shutdown is not what we have been sent to Washington to accomplish. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition—I might add, reluctant opposition—to the rule on two important bills that really shouldn't be controversial: the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250—that is a short-term continuing resolution. It shouldn't be necessary. This body should have acted, but given that the body has not passed through regular order an appropriations process to keep government open, that bill is necessary—and the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

H.R. 644, which is often called the Customs bill, is a bill that needs to pass in some form. I want to see it pass. I have voted for it to go to conference. It has a lot of provisions that are extremely important to many Members, to our economy, and to even Americans traveling casually overseas. It increases, finally, the amount of items they can buy as gifts for their friends and then bring back without having to pay duties. But looking at the version that we are considering today under this rule, which does not allow amendments, I think the body would be better taking individual votes on some of the provisions.

There is a lot of good in this bill, but there is also a blatant attack on climate science, on environmental protection, and, really, items that serve no purpose in a bill written to facilitate trade. They even put a separate item preventing Internet sales tax, which I support the bill separately, and somehow this wound up in the Customs bill, a totally unrelated measure from a different committee that wound up in this bill at the last minute, this Christmas-tree bill. It wasn't in the House or the Senate version before. I think we do need to give Members a chance to be on the record to approve or not approve these items individually, and I think

that would be the open process that this Speaker has committed to.

The second item under this rule, the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250, our short-term continuing resolution, is straightforward and is necessary as we near the shutdown of government, which would otherwise occur December 11. Today would be the last day that we would fund government, so, of course, we have to act. You don't hear objection about that. The only objection I hear is: Why does this Congress always wait until the eleventh hour to pass these kinds of bills? It just doesn't make any sense. You don't wait until the day before government shuts down to say: Okay. We will give ourselves a 5-day reprieve.

Are we even going to be able to complete the omnibus or continuing resolution in those 5 days? I don't know. Are we going to be back here next Wednesday doing another 3-day or 5-day CR?

There is no particular reason that we are doing this, nothing new. No new information about how to better construct funding bills comes to us next week or the week after than we had last week or 2 weeks ago. I don't understand why we didn't do these bills last month. We passed the budget bills. We agreed on the overall dollar figures about a month ago. That is one of the hardest things about figuring out the appropriations bills and spending is what levels are you going to spend. We agreed on that. The House, the Senate, and the President agreed. So that is not even being discussed. Why didn't we do it within a week of that and just be done with it? It makes no sense.

So this bill would make December 16 the new deadline to finish Congress' appropriations work and keep government open, and I do think that Members and the public are anxious for us to complete our work. It is also critical that we get a good product.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the majority, the Republicans, have previously shown this country their willingness to go into a shutdown, so I hope that we take this new 5-day period to avoid a shutdown permanently rather than just to do another 3 or 5 days again and again and again.

Why aren't we sending a bill on appropriations to the President today? From my point of view, it seems like it is nothing more than partisan politics that is keeping it from getting done. I think the votes are here—they have been here, were here a month ago, and were here a week ago—for a common-sense bill that meets the budget that we have already agreed on, that doesn't have completely unrelated Christmas-tree policy riders that were put together in smoke-filled rooms rather than the open process that the new Speaker has committed to. And it is a real opportunity for this body to live up to that promise and put together an appropriations bill that passes overwhelmingly, which I think can absolutely be done.

Nearly every single member of the Democratic Caucus has said no divisive

or controversial riders. The appropriations bills are not a place for them. You don't bring government to the brink of a shutdown over policy disagreements. You don't say: "Look, unless we don't fund Planned Parenthood, we are shutting down government. Look, unless you don't ban the EPA from keeping our air clean, we are going to shut down government." You can have those debates and you can have those discussions, but it is not appropriate to do that with a threat of shutting down government.

Didn't the Republicans recently sign some sort of pledge to have no extraneous or legislation or must-pass bills? Well, what about taking on the President's attempt to protect clean air standards? If Republicans want it, then debate it and pass it. If you want to defund Planned Parenthood, then debate it and pass it, but not in a last-minute, closed package with a threat of closing government.

Compromise is what we did on the highway bill to pass a long-term authorization. It worked great. It didn't have what every single Member wanted, and we had to make tough compromises, but we can live with it. It passed overwhelmingly. Compromise is what we took yesterday when I got to go to the White House to see the Every Student Succeeds Act signed, the new Federal education law that replaces No Child Left Behind. It passed overwhelmingly in its final form in both the House and the Senate. Now, a compromise is not seeing how many partisan stocking stuffers you can jam into a must-pass bill before we head home for the holidays.

Moving to the Customs enforcement bill, H.R. 644, it is, for the most part, a very positive bill. The Customs bill is about giving the administration the tools they need to make sure we are fighting a fair fight when it comes to trade and to updating and eliminating unintended consequences of other trade laws. I heard Ranking Member LEVIN testify in the Rules Committee yesterday that the key to enforcement on trade issues was the willingness of the administration to act, and the final step of enforcing our existing and future trade agreements will always fall to the executive branch. But they can't fight those fights without the right tools in the toolbox. That is what the Customs bill does, and this bipartisan bill has a lot of very high-quality elements that we will likely send to the administration before the holidays.

It has the full ENFORCE Act, which would require immediate action to investigate and address trade cheats and take measures to stop those who continually attempt to circumvent the penalties already imposed on them. It establishes and funds the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center, which helps agencies find trade cheats and those who engage in illegal dumping that risk putting Americans out of work. It establishes the Trade Enforcement Fund, which would provide critical and

dedicated resources to enforce our trade agreements, and it would help with capacity building, an important issue which would help our current and future trading partners implement labor and environmental standards that we push them towards in a real way.

The bill also contains important language on ending the importation of goods made from child or forced labor, which is yet another step we are taking towards ending this abominable practice on a global scale. It also includes bipartisan language which gives the executive branch new tools in evaluating and consulting with partner countries who may be manipulating their currency.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to be serious with enforcing our trade agreements, then the enforcement provisions in this bill are a major step forward. We may still have to push this Executive when we feel they aren't using these tools, but having these tools available is a critical step.

The Customs bill also gives a leg up to American small business. The bill makes commerce at the border more efficient. It modernizes the operation of Customs and Border Patrol; and something that I fought for for many years, it raises the de minimis threshold from \$200 to \$800, which, again, is important to all Americans who travel overseas. Being able to have smaller items cross our border duty-free is a major win for small businesses and consumers, especially in the e-commerce space on the commercial side, but also for casual tourists who travel overseas.

What that means is, when you are re-entering this country, if you ever have to fill out one of those forms if you are coming back from Mexico or Canada or Europe, the de minimis threshold was \$200, and technically you are responsible for a duty above that. This finally raises it. It hasn't been adjusted for inflation for decades. This raises it to \$800, so you can truly bring back gifts for your friends and family. This is important for individuals, and it is important for businesses.

The bill makes important technical corrections that are important to companies in my district, like adjusting tariff lines for outdoor wear and footwear.

□ 0930

I am also very excited to say, as the cochair of the Nepal Caucus, that the bill includes the Nepal Trade Preferences Act, a very important provision that is a tangible benefit for Nepal's recovering economic market. That is simply the right thing to do. As many here know, Nepal suffered a devastating earthquake on April 25, 2015. Over 9,000 people were killed; 23,000 were injured. The earthquake triggered a series of avalanches on Mt. Everest where 19 people, including one of my constituents, were killed in what was the deadliest day in Mt. Everest history.

The country has begun the urgent process of rebuilding. Despite the trying circumstances, Nepal has remained resilient. On December 20, I am proud to say, the democratically elected constituent assembly announced the passage of a new democratic constitution, a remarkable chapter for a country that, until recently, had been mired in civil war and strife.

I am honored to join Representative CRENSHAW, my cochair on the U.S. Nepal Caucus, in introducing the Nepal Trade Preferences Act, which gives preferential treatment to textile, leather, and apparel products made in Nepal. And the bill facilitates capacity building to help expand the Nepali export market.

I am very grateful for the hard work of my colleague from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), and the simultaneous effort that has been taking place in the Senate under the leadership of Senator FEINSTEIN.

Nepal is a very important and strategic ally between global powers, India and China. Cooperation with America to help build capacity and build the Nepali economy and stability is a critical foreign policy priority, in addition to being an economic benefit to the American people.

I believe trade can be a mechanism for poverty reduction worldwide. I am heartened to see that this act, which attempts to do that, is included in the Customs bill.

With all these great things, why would anybody oppose this bill? Unfortunately, like anything, it is not that easy. I joined my Democratic colleagues in voting against the Customs bill when it was on the House floor last summer. Despite knowing that it needed to get done, I was simply unable to vote for a bill that contained extraneous, unnecessary attacks on climate science, on environmental protections, and on immigrants.

These are some of the things that needed to be taken out in the conference committee. They should have been taken out in the conference committee. If they were, I would be proudly 100 percent supporting this bill. If I could, in an open process, I would be amending the bill today to take them out, so that this bill could enjoy broad Democratic support.

The only positive thing I can say is that, emerging from conference, this bill is less bad than it was. Included in the underlying report is a renegotiated provision on greenhouse gas emissions and the role in international trade agreements that certainly is not as bad as the version that originally passed the House and, many argue, would not have any significant legally constraining role on agreements negotiated by the chief executive.

The House negotiated an objective that would have prohibited the USTR from pursuing trade agreements that obligate United States law or regulation towards global warming and climate change was stripped. It was replaced with an equally nontopical, but

somewhat convoluted, provision that is a little difficult to understand.

We use new language to bar trade agreements from including obligations to alter U.S. law or regulations surrounding greenhouse gas emissions.

To clarify, international trade policy will not be the stage on which the United States establishes and implements strong and thoughtful climate change policy. That is what Congress is for, that is what our States are for, that is what our local governments are for. That must be done. I think we all agree that won't be done through trade agreements.

In that sense, the language was only added to speak to a deeply held fear by my Republican Party colleagues to even acknowledge that climate change exists. To my colleagues on the other side, I would say, this is simply not the place for that kind of ideological statement.

Further, the language contradicts itself by explicitly allowing the USTR to seek provisions, including those related to global warming and climate change, if doing so would fulfill another negotiating objective.

So, we bar negotiators from discussing environmental policy objectives and then flip, allowing them to do so if it meets another objective.

Not only is this language unnecessary, it is a messy, convoluted, contradictory-type of compromise that nobody really even knows what it would mean, and is really rife for lawyers on both sides to be debating it for years or decades.

The entire world is in Paris right now talking about specifics on fighting climate change. And here we are today, with the only political party in the developed world that still questions the existence of climate change in their very platform, attaching this ridiculous provision to an unrelated Customs bill, embarrassing our own negotiators while they are in Paris.

We get it: you don't agree with the rest of the world on this, you don't agree with scientists on this, you don't agree with the majority of Americans on that. We get that. Next year, feel free to pass a resolution that says, we don't believe in climate change, if that is what you want to do. But put it on your letterhead; don't put it into an unrelated Customs bill that is actually important for our economy and for the American people. Stop trying to muddle good bipartisan bills with this sort of divisive, unscientific language that, frankly, not only threatens the environment, but also embarrasses our country. These kinds of provisions have no place in bills like the Customs bill and should have been taken out in the process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First, I want to begin by agreeing with my friend on the other side on a number of areas. I, too, have concerns about the process by which we operate,

and would have preferred a number of these items to come, as my friend suggests, separately. But the reality is, of course, we are late in the year and late in the session, we have got significant work to do, and this, I think, is the best way to proceed.

It is worth noting that the conference report itself is a compromise. The Democrats and Republicans were involved in putting that together, and, indeed, this entire bill has considerable Democratic support, as we work toward a larger compromise on the omnibus itself.

It is also worth noting why we ended up in this situation. Frankly, the Appropriations Committee in this House accomplished its work—all of its work—for the first time in a long time early this year. All 12 legislative bills passed through the Appropriations Committee, six of them across this floor. To suggest that anything has been done in the dark or in the back room, frankly, ignores that fact.

What happened was the United States Senate chose not to allow any appropriations bills to come to the floor. They didn't do that as a body. My friends on the other side of the aisle in the Senate—the Democrats—chose not to allow any bills to come to the floor. To be fair to them, they also completed every appropriations bill through the full committee. That is the first time that has happened in many, many years in the United States Senate.

But, our friends, until we got this larger agreement, the budget agreement, which I was happy to vote for, and I know my friend on the other side also voted for, until we reached that point, the appropriations process in the other body didn't happen. At some point, that affects what is going on over here. If they are not moving bills, we stop moving bills because it is sort of a waste of time to do that. If you have got complaints, you should talk to your colleagues in the other body on your side of the aisle, and tell them hopefully next year they won't try to keep bills from moving to the floor in a normal way. Again, I am proud that this body moved all 12 bills through the Appropriations Committee.

I also want to make a couple of other points in terms of where we are now in trying to reach an omnibus. This puts me a little bit, again, at odds with my friend. I don't think that is a closed process. Frankly, it is a pretty normal process. There are representatives involved in these negotiations, both Democratic and Republican, and from the administration. They are working very hard, in good faith, to try and do something that is extremely difficult. Writing a \$1.1 trillion omnibus bill takes a lot of time, and there are multiple items to be negotiated. I think both sides are negotiating in good faith in this legislative body, and I think the administration is participating in good faith.

My friend and I will also disagree that riders on appropriations bills, as

they are called, is somehow unusual. They certainly, when they were in the majority, had lots of riders on appropriations bills. It is just not an unusual thing. There is, obviously, give-and-take on these things. But Congress, exercising the power of the purse, is a perfectly appropriate constitutional tool to use.

In this case, where we end up will, indeed, be a compromise. The omnibus bill cannot pass either Chamber, and certainly has to be signed by the President of the United States. A Republican Congress, our friends with the appropriate tools and votes that they have, the President of the United States, who has the ultimate veto pen, all of these parties will have to be placated. Again, that negotiation is long and complex. We are making good progress. All parties are represented there.

Eventually, a bill will be presented to this body, hopefully, in the next few days. I share my friend's concern. I would prefer not to be here. But if we have to be here next week and have two or three more days to have the process work out, so be it.

The lessons I think we ought to draw from this, and that we have a chance to implement next year, are let's do a normal process. We already have an agreement now for next year's spending numbers. That is a step in the right direction, and, actually, says a lot of good things about all parties and all concerned that they were able to come to this larger agreement earlier this year.

We have no excuse, in my view, not to move all 12 bills across the floor in regular order under an open rule so every Member can come down here and participate. I know that that is certainly the goal of Chairman ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I know that is the goal of his ranking member, the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

I think the hard work this year has set us up both for a fruitful compromise here in the waning days of the calendar year in the legislative session, and has actually laid the foundation for something we have not seen around here in a long time: regular order, next year. In the course of that regular order, all of us will be forced to compromise.

We still live in a divided government: a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. We still operate in a system of checks and balances that our Constitutional forebearers set up over 230 years ago. That system has served us pretty well over the course of our history. I think it will continue to. And it will continue to demand compromise. We have seen a little bit more of that lately. I know my friend has his concerns, some of which, again, I share.

I am pretty proud of a Congress that has: number one, produced the first unitary budget since 2001, where the Senate and the House agree that, for

the first time since 2006, has moved all appropriations bills through the Appropriations Committee of both Chambers; that, actually, in recent days and weeks, passed landmark legislation, as my friend referred to, the Reauthorization of Higher Education Act, where I know he played a role in that; the highway bill that was recently passed; this conference report, which I know my friend has some concerns with, but, in fairness, speaks well of him, and pointed out a lot of things that he liked in this conference report.

If we sit here and wait to pass things where we all get 100 percent of what we want, nothing will ever pass the United States Congress. Certainly, in a bill this large, when we reach the omnibus, this is going to call for many compromises. This bill before us has called for many compromises. But people have found a way to work in good faith.

My friend is perfectly in order to oppose the rule. That is a pretty normal position for each side to take, minority and majority. I never have any problem with that. I think we will pass the rule. I hope he looks at the entire bill: the funding of the government and the Customs Act, where he had some concerns, but also had many things to point to that he thought were appropriate and good; and the Internet tax prevention that we now make permanent, where I know my friend has worked very hard for many years to do that.

And, yes, there will be some things in this bill that he doesn't like. There are some things in this bill that I don't like. But I think if you look at the merits of it, the permanent end of taxes on the Internet, the Customs legislation that my friend very ably pointed out has many good provisions; finally, the essential operation of government for the next few days, so people negotiating in good faith for both my friend's party and my party and from the administration can actually arrive at a deal. I think there is a lot of merit in the underlying legislation.

I would just ask that we be realistic. Again, my friend is perfectly within his rights to oppose both these measures, the rule and the final bill. I certainly understand his concern about the rule. If the roles were reversed, my concerns would probably be similar. I hope he looks to the underlying legislation when that vote comes and says, there are a lot of good things here.

There is a lot of give-and-take by both sides. There is real compromise. We have done a lot of that in the last few weeks under Speaker RYAN. I think we have the opportunity to do more next year. Let's pass the rule, pass the underlying legislation; get to finishing our business in the next few days; hopefully give the American people what they deserve: some peace, quiet, and certainty in the Christmas season; and then come back here next year with an opportunity to build on this and do some tremendous things in a bipartisan way. That is what I intend to

work for. I know that is what my friend will be working for.

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

□ 0945

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I am here to speak in support of the Customs bill that we will be facing later today. It represents significant progress over the version from earlier this summer that I opposed. Part of this progress is due to strong bipartisan support from the Senate and bipartisan give-and-take with some of my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee.

I appreciate having worked with then-Chair RYAN and Chairman BRADY to see some of these elements improve. I think it is important to recognize that the bill before us is substantially better. I know there are concerns by some of my friends about currency manipulation, which I share, and we have been pushing for and secured stronger provisions.

In the Customs bill, we have elements that represent the give-and-take of a legislative process, working with the administration; and the provisions, while no one would suggest they are perfect, are substantially better than the situation we have right now. We will be better off with the currency provisions in the Customs bill.

It contains many provisions that I fought for that are important to my constituents—businesses in the Pacific Northwest—dealing with unfair and outmoded tariff provisions, dealing with things like performance outerwear, that I know I share with my friend from Colorado. These are important both in terms of businesses that we represent and constituents that we represent who value that equipment—the shoes, the outdoor apparel—and making it more affordable.

Beyond the elements of making sure that the Customs system works more appropriately, there are important things that I think all of us can point to and be enthusiastic about. Both speakers have mentioned the end of the importation of products that are made by child and forced labor. There are strong provisions here to help us keep that out of the stream of commerce.

My friend from Oklahoma referenced the ENFORCE Act, and there have been problems—tires, solar panels—up in my area. We have had people cheat and do so with impunity. Incorporating the provisions of the ENFORCE Act gives us the tools to go after the cheaters, to make them pay, and to protect American companies and their employees.

It permanently establishes the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center to centralize and enforce trade enforcement. This is an area that I have been

working on throughout this process. In the Ways and Means Committee, I introduced the STRONGER Act with my friend and former fellow Northwesterner, Senator MARIA CANTWELL from Washington, to deal with ways to better enforce our agreements.

Today trade agreements are complex and trade enforcement takes a long period of time. They are expensive. Frankly, we are not equipped as well as we should be to do the job of protecting Americans by enforcing and implementing these agreements.

This legislation includes the trust fund for enforcement and in-country capacity building. It provides for up to \$30 million a year. It may not seem like much when we are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars in the Federal Government, but when you consider that the budget of the United States Trade Representative is less than \$60 million to do all of the things with which they are charged, being able to have a \$30 million a year enforcement fund is a very significant advancement.

Now, I am mindful of the extraneous climate provisions. I think they are unfortunate and should have been left out. I think my Republican friends in the future are going to be embarrassed by doing things like this, particularly when the rest of the world is in Paris, working to try and help deal with the crisis that is carbon pollution and climate change.

As a practical matter, again, the result of working with the administration and people in the Senate, the provision that is stuck in the bill, yes, is confusing, but it is much better than it was in June, and I am convinced it doesn't change the status quo at all, nor prohibit other efforts in different forums, such as Paris.

The optics are bad for my Republican friends, I think, and I do believe that they will rue the day for doing things like this. But, as a practical matter, we are not going to solve our climate problems through international trade. This doesn't change that.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Because of the composition of the Senate and Republican opposition, we couldn't pass those things when we were in charge. So we are going to do it through other mechanisms. This Customs bill does not prevent that. I strongly urge my colleagues' favorable consideration.

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

First of all, I want to thank my good friend from Oregon for coming to the floor and for, frankly, more ably explaining the Customs portion of this legislation than I could.

I want to commend him and his colleagues for working in a bipartisan fashion to improve a bill that had passed earlier this year in ways that I think broadly make it more acceptable

to a larger percentage in this body. He is to be commended for that. So are his colleagues on that committee on both sides of the aisle. So is the administration, which I know has been heavily involved in these deliberations.

I think my friend makes an excellent argument for the passage of the underlying legislation. When you combine that with a permanent prohibition on Internet taxation—something I assume my friend also supports—and the necessary continuing resolution to give us a few more days to negotiate a bipartisan omnibus spending bill that, frankly, both parties will need to contribute votes toward and that the administration ultimately will have the prerogative of signing, I take these to be hopeful signs.

With some of the things that have happened in the last few weeks on a bipartisan transportation bill and on a bipartisan education bill and with what I am convinced is essentially a bipartisan conference report here today and with what will be a bipartisan omnibus bill, it sounds to me like significant progress.

It is something that leaders on both sides of the aisle can take some pride in as long as we get it done, hopefully, in a timely way next week and then come back here and build on this progress for all of next year, when we can move under regular order.

Again, I thank my friend for his hard work on the Customs portion of this. I also thank him for giving what I thought was a very thoughtful, constitutional lesson in give-and-take.

There are some things that we might all like to achieve, but that are just simply not possible, given the distribution of political power, the checks and balances in our system, and the fact that people do have, indeed, differing opinions and perspectives.

But the fact that we have gotten to this point I think demonstrates we can produce a good product even within a complex constitutional system, with a rather polarized political environment, and given the hard realities of divided government. I am pleased we have made the progress that we have made, and I thank my friend for his participation in that.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Colorado and let me thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for the thoughtful discussion and for the tone in which it is offered.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us certainly are interested in coming to a place next week that embraces, really, the values of America and all of our concerns, and, obviously, riders that are toxic are obstacles we need to continue to discuss.

In my district, I have senior citizens with blue tarps on the tops of their homes, blue tarps that have been there

since the terrible Hurricane Ike. Obviously, we need the Housing and Urban Development to have funding that not only addresses affordable housing, but senior housing repair.

It comes down through community development. In the manner in which we are going through this, we are looking for that kind funding to make sure that the plus-up of \$80 billion that came about through the budget agreement gets evenly distributed, if you will. What happens is that, with the extenders of tax provisions that are unpaid for, the blue tarps in my district continue to exist. Seniors have roofs that are falling in.

I think that is an important issue at which many of us will be looking this weekend, and we will be looking to the appropriators to do what is right by the American people.

We wrote a letter regarding the Minority HIV/AIDS Program, which was gutted out. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that HIV/AIDS is resurging among young people and among minorities. This is no time to zero out that funding.

As we go through this process, we are asking the question whether you are putting in toxic riders, but are not focusing on funding that is needed. The Thomas Street Clinic in my district needs the minority HIV funding.

I know that my good friends Mr. POLIS and Mr. COLE are certainly interested in making sure that transportation funding matches the funding that came about through the bill. Then, certainly, I hope that, as I listen to the calm discussion by Mr. POLIS, we can find a way to eliminate the prohibition from the Centers for Disease Control to not do their work.

Why are we preventing them from discerning the impact of gun violence on suicide? of the impact of gun violence on young people who are committing suicide? We have done research on drunk driving. We have done research on cancer. We have done research on diabetes. We have done research to move the country forward in a healthy manner. Why are we blocking the CDC from assessing what the impact is from gun violence?

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I now understand that the Internet Tax Freedom Act is in this legislation and it is in this legislation permanently. There was no hearing. I remember this bill on the floor of the House in June.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of letters to include for the RECORD. One is from Tom McGee, the President and CEO of the International Council of Shopping Centers. One is from the NRF. One is from the AFL-CIO.

DECEMBER 10, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 70,000 members of the International Council

of Shopping Centers (ICSC), I am writing to urge you to oppose the conference report on H.R. 644, Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, which contains a non-germane provision permanently extending the Internet Tax Freedom Act (PITFA). This is considered a key vote for ICSC.

Because PITFA was included without being paired with long awaited remote sales tax collection legislation, the added fiscal pressure being put on states and local governments will result in less funds for first responders and infrastructure and additional pressure to increase other state and local taxes such as sales or property taxes. This will truly add insult to injury for thousands of local businesses across the country.

As an organization, ICSC supports PITFA but strongly believes that a permanent restriction on states' ability to tax telecommunications services should absolutely be linked with the restoration of states' rights to collect sales taxes that are already owed in 45 states today. It is not only a missed opportunity to pursue good policy, but the manner in which this provision is being advanced certainly represents a departure from regular order.

After more than 20 years, close to 40 hearings and a successful bipartisan vote in the Senate, it is time for Congress to do the right thing and update sales tax collection policy to reflect the 21st century marketplace. The shopping center industry has sales that represent 15% of U.S. GDP, employs 1 out of every 11 Americans and generates \$141 billion in sales tax revenue. Our industry touches people's lives every day and is essential to the economic, civic and social vibrancy of every community. We urge you to send an important message on state tax policy and oppose H.R. 644. Please vote NO when the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act Conference report is voted on later this week.

Sincerely,

TOM MCGEE,
President & CEO.

NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

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

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND SPEAKER RYAN: On behalf of the National Retail Federation (NRF), I would like to take this opportunity to share our views on the Conference Report to the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (HR 644). NRF is concerned with the last-minute inclusion of the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (PITFA) as part of the Conference Report, without also including legislation to provide parity in sales tax treatment of internet sales with sales in brick and mortar stores, like H.R. 2775, The Remote Transactions Parity Act.

NRF has long supported the efforts to pass a Customs Reauthorization bill, especially those provisions focused on trade facilitation. We believe the Conference Report includes provisions to help facilitate and streamline the Customs process. While we strongly support enforcement of U.S. trade laws, we remain concerned with the final enforcement language and the impact it will have on retailers and other downstream consumers.

Unfortunately we are extremely concerned about the inclusion of the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (PITFA) in the final conference report. Retailers have long believed that it is appropriate to eliminate the

sales tax discrimination for brick and mortar stores as part of Congressional consideration of PITFA. This past Thanksgiving week-end was the first time that electronic sales surpassed brick and mortar sales in that key metric for retail sales. As more and more Main Street retailers close their doors because they cannot compete, it is time for Congress to remove the sales tax advantage for internet sellers that is harming our communities. We need a level playing field so retailers can compete without the government advantaging one sector of the industry over another.

NRF is the world's largest retail trade association, representing discount and department stores, home goods and specialty stores, Main Street merchants, grocers, wholesalers, chain restaurants and Internet retailers from the United States and more than 45 countries. Retail is the nation's largest private sector employer, supporting one in four U.S. jobs—42 million working Americans. Contributing \$2.6 trillion to annual GDP, retail is a daily barometer for the nation's economy.

We urge you to remove language on PITFA from the final conference report, unless it is accompanied by sales tax fairness.

Sincerely,

DAVID FRENCH,
Senior Vice President,
Government Relations.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

December 10, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I write to urge you to oppose the conference report on H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Customs Bill).

The Customs Bill, which when it emerged from the Senate had bipartisan support and included provisions supported by both labor and industry, was loaded up in the House with numerous controversial and partisan provisions that weakened or unacceptably altered it and would make it more difficult to negotiate trade agreements that are good for workers and the environment. Unfortunately, numerous of these unacceptable provisions remain in the bill that will be voted upon.

Stripped from the final bill is a critical bipartisan currency provision that would have made clear the U.S. can treat currency manipulation as a countervailable subsidy. The remaining currency provisions are a poor substitute, simply calling for "engagement" and with so-called "consequences" that simply won't work—including the possible exclusion from OPIC funding, something the worst currency manipulators (including China and Japan) don't receive anyway.

The conferenced Customs Bill also contains language that U.S. free trade agreements (FTAs) must not include obligations regarding greenhouse gas emissions. This will prevent the United States from making meaningful commitments on climate policy. It is incomprehensible how a 21st century trade agenda would ignore the reality of important climate issues.

Also included in the bill is language weakening the Menendez trafficking amendment, which barred Tier 3 trafficking nations from joining U.S. FTAs. Weakening this provision by allowing a nation to be included should they merely implement "principal" recommendations for changes, undermines the U.S. commitment to lead on human trafficking and raises doubt regarding the ability of the FTAs to protect workers and ensure compliance by trading partners with internationally recognized ILO labor rights, including the right to be free from forced

labor. This move is particularly troubling given the recent interest expressed by Thailand in joining the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). Thailand is a Tier 3 trafficking nation and should not be allowed to participate in the TPP until such time as it is no longer justifiably designated as a worst-trafficking nation. On a related note, language is included in the bill that could be used to prevent trade deals from ensuring that migrant workers have effective protections and remedies against fraud, trafficking, forced labor, and other forms of labor exploitation and abuse.

This package also contains a harmful bill unrelated to trade. We strenuously oppose the inclusion of the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (PITFA), which bans the authority of state and local governments to impose taxes on internet access. By restricting state and local government taxing authority, this bill reduces the ability of state and local governments to raise funds to invest in needed infrastructure, education, health care, job training and other vital public services. This unrelated harmful measure was unfortunately added at the last minute.

While the bill does contain Rep. Sanchez's ENFORCE Act, which would address the circumvention of antidumping and countervailing duties and assist with addressing unfair trade, other provisions in this bill remain unacceptable.

The Customs Conference Report unfortunately too closely resembles the flawed House version of the bill and the AFL-CIO urges you to oppose it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is, with what you are doing, even though there is a 4-year lapse, you are grandfathering this. My own State of Texas will lose \$358 million, Wisconsin \$120 million, Ohio \$65 million, and South Dakota will lose about \$13 million.

Are we going to replace those moneys from the Federal Government? What are we going to do to the retail industry that has bricks and mortar?

My friends, I am going to support a CR, but I do believe we should work together to do things that impact us positively and not negatively. Get rid of the riders and help our States, which have a need to have this Internet tax provision lifted.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee; as the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; and as the representative from Houston, I rise in opposition to the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act" being in this bill.

When originally enacted in 1998, the Internet Tax Freedom Act established a temporary moratorium on multiple and discriminatory taxation of the Internet as well as new taxes on Internet access.

This moratorium, however, is due to expire on October 1st of this year.

Since 1998, Congress has extended the moratorium on a temporary basis. The bill before us will make that moratorium permanent.

Unfortunately, in doing so, the bill also ends the Act's grandfather protections for states that imposed such taxes prior to the Act's enactment date.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is problematic for several reasons.

First, Congress, instead of supporting this seriously flawed legislation, should be focusing on meaningful ways to help state and local governments, taxpayers, and local retailers. The House can do that by addressing the remote sales tax issue.

In addition to extending the expiring moratorium on a temporary basis, the House should take up and send to the Senate legislation that would give states the authority to collect sales taxes from remote sellers.

Such a proposal would incentivize remote sellers to collect and remit sales taxes as well as require states to simplify several procedures that would benefit retailers.

Such legislation would enable states and local governments to collect more than \$23 billion in estimated uncollected sales taxes each year.

The measure would also help level the playing field for local retailers—who must collect sales taxes—when they compete with out-of-state businesses that do not collect these taxes.

Retail competitors should be able to compete fairly with their internet counterparts at least with respect to sales tax policy.

The House should do its part and address the remote sales tax disparity before the end of this Congress.

Second, this legislation will severely impact the immediate revenues for the grandfather-protected states and all states progressively in the long term.

The Congressional Budget Office, for example, estimates that this bill will cost certain states "several hundred million dollars annually" in lost revenues.

Indeed, the Federation of Tax Administrators has estimated that the bill will cause the grandfather-protected states to lose at least \$500 million in lost revenue annually.

For my home state of Texas, enactment of this bill will result in a revenue loss of \$358 million per year. Texas will not be alone in these losses, annually: Wisconsin will lose about \$127 million, Ohio will lose about \$65 million, and South Dakota will lose about \$13 million.

Should this bill become law, state and local governments will have to choose whether they will cut essential government services—such as educating our children, maintaining needed transportation infrastructure, and providing essential public health and safety services—or shift the tax burden onto other taxpayers through increased property, income, and sales taxes.

Meanwhile, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has estimated that the permanent moratorium will deny the non-grandfathered states of almost \$6.5 billion in potential state and local sales tax revenues each year in perpetuity.

This bill will burden taxpayers, while excluding an entire industry from paying their fair share of taxes.

Finally, this bill ignores the fundamental nature of the Internet.

The original moratorium was intentionally made temporary to ensure that Congress, industry, and state and local governments would be able to monitor the issue and make adjustments where necessary to accommodate new technologies and market realities.

The Act was intended as a temporary measure to assist and nurture the fledgling Internet that—back in 1998—was still in its commercial

infancy. Yet, this bill ignores the significantly changed environment of today's internet.

The bill's supporters continue to believe that the internet still is in need of extraordinary protection in the form of exemption from all state taxation.

But, the internet of 2015 is drastically different from its 1998 predecessor. And, surely the internet and its attendant technology will continue to evolve.

Permanently extending the tax moratorium severely limits Congress's ability to revisit and make any necessary adjustments.

Simply put, a permanent moratorium is unwise.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 235 and I reserve the balance of my time.

The bill is misguided legislation that will devastate state revenues, especially for those states currently protected by the grandfather clause, and could force state governments to eliminate essential governmental programs and services, while increasing the burden on taxpayers.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to reject this flawed legislation; that makes the internet tax moratorium permanent, in part.

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

First, I want to thank my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, for coming down and raising important issues.

I am not involved in the negotiations where HUD is concerned, but it would be my hope that her concerns would be addressed, quite frankly. I think, with the additional funds that are a product of the bipartisan negotiations of the Budget Act, which I know my friend supported, there is certainly a prospect that that will occur.

The negotiations that are going on now are indeed bipartisan. I have no doubt my friend's point of view is ably represented by her Democratic colleagues in those negotiations and by the administration. So, hopefully, we will arrive at a product in the next few days that will address some of those concerns.

I want to reinforce my friend's remarks about moving in a cooperative way. Again, we are not going to agree on every part of every piece of legislation, but I think the underlying legislation that we present today is a product of bipartisan cooperation and of compromise and of give-and-take. It is my hope that many people on both sides of the aisle will be able to support that.

There are three important elements of the Customs proposals. My friend from Oregon earlier laid out the many virtues with them, and, frankly, my friend from Colorado has extolled many parts of them.

The prohibition of taxation on the Internet I think is something we have routinely passed through this body since 1998. It has usually not been a particularly contentious issue. It is something we agree on on both sides of the aisle. Making it permanent makes a lot of sense, and I am hopeful that

many of my colleagues who have worked so hard on that will see that as an advantage.

Finally, I don't think we disagree on a short-term continuing resolution because we know that our Representatives on the Appropriations Committee—certainly Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY—are working really hard to find a bipartisan compromise.

□ 1000

Now, I will remind my friends, we are not going to agree on every part of this bill. There will be elements, so-called riders, that are in them that probably some of my friends don't like. There will be Democratic riders in this bill, not just Republican riders. That is just the process of normal legislation.

Congress has every right to use the power of the purse. I don't know any executive branch, be it Republican or Democrat, that ever likes Congress getting down to the details of this. They just expect us to write a check for whatever they ask for. Well, that is not the way our Constitution is set up.

While the executive branch has a range of powers and authorities that are unique to itself, at the end of the day, we do fund every single activity that they engage in. At the end of the day, we have the right to say: Well, we agree with you here, here, and here, but we disagree here, and we are not funding that activity.

Now, in this case, I would always point out that wherever we end up at the end of the day is, by necessity, going to be a matter of compromise. My friends, frankly, don't have the congressional strength in either the House or the Senate to dictate to us, but we don't have it to dictate to them either.

Obviously, the President of the United States is of my friend's political party, and he has got to sign this legislation. So anything that gets done is going to involve a lot of compromises. Anything that comes to this floor, whether you like or dislike it, will have been approved at some level or, at least, accepted at some level by Members of both parties, as this is what we had to agree to.

So I am optimistic about that, and I am very pleased, frankly, that this process is largely driven by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, and by Mrs. LOWEY from New York. I know them to be exceptional legislators. I know that all parties concerned here and their Senate counterparts and their administration counterparts are involved in a good faith effort to give us a good funding bill for next year and to set the stage for what we hope is a normal appropriations process.

If we have that process next year, my friends on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to see every bill on the floor, the opportunity to offer any amendment they want, the opportunity to literally educate the com-

mittee about some concern that may be unique to their district or something that they understand, frankly, better than the members of the Appropriations Committee. That is the process that we are trying to get back to. I know it will serve the country well if we can actually reach that.

What we have done in the last few months of this year has actually set that up: the budget agreement, which was preceded by a temporary CR and the budget agreement that came out of that, the omnibus we are working on now, and the legislation that has passed in the last few weeks in a very bipartisan fashion on education and highways. All of those things create a foundation for what can be an exceptionally productive year next year and one where we move through regular order.

Again, I thank my friend from Texas for bringing her concerns to the floor. I look forward to working with her on the underlying legislation, which I hope has enough items in it to attract significant bipartisan support.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and as someone who has been involved in negotiations in regards to the Customs bill before us today, I rise in strong support of that bill. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The Customs bill before us today is not the Customs bill that was reported out of the House in June of this year, a bill, quite frankly, that I couldn't support because of extraneous provisions—controversial provisions—that got included in it.

Through the product of the give-and-take in the negotiations, I think we reached a good bipartisan compromise. This is what bipartisanship looks like: the cooperation, the give-and-take. It is not a perfect bill. I know there are still some objections to it.

At its crux, however, this bill provides us important tools and resources to enhance enforcement mechanisms so we can enforce trade agreements and the standards that we are trying to elevate in these trade agreements. For instance, this bill, with the language that I worked on very hard with my colleagues Mr. LEVIN and Mr. LEWIS on the Ways and Means Committee will finally end the importation of goods and products based on the exploitation of child and forced and slave labor. That is in this bill.

This bill also includes the full ENFORCE Act on the Senate side, the PROMISE Act on the House side that again gives us additional tools to enforce elevated standards in the trade agreements that we lacked previously.

It also establishes for the first time an interagency trade enforcement center to require greater coordination from our agencies when it comes to the implementation and the enforcement of trade provisions that matter, leveling the playing field for our businesses, our workers, and our farmers.

With the help of my friend from Oregon, we were able to get included a trade enforcement trust fund so that resources are dedicated for the enforcement of trade agreements. I hear that a lot from our colleagues that they are not so much concerned with what goes into the trade agreements; they are more concerned about the lack of follow-up and the enforcement of the trade agreements. Again, because of the progress we have made and the creation of this trust fund, there will be resources in the future that will enable us to better enforce the trade agreements that are in front of us.

This also, again, to the credit of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), establishes a Super 301 section, enhanced trade enforcement on key priorities, such as labor, environmental, and human rights standards that are now being negotiated in the body of these trade agreements. They are fully enforceable like any other provision. This Super 301 gives us tools now to be able to follow that up and enforce it.

This also establishes a State trade and export promotion program to help our smaller businesses, our manufacturers in our respective States to get in the game and be able to offer more export opportunities to them. We know that with exporting companies their workers are paid roughly 18 to 19 percent more than other workers in our economy, so this is a good thing to help promote exports in our own country.

This also provides our Treasury-enhanced tools when it comes to fighting against the manipulation of currency in the foreign markets. The Bennett language that was agreed to in this language is a step in the right direction when it comes to the enforcement of currency manipulation.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, again, that is a source of concern that many of our colleagues have expressed concern about and, I think, legitimately so. Again, progress was made in this Customs bill when it comes to currency manipulation.

For all these reasons, I think it is important that we move forward on this Customs bill and give this administration and future administrations the tools they need in order to enforce trade agreements so we can elevate standards and begin to level the playing field for our workers, our businesses, and our farmers so that they can be as successful as they can be in

the 21st century global economy. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

I just want to quickly respond to my friend's point and, number one, thank him for his hard work in getting us to this position on this very important Customs legislation. I appreciate the bipartisan manner in which the work product was clearly achieved. I take a lot of hope from the fact that our current Speaker was actually the chairman of the committee in much of that process, and obviously Mr. BRADY from Texas continues in that tradition. So I am pretty hopeful that we are seeing a good, open process that is producing products that Members on both sides of this Chamber are happy to support and participate in. So this is a good and hopeful thing. Again, I thank my friend for coming back and educating us about an area he knows a great deal more about than I do.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. COLE has been a leader in this area for many years now, and I appreciate that leadership.

I rise today, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, in strong support of H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

The importance of robust international trade for America's small businesses cannot be overstated. Small businesses represent 98 percent of all goods-exporting firms in the United States—98 percent are small businesses—establishing our Nation's role as the world's leader in international trade. Seven out of every 10 new jobs in this country are created by small businesses. So if we want to improve the economy and trade, small businesses are an integral part of doing that. In my home State of Ohio alone, more than 1.5 million jobs are tied to international trade, many of them with these small firms.

The bipartisan Customs reauthorization bill before us today will give small businesses the confidence and security they need to compete in a global marketplace. Specifically, it accomplishes this important goal by making sure international trade agreements are working to benefit America's small businesses and the employees of those small businesses. That is why I am pleased that the finished bill incorporates language that our committee helped to craft to ensure we are doing everything we can to keep the doors of trade open to small businesses. We have done this in that committee, in general, in a bipartisan fashion.

By modernizing the procedures and systems used by Customs and Border Protection, this bill also improves trade facilitation and makes sure their safeguards are working as intended.

By giving the Treasury new tools to crack down on currency manipulation,

this bill ensures that foreign competitors like China aren't taking advantage of our workers and small businesses. That has been a top issue for those of us that have dealt with trade, and that is the concept, that the Chinese have been manipulating their currency to give them an unfair advantage over America's businesses, that this bill helps to deal with.

By empowering the CPB and the Department of Commerce, this bill will make it easier to hold bad actors accountable when they engage in unfair trade or evasive trade practices. Mr. Speaker, this is truly commonsense legislation that will help America's small businesses at a time when they need our help to compete in the era of globalization.

I also thank my friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for his leadership on this issue. He has worked on this since he introduced a Customs reauthorization bill back in 2011, and I know that is the basis for today's legislation. I again thank Chairman COLE for his hard work in this area because trade is important to jobs. Yes, it is important to large corporations, but it is especially important to those small businesses all across America who engage in international trade. In the Small Business Committee, we are encouraging them more and more to do that. That means more jobs for more families all over this country.

I urge my colleagues to support this.

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

Mr. Speaker, even after we pass this continuing resolution today, we will still be just 5 days away from a government shutdown. That is no way to run the greatest, freest, most prosperous country on the face of the Earth. We agree on so many of the issues. I urge my colleagues to stop the partisan games.

We have shown in recent weeks we can produce good, bipartisan legislation when we just put the controversial, divisive poison pills on the side. Look at what we accomplished in transportation and in education. Let's continue that trend. Let's drop the ideological wish list for another time and pass the spending bill without the last-minute hysterics and partisan riders.

In recent weeks, Americans have witnessed two senseless, horrific mass shootings: one very near to my district in Colorado that took three lives, and another in San Bernardino, California, that took 14 lives. These slayings are heartbreaking and tragic. Sadly, no one can any longer use the adjective to describe them as "shocking." There have been 355 mass shootings in 2015, which, themselves, are just a small portion of the 48,000 incidents of gun violence so far this year.

While I strongly support the rights given to Americans in our Second Amendment, I believe there are commonplace measures that we must take

to curtail gun violence. A common-sense improvement we can make is passing legislation to keep individuals who are suspected of terrorist activity from purchasing firearms.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider H.R. 1076, the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act of 2015. H.R. 1076 would amend the criminal code to stop the issuance of firearm licenses to people on the terrorism watch list.

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. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time to act. Let's make it harder for criminals and terrorists to quietly assemble arsenals designed to kill innocent Americans. We can do that. We can protect the Second Amendment. We can implement commonsense reforms that keep America safe.

□ 1015

There is nothing Congress can do to end gun violence, but we can and we must take action to reduce gun violence. If we defeat the previous question, we will do that. It will pass, and it will become law, and the American people will be safer. Stop standing in the way, Mr. Speaker.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

First, before I close, I want to thank my friend for the debate and for his thoughtful remarks.

Not surprisingly, there will be a couple of areas in my close where I disagree with my good friend. One of them is the process itself. I share, actually, his frustration and the need for us to move under regular order. I share the frustration I think both sides share in this that we are doing an omnibus, but I remind my friends, we moved six bills across the floor here. Every bill has moved through the full Committee on Appropriations.

Frankly, our friends on the other side of the rotunda need to take a considerable responsibility for the delay in the appropriations, since they prevented the Senate from actually picking up and acting on individual bills. I think, frankly, had they done so, we would have had a more orderly process and been out of here in an easier way. My hope is next year they will do that, because I think in the bipartisan budget compromise, we set a framework up by deciding early on what the top line numbers are for next year, where that process can, indeed, occur. I certainly promise to work with my friends on

the other side of the aisle to see that we restore regular order, bring each appropriations bill down here.

I am going to disagree with my friend, too, on this terrorist watch list idea. This is a very interesting point. I think Members on both sides are equally committed to making sure all of our citizens are safe, but the terrorist watch list that my friend has talked about is one of the more mysterious lists in the United States.

As I read the press, I find one article that tells me there are 47,000 people on it; another one that tells me, no, there is 470,000 people; yet another that tells me there are 1 million people on it or more. I do know that the American Civil Liberties Union has called the terrorist watch list a "massive, virtually standardless, government watch list scheme that ensnares innocent people and encourages racial and religious profiling." Now, that is not from a conservative group. That is the American Civil Liberties Union.

I also know in this Chamber, one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who, when he was a State senator, found out accidentally going to the airport he was on the terrorist watch list. He found out another Democratic colleague, another State senator, was also on the terrorist watch list. They inquired as to why, and they were told: Well, we can't tell you.

Eventually, working with the Sergeant at Arms of the California Senate, they were able to determine Mr. MCCLINTOCK had been confused with an IRA—Irish Republican Army—terrorist, and the other gentleman had been confused with somebody else. We know that the late Senator Kennedy was, at one time, on the terrorist watch list. So I think this is a very imperfect tool that will ensnare lots of innocent Americans in it.

It is also worth noting—and this was a fact that was made acquainted to me by our good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) who, along with his distinguished record of service for over 21 years in the United States Army, is an arms manufacturer and an arms seller—he pointed out actually the terrorist watch list is one of the lists that is used by the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms group to decide whether or not to issue a permit. So it is a factor in now. It is not exclusive. You wouldn't exclude somebody simply because they were there, but it is a factor taken into consideration.

I say this just to suggest that perhaps we shouldn't seize on this as a be-all and a political talking point. This is worth a real serious look as to whether or not this particular list, how it is compiled, who is on it, what is the appropriate way to use it?

I think the last thing we should do is attach it to legislation without the appropriate hearing and discussion of it, which actually I think my friend on the other side would generally be in favor of.

There are plenty of reasons, anecdotal and serious studies, when, again, groups like the American Civil Liberties Union look at this as a very imperfect tool that will violate the civil liberties of the average American. Again, I caution my friends on the other side. It is a great political talking point, but I think it is a pretty imperfect tool, and I think they would find themselves embarrassed, frankly, were it used in the manner that they suggest here.

Mr. Speaker, let me move to my close. Passage of the continuing resolution, as we both agree, is critical to prevent a government shutdown and, frankly, to allow both sides and the administration to continue to negotiate. A CR passed the Senate yesterday by voice vote. We should pass this rule, and we should support the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 560 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. COLE. 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 177, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 690]

YEAS—236

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

NAYS—177

Adams	Capps	Cohen
Ashford	Capuano	Connolly
Bass	Cárdenas	Conyers
Beatty	Carney	Cooper
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Costa
Bera	Cartwright	Courtney
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Cummings
Bonamici	Ciulline	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Brownley (CA)	Clay	Delaney
Bustos	Cleaver	DeLauro
Butterfield	Clyburn	DelBene

DeSaulnier	Langevin	Rangel
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Doggett	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
Doyle, Michael	Lee	Ruiz
F.	Levin	Ruppersberger
Duckworth	Lewis	Rush
Edwards	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)
Ellison	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Engel	Loebbeck	T.
Eshoo	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Esty	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Farr	Lowey	Schiff
Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Foster	(NM)	Scott, David
Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano
Fudge	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Gabbard	Lynch	Sherman
Gallego	Maloney,	Sinema
Garamendi	Carolyn	Sires
Graham	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Grayson	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	McCollum	Speier
Grijalva	McDermott	Swalwell (CA)
Gutiérrez	McGovern	Takai
Hahn	McNerney	Takano
Hastings	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Heck (WA)	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Higgins	Moore	Titus
Himes	Moulton	Tonko
Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)	Torres
Honda	Nadler	Tsongas
Hoyer	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Huffman	Neal	Vargas
Israel	Norcross	Veasey
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Vela
Jeffries	Pallone	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Visclosky
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Walz
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Keating	Peters	Schultz
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Waters, Maxine
Kennedy	Pocan	Watson Coleman
Kilmer	Polis	Welch
Kind	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Kirkpatrick	Quigley	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Aguilar	Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo
Boyle, Brendan	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
F.	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Kuster	Schrader
Fincher	Meadows	Schweikert
Green, Gene	Nolan	Sessions
Harper	Payne	Westmoreland

□ 1051

Mr. RANGEL and Ms. EDWARDS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PETERSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, looking ahead to next week, Members are advised that no votes are expected in the House on Monday.

Members are further advised that first votes of the week are expected on Tuesday at 6:30 p.m., and it is my intent to stay until we get our work done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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 236, noes 174, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 691]

AYES—236

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

NOES—174

Adams	Blumenauer	Capuano
Ashford	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Bass	Brady (PA)	Carney
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Cartwright
Bera	Bustos	Castor (FL)
Beyer	Butterfield	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Chu, Judy

Ciilline	Huffman	Peters
Clark (MA)	Israel	Peterson
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Clay	Jeffries	Pocan
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Connelly	Kaptur	Quigley
Conyers	Keating	Rangel
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kennedy	Richmond
Crowley	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kind	Ruiz
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rush
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Delaney	Lawrence	T.
DeLauro	Lee	Sarbanes
DeBene	Levin	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Schiff
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott, David
Doggett	Lofgren	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lowe	Sherman
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Edwards	(NM)	Slaughter
Ellison	Lujan, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Engel	(NM)	Speier
Eshoo	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Esty	Maloney,	Takai
Farr	Carolyn	Takano
Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Foster	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Titus
Fudge	McDermott	Tonko
Gabbard	McGovern	Torres
Galleo	McNerney	Tsongas
Garamendi	Meeks	Van Hollen
Graham	Meng	Vargas
Grayson	Moore	Veasey
Green, Al	Moulton	Vela
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Visclosky
Hahn	Napolitano	Walz
Hastings	Neal	Wasserman
Heck (WA)	Norcross	Schultz
Higgins	O'Rourke	Waters, Maxine
Himes	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Hinojosa	Pascrell	Welch
Honda	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Hoyer	Perlmutter	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Aguilar	Harper	Payne
Boyle, Brendan	Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo
F.	Johnson, Sam	Sanchez, Loretta
DeFazio	Kildee	Schrader
DeSantis	Kuster	Schweikert
Fincher	Loebbeck	Sessions
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Green, Gene	Nolan	Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1059

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.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 691, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2693. An act to designate the arbo-retum at the Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in Richmond, Virginia, as the "Phyllis E. Galanti Arboretum".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following

titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 142. An act to require special packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 209. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 993. An act to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 2308. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of church pension plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2393. An act to extend temporarily the extended period of protection for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 644, TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question on adopting a motion to recommit on the conference report to accompany H.R. 644 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 644, TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 560, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 644) to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 560, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 9, 2015, at page H9104.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on the conference report to accompany H.R. 644.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be here today to talk about the conference report on the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015. This process marks a return to regular order and ensures that Members and constituent voices are heard. As chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, I share the Speaker's commitment to an open and transparent process.

The conference report builds on the good work of my fellow conferees, Representatives REICHERT and TIBERI, as well as support from a number of our Ways and Means members in the conference as a whole and dozens of other Members. It delivers on the promises we made to those Members when we considered trade legislation earlier this year.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a vital part of our progrowth agenda. It will level the playing field for Americans and also make it easier for them to compete in a global marketplace. It significantly improves trade facilitation. Here is how: it ensures that Customs and Border Protection focuses on its trade-related mission and streamlines processing of legitimate trade which will increase U.S. competitiveness and create U.S. jobs; it modernizes the agency's automated system and reduces paperwork burden. Basically, this bill replaces inefficiency with innovation and eliminates outdated systems.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that free trade is enforceable trade, and I am glad that this bill significantly strengthens enforcement of America's trade law. It creates new tools to combat currency manipulation based on ideas from Representative MILLER and her colleagues in the Michigan delegation. It gives Customs and Border Protection new tools and holds it accountable to effectively act against evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties, including by targeting risky imports and establishing a new investigation process with strict deadlines and judicial review. Representatives BOUSTANY and JASON SMITH deserve credit for working together to make sure these provisions were included.

The conference report strengthens trade promotion authority by reaffirming that trade agreements should not include provisions on immigration or greenhouse gas emissions, for which Representatives KING and SESSIONS deserve great recognition.

It ensures greater oversight of administration trade nominees and at trade negotiating rounds.

This bill also includes important provisions to help fight human trafficking, which is a scourge that we must take seriously.

Thanks to Representative ROSKAM's leadership, the conference report combats politically motivated acts against our good friend and ally Israel.

With respect to the miscellaneous tariff bill, it reaffirms Congress' com-

mitment to advancing a legislative process with robust consultation and consistent with House rules. I fully intend to work with my colleagues to develop this process early next year.

Finally, it contains the Internet Tax Freedom Act to permanently ban States and localities from taxing Internet access or Internet commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this important legislation. While I celebrate this bill, this is only the beginning. As chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I want to make sure my constituents in Texas and constituents all across America understand that we are going to continue to move progrowth bills that help grow our economy and make it easier for all Americans to find good jobs and have more opportunities.

We have got an ambitious agenda, and we are just getting started. You can expect to see more action soon at our committee and on this floor on trade, on jobs, and on all the economic issues that matter to the American people. We are going to lead, and we are going to deliver.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this conference report. I am disappointed that we have passed up an opportunity for a truly bipartisan action on Customs and trade legislation. The Senate took that opportunity over the summer. It passed a Customs bill by a vote of 78-20 that was truly about Customs and trade enforcement. It included a strong provision to address currency manipulation, the most significant trade enforcement failure over the past decade, and the Senate bill very importantly avoided including wrongful positions and provisions that had nothing to do whatsoever with Customs or trade enforcement.

The House bill did just the opposite. It passed a bill that seeks to prevent our trade agreements from addressing climate change and weakens current law on human trafficking. It failed to include anything meaningful on currency manipulation, even though just a few years ago this House passed a currency bill very similar to what was in the Senate Customs bill by a vote of 348-79. Because of the partisan and flawed nature of the House Customs bill, just 12 Democrats voted for it.

This conference report is far more like the fundamentally flawed House bill than the Senate bill. The conference committee rejected the Senate currency provision, as I said, one that had the support of 348 House Members just a few years ago.

There is much talk about how this bill will create jobs and about economic growth. But make no mistake; over the past decade or so, currency manipulation has cost the U.S., our workers, and our industry between 2 and 5 million jobs. Instead, this conference bill includes a meaningless pro-

vision that simply calls for more talk, more deference to the Treasury Department, and no real action.

The climate change language in the conference report sends just the wrong message as our diplomats are working in Paris with over 150 nations to find an agreement on this threat to our environment. The language in this conference report on climate change is far more than confusing, as some people like to say. It would prevent us, for example, from negotiating provisions like common fuel efficiency standards, a very real possibility in our negotiations with Europe. As reported today from Paris, the Republican Party of the United States may be the only political party anywhere in denial about climate change. That denial is why this provision on climate in this conference report is before us.

Now, as to human trafficking, this provision weakens current law by allowing for a trade agreement with a tier 3 country to be fast-tracked so long as that country "has taken concrete actions" to implement recommended changes, no matter how egregious the conditions are still in place. Countries on tier 3 are the worst actors, countries that the State Department has concluded "do not fully comply with the minimum standards under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act." We need to get these countries to meet minimum standards on trafficking, certainly well before we enter into a trade investment relationship with them. Unfortunately, this conference report does not get us there.

These and other fundamental flaws outweigh the enforcement provisions that were included in the conference report. Most of the enforcement provisions are weak, and I think they are being oversold. For example, the bill establishes an interagency enforcement center, but that has already existed for several years.

It renews the Super 301, which requires the USTR to report regularly on its trade enforcement priorities, but this is something an administration can already do on its own, just as the Clinton administration did.

The bill establishes, also, a new trade enforcement trust fund, but those funds still need to be appropriated and paid for, just as they did in the past.

It requires the ITC to make information related to imports available on its Web site, information that already exists in other forms in the same Web site.

All this is very disappointing because there are positive aspects of this bill, such as the ENFORCE Act that my colleague LINDA SANCHEZ has spearheaded, which will help to address the circumvention of antidumping and countervailing duties to address unfair trade. All of the deep flaws in this conference report far overshadow this provision and the real Customs provisions that have long had bipartisan support.

Going further, the bill includes an Internet tax provision added by the

conferees that has absolutely no place in this Customs bill. It was neither in the House nor the Senate Customs bill. Not only is it not a Customs measure, it is not even a trade measure. Dropping this provision into a conference report at the last minute and with no warning is no way to legislate. It is the opposite of regular order.

Indeed, this conference report does not tell it straight. As I said, it deletes the only provision that reflects meaningful legislation on currency, which has devastated U.S. jobs and economic growth, legislation that overwhelmingly passed the House previously.

□ 1115

It keeps provisions inserted by the House to encourage Republicans who oppose action on climate change, as I said, at the same time the world is meeting in Paris, thwarting further possible action on climate change in trade negotiations, including with Europe.

It tones down a provision which had teeth on human sex and labor trafficking.

It sneaks in another provision totally unrelated to Customs, as I said, never being discussed at the only meeting of the conference committee, relating to taxation of Internet access. It leaves in the dust the issue of trying to even out the taxation of sales on the Internet with sales at hardworking brick-and-mortar stores.

For all of these reasons, all of them, I strongly urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), who is the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank him for his hard work, and Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIBERI, and other members of the committee, who have worked hard on this legislation, and, also, Members across the aisle who have come together to build this piece of legislation presented here today.

I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker, of this important legislation.

In my home State of Washington, 40 percent of jobs are tied directly to trade. We are the most trade-dependent State in the country. This bill supports that trade and those jobs through the elimination of unnecessary roadblocks U.S. companies face when exporting and importing goods and the enhanced enforcement of our laws. And it lays the groundwork for the miscellaneous tariff bill, often called the MTB, which reduces costs on American manufacturers and supports jobs across this country.

I am proud that this bill includes several provisions that I have championed with colleagues across the aisle from the Pacific Northwest, including outdoor recreation apparel provisions with my colleague from the State of Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), and the renewal of the State trade expansion program

with my colleague from the State of Washington (Mr. LARSEN). We have fought hard for those two provisions, and they are included in this legislation.

That program helps small businesses grow by making it easier for them to sell their products across this world, which, of course, helps create jobs here in the United States. The more products we sell, the more jobs we create here at home. It has supported over 430 small businesses in Washington and 2,200 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me today in supporting American farmers, American workers, and businesses through stronger enforcement of our laws and streamlined trade.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ), another member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015. I am extremely frustrated that, after the long path to get us to the conference report before us today, I won't be able to support the bill.

As I said during our conference committee meeting earlier this week: if Customs were truly all that this bill was about, it would pass overwhelmingly on the floor.

I strongly support the bulk of what is in the final bill. Trade enforcement should always move in lockstep with our trade policy. It is only when countries live up to agreed-upon laws and regulations that we can truly have robust trade, but robust trade also requires strong enforcement.

Particularly for me, I am pleased that the bulk of the ENFORCE Act is finally at the finish line after many years of work. One of my biggest priorities for several years has been finding a way to combat the blatant abuse and duty evasion by some foreign producers that undercut American industry. Foreign companies use schemes to avoid paying the duties they owe on goods that they bring into the United States.

We will finally give some real teeth to our enforcement procedures and send the right message to domestic manufacturers, employers, and workers that this Congress cares about Customs enforcement. This idea doesn't hinder free trade. Instead, it promotes fair trade and sends a strong signal to foreign producers that the U.S. will not tolerate abuses of internationally agreed upon trade rules. By increasing our Customs security measures, we ensure that American companies that play by the rules are not disadvantaged as a result of evasion by foreign competitors.

Unfortunately, unrelated TPA language included in the final bill will keep me from being able to support something that I have worked on for many, many years.

In this bill, we fail to address currency manipulation in a meaningful

way. The conference report also falls short in the areas of climate change and human trafficking. Specifically, we should not tie our hands when it comes to combating climate change, nor should we be rushing to increase our trade with countries that persist in allowing human trafficking. To me, these are not the values of this country. They are no-brainers, and they shouldn't be in this bill. But today, we fell short.

For those reasons, I cannot support the final Customs package that we have before us today.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), the former chairman of the Trade Subcommittee who played a key role in bringing forth this legislation.

Mr. TIBERI. I thank the chairman for all his leadership on this going back years.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act in April of this year, and it is great to see that this issue is finally getting done.

I would really like to thank Speaker RYAN and, again, Chairman BRADY; Chairman REICHERT; a special thanks to Representative BOUSTANY for his leadership going way back as well; and JASON SMITH, the Congressman from Missouri, for his incredible work to get this bill in a better place. I would also like to thank my colleagues in the Senate who helped make this a successful conference committee.

This bill presents a long, long overdue opportunity. I would ask my colleagues to not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

In my home State of Ohio, one in five workers' jobs, Mr. Speaker, depends on trade. Trade drives our economy. In fact, exports from Ohio last year hit an all-time high. This bill will make it even easier for Ohio companies to trade and will increase exports, and that means increasing jobs in my State of Ohio.

The U.S. Customs and Border Protection Act plays a pivotal role in helping ensure that our trade agreements, our preference programs, and our U.S. trade laws are enforced and that legitimate trade is done. Over the years, the volume and the complexity of trade and the challenges, such as combating evasion of duties and protecting U.S. intellectual property rights, have grown, and grow more complex.

Meanwhile, we are facing increased competition around the world, and it is critical to keep the flow of trade moving efficiently.

Customs issues are vital to our competitiveness, security, and safety.

Streamlining legitimate trade and providing benefits to trusted traders will increase U.S. competitiveness in the global marketplace.

This bill would reduce barriers and burdens to our small and medium businesses that drive our economy, saving them time and money, and, again, create jobs.

Another major pillar of this bill is strengthening enforcement of our trade remedy laws.

Enforcing U.S. intellectual property rights, anti-dumping, and countervailing duty laws prevents our competitors from gaining an edge by cheating. When our competitors around the world don't play by the rules, we get hurt; our American businesses get hurt; and our American workers pay.

When our American companies and American workers compete on a level playing field, they win; we win.

This bill makes our trade remedies more effective by allowing our Customs agencies to take quick action against these bad actors, giving our businesses a fair opportunity to compete and win.

This bill also contains a commitment to advancing a Miscellaneous Tariff Bill process. I strongly support that commitment, and will continue to work to find a path forward, Mr. Speaker. MTBs provide important relief to our manufacturers who import materials that have no domestic content or supply. The tariffs they pay—or the taxes, they are taxes—on these products make the entire manufacturing supply chain and the process more expensive to my constituents. The MTB process must be resolved in a way that is not only consistent with our House rules, but also our constitutional responsibilities.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TIBERI. I am confident we can resolve these issues, Mr. Speaker. This has been a long overdue bill that provides much modernization to our Customs process to make it easier for our manufacturers and our businesses and, ultimately, our workers, to export their products around the world. In the end, we win.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, or the Customs bill. This legislation has historically been a bipartisan bill, but the majority has politicized the Customs legislation by adding several riders that would be harmful to our trade policy.

The bill undermines our ability to address several of the most critical global issues that we face: climate change, human trafficking, and immigration. And it includes no meaningful method for dealing with one of the biggest causes of job loss and wage suppression in the United States: currency manipulation, which has cost our Nation over 5 million jobs.

Ironically, world leaders are concluding negotiations today in Paris at the largest climate summit in history. They are working hard to hash out an agreement that, as the Sierra Club has pointed out, will be undermined by the

Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. With the bill before us today, the United States will not be allowed to address greenhouse gas emissions in future trade negotiations. Imagine.

The bill also contains no funding to support the enforcement and monitoring of our trade agreements, and it lacks any automatic mechanism for ensuring compliance with our trade rules. This administration has never self-initiated a trade complaint against any of our free trade partners. It takes years for the administration to bring a case against countries that subsidize or dump their product in our markets.

Lack of enforcement of our trade agreements has plagued our country for decades. Despite environmental rules in the U.S.-Peru free trade agreement, the overwhelming majority of timber from Peru is illegally logged. Despite the labor rules in the Colombia free trade agreement, over 100 Colombian trade unionists have been murdered, 19 this year alone.

This bill does not adequately address enforcement. It lacks the mechanisms for ensuring compliance with trade rules. As I said, no administration has ever self-initiated a labor or environmental trade complaint against any of our free trade partners. Why would we think that this would begin now?

While this bill authorizes funding for enforcement, there is no guarantee that this funding will ever be provided. We already lack the critical funding to enforce our existing trade agreements. American workers cannot afford to suffer through additional losses as their jobs are shipped to countries that do not play by the rules.

Worst of all, one day after International Human Rights Day, which was yesterday, this legislation contains a provision that will weaken U.S. efforts to curb human trafficking forced labor. The bill would allow for expedited consideration of a trade agreement with nations classified as the worst offenders of human trafficking.

We have already seen the administration's willingness to do whatever it takes to secure a trade deal when it upgraded the human trafficking ranking of Malaysia to conclude the TPP negotiations. Malaysia was in the same category as Iran just 5 months ago. Where are our values with regard to human life?

The biggest problem with our economy today is that too many Americans are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. They are struggling. One of the main reasons for this is several decades of bad trade policy that has shipped millions of jobs overseas, like the policies in this Customs bill and the TPP.

□ 1130

People in this body like to say that all of the job losses and the wage depression are because of technology and globalization. It is. It is because of the policy choices we have made over the years. It is time for us to rewrite the rules.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, millions of jobs are at stake as is the fate of our country's economy. Working class families in this Nation are struggling just to get by. Men and women are scraping together meager earnings to put food on their tables, to warm their homes, and to take care of their kids. They can't think about sending their kids to college. They can't think about vacations or retirement security.

We need to decide if we are going to rebuild a land of access and opportunity, where anyone who is willing to work hard and to play by the rules can find a good job that can support a family. There is no reason to make bad trade policy even worse. This legislation, with enforcement gaps and harmful negotiating objectives is unacceptable. We can and should do better for working people. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), who has played a key role in strengthening trade enforcement in this bill.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank Chairman BRADY, Chairman TIBERI, Chairman REICHERT, Congressman JASON SMITH, and others on the committee, as well as staff, for helping make this legislation—finally, this conference report—a reality that will become law.

Mr. Speaker, today, Louisiana's seafood industry is being severely injured by illegal foreign imports. Right now, the fundamental issue is economic growth. How do we empower our seafood producers, our farmers, and our manufacturers to grow their businesses? to create opportunity? to grow this economy? The legislation before us today is important because, as we seek to expand market access for all of our businesses and our farmers, we need seamless trade facilitation and strong enforcement if we are going to achieve that economic growth.

This bill contains language from my PROTECT Act, providing new tools for the relevant Federal agencies, for legitimate importers and distributors, and for trade-affected domestic industries to prevent and combat fraud at our border, not after the fact. That is a key distinction and a key piece of this legislation. It will allow our seafood producers, our farmers, and our manufacturers to compete on a fair playing field here in our American domestic market as we seek open market access abroad for them as well.

Additionally, crawfish processors in my State of Louisiana have suffered for 15 years because of the unfair dumping of crawfish from China and other illegal sources. In effect, the administration punished domestic crawfish producers by forcing them to pay for the delays caused by Chinese dumpers, by the U.S. insurance companies that posted bond for the duties, and, in

some cases, by the Customs and Border Patrol, itself. This bill contains an important fix that will make sure that our crawfish producers are paid what they are owed.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, this Customs reauthorization conference report, will make necessary improvements, not only to ensure fraud is prevented at our border, but so that our American industries are treated fairly. I urge its support.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee and as someone who has been involved in the negotiations of the legislation before us, I rise in strong support of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act.

The bill that we have before us today is not the bill that came out of the House in June. There are much-needed improvements. As we debate trade policy and where we are going in the 21st century global economy, we need strong enforcement mechanisms so that, when we get standards in these trade agreements that elevate it as being up to us to level the playing field for our workers, for our businesses, and for our farmers, we have the tools to ensure that those standards are enforced on an appropriate basis, so we are able to counter unfair trade practices as they are applied against us. That is exactly what is in this bill right now. This bill will end any importation of products that are made from the exploitation of child and forced labor, for instance.

This bill also includes the ENFORCE Act, additional tools to enforce the provisions that we do negotiate in future trade agreements.

This bill establishes the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center for greater coordination between our agencies in order to enforce provisions that we negotiate in trade agreements.

It establishes an enforcement trust fund, which is due to the hard work my friend and colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) put in, so that there are dedicated resources in order to enforce the provisions that we fought to achieve.

It establishes a Super 301 section—again, enhancing the enforcement on those standards that many of us have been fighting for: core labor, environmental, human rights protections—in the body of these trade agreements, which are fully enforceable like any other provision. That Super 301 will give us tools that will enable us to move forward on that.

It also establishes a State Trade and Export Promotion Program—reauthorizing it and funding it—to make it easier for our small businesses and our manufacturers back home to be able to export more easily. We know that those exporting companies typically

pay their workers, roughly, 18 to 19 percent above other workers within that sector; so it is a win for our small businesses back home.

It is not a perfect bill. It is the product of compromise and bipartisanship. I think it advances the ball when it comes to key enforcement. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), who played a key role in the language defending our friend and ally Israel.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman BRADY.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, Israel's Ambassador Michael Oren wrote an opinion piece that got my attention, and he described the waves of attempts to wipe Israel off the map.

He said the first wave was military, and we know how that worked: Israel's enemies worked together, and they were not successful in defeating Israel back in 1948. The second wave was a wave of terror. That is still ongoing, but that wave has not been successful. Yet there is a third wave, and the third wave is, actually, more insidious. The third wave is a movement called the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Movement. It is an attempt to take away Israel's legitimacy, to hold Israel to a standard to which no other country in the world is held.

So let's not kid ourselves that this is an attempt to drive Israel to the negotiating table—this movement, that is. It is an attempt to wipe Israel off the map. It is the smart, long move for the haters of Israel.

But, today, in this bill, the House is saying we stand with Israel. We stand with Israel, and we are pushing back. We are making it the official policy of the United States, along with the Trade Promotion Authority Act, which says we are going to push back against state-sponsored BDS activities. There is good work here.

Mr. Speaker, there are many times when people ask: Can't people get along in Congress? The answer is, yes, we can. This is strongly supported on a bipartisan basis, and it does two things in particular that I want to bring your attention to:

Number one, it works to protect American companies from foreign lawsuits, which is incredibly important because of our strong commercial relationship with the Israelis. Secondly, it has a reporting requirement, so it makes the administration more mindful, and we are going to have more information.

I thank Congressman VARGAS, who was a coauthor with me in some of the underlying legislation that was adopted by Chairman BRADY and others. I thank all of the conferees.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 16½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), who has played a key role in advancing our entire pro-growth trade agenda.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the chairman for moving this bill forward and getting it one step closer to law after his long-term engagement in trade facilitation.

Mr. Speaker and Members, trade facilitation and trade is key to growing our economy. This bill makes needed reforms to our Customs procedures; it strengthens enforcement measures behind our trade agreements; and it removes unnecessary barriers to trade.

The bill couldn't come at a more important time. Think about it. We are in the midst of the opportunity to complete two of the most ambitious trade agreements in our Nation's history: one with countries in the Pacific Rim and the other with our allies in the European Union. The United States used to be at the top. We were at the top for our efficiency and trade and logistics and moving goods across the border, but our Customs procedures have become outdated, and we have slipped. Now we have too much paperwork and too much inefficiency. This bipartisan bill streamlines and modernizes our Customs system to get us back on track.

Why is trade important? Of course, the answer is very simple: It is about jobs.

Trade supports one in five American jobs. In my State of Minnesota, more than 774,000 jobs are connected to trade; so trade is driving our economy. Many of these jobs are held by people who do work at small- and medium-sized businesses, which are the backbone of our economy. In fact, 98 percent of all American exporters are small- or medium-sized employers. These are jobs that pay more. They pay higher than average wages, and they pay better salaries for American workers.

In addition to supporting American jobs, the Customs bill also includes stronger enforcement tools that are essential to the trade agreements that we have with other countries so that they don't cheat. It provides fair and strong rules to hold other countries accountable for their unfair trade practices, and it will help tear down barriers that unfairly block our goods from foreign markets.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I am excited to see the Customs bill move forward on a bipartisan basis. It will improve trade facilitation so as to move goods and services more efficiently.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee who is focused on American agriculture and American outerwear.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

This legislation will update and streamline our country's Customs and Border policies to facilitate trade and enhance U.S. competitiveness. Included in the bill are a number of additional, commonsense provisions.

For example, the bill fixes a technical error which inadvertently increased the tariff rates on outerwear. Not only is this fix important to producers, retailers, and consumers, but it also brings the U.S. back into compliance with our commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

While I am disappointed we couldn't find a path forward on the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill process, I am pleased the bill contains language in support of continued work on this issue.

The conference report also takes important steps to strengthen Trade Promotion Authority. TPA is necessary to ensure that the U.S. gets the best possible deal in trade negotiations as we move forward, and these agreements should leverage our country's comparative advantages in all industries, certainly including energy.

For this reason, I was happy to see the inclusion of language to prevent the administration from using trade agreements to negotiate very costly greenhouse gas emission rules in the United States. I also want to make sure Nebraska producers can make the most of the opportunities provided by a level playing field in order to increase exports.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Customs bill fails totally to address a custom that is the custom of the USTR: saying one thing and doing another.

Were it possible to legislate trust, to legislate candor, to legislate fidelity to public duty, I would be the most enthusiastic supporter this bill could have. Unfortunately, this proposal represents only a very thin, see-through window dressing for a runaway bureaucracy that is pursuing its own multinational corporate agenda and ignoring the public interest.

The USTR, in its history, has never successfully challenged an environmental abuse. Though the USTR has been charged since February 2009 with preventing trade in illegal logging and in the destruction of Peruvian rain forests, the Environmental Investigation Agency recently reported: "Illegal logging in Peru and the associated trade remains a serious and unabated problem." There has been a "complete failure to enforce these obligations . . ." One such obligation is a very simple audit to demonstrate whether logs are

being harvested legally or illegally. I have specifically asked the USTR repeatedly to just produce the audit so we can see, and they have refused to provide that documentation or to admit that their enforcement has totally failed to do that simple matter. Meanwhile, coffins with the names of brave Peruvian inspectors are being dragged through the streets.

The USTR trumpets its environmental successes; yet the Peruvian Government is being rewarded for going backward, not forward, on the environment.

□ 1145

USTR has never successfully challenged worker abuses. Almost 8 years after the Administration received a complaint about serious abuses in Guatemala, such as the right to work and join with other workers without being murdered, USTR has not remedied the complaint.

In Honduras, USTR announced with great fanfare just by coincidence yesterday that, after 3 long years of delay on child labor and other abuses, it had a new plan. Well, it is the same type of plan that failed in Guatemala. We don't need new public relation plans. We need to enforce the law effectively.

What reason is there conceivably to believe that Vietnam, a country with one union that is only a branch of the Communist Party, will somehow fulfill its trade obligations under the Trans-Pacific Partnership for a complete overhaul of its system when it takes the Administration almost 8 years to address Guatemala labor concerns? More likely, we will simply be joining another race to the bottom with a 60-cent-per-hour Vietnamese wage.

Just as it lacked the will to enforce environmental and working conditions, USTR prioritized trade even when that meant excusing modern-day slave trade in corrupt Malaysia. The bureaucratic manipulation and indifference to human trafficking in Asia is disgraceful.

The only thing that is transparent about USTR is the ease of seeing through its propaganda. Certainly, I am very concerned about climate change, but the real climate that needs changing when it comes to our trade policy is the climate of indifference and secrecy at USTR.

I ask that you vote against this bill in order to develop a true pro-trade, 21st-century American policy that reflects our basic American values and protects our jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. If the chairman does not mind, I would like to yield to the distinguished leader. Is that okay, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on behalf of America's

working families. I thank the chairman of the committee for his courtesy in enabling me to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a responsibility to stand with American manufacturing and to help create good-paying jobs for the hardworking families who are the backbone of our country. The middle class is the backbone of our democracy. In order to have fair trade, we must have robust tools to enforce the obligations of our trading partners.

This legislation began as a strong, bipartisan trade enforcement bill. It has degenerated into a vehicle for all of the toxic, special interest promises that have been made to secure passage of the TPA. They have poisoned a strong trade enforcement bill with their denial of the climate crisis, with their turning a blind eye on human trafficking, and with their refusal to address the foreign currency manipulation that destroys millions of American jobs.

In terms of the climate crisis, congressional Republicans refuse to acknowledge the truth of the climate crisis. Pope Francis, on his visit here and even before he came and since, has made this climate crisis a priority. It was the subject of his encyclical. He has said that he is praying for the success of the historic Paris Climate Summit.

Faith leaders from the evangelical community and across the board are urging us to answer our moral responsibility to preserve God's creation. It is our responsibility. As God's creation, we have a responsibility to be good stewards of it and to do so in a way that does not hurt the poor and their presentations.

Just look at what is happening in Paris as opposed to what is happening here. In Paris, 195 nations have convened to address the climate crisis that threatens the health of our communities and the future that we leave our children. It is about air pollution. 186 nations have submitted plans to address the climate crisis and the air pollution. 146 world leaders personally attended the conference.

Yet, with this Customs bill, Republicans would bar our trade negotiators from even discussing climate in the context of a trade agreement. You cannot separate climate and commerce. We cannot accept Republicans' willful blindness to this connection and to the reality of the climate crisis.

Our trade negotiations must honor our values as a Nation. America must stand as a bulwark against the atrocity of human trafficking wherever it is found.

In the week that we mark the 150th anniversary of the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery in the United States or anyplace subject to our jurisdiction, this legislation allows countries with documented forced labor practices and brutal human trafficking to enjoy the benefits of free trade and full access to our markets.

In the Trade Promotion Authority legislation, we prohibited fast-track

procedures for trade agreements with countries ranked tier 3 in the State Department's Trafficking in Persons Report, which are nations with the worst human rights records. That is in the TPA. Yet, in this bill, we weaken that standard, say, for example, for Malaysia and for other nations failing to address human trafficking.

In terms of currency, Republicans continue to allow foreign currency manipulation to devastate the competitiveness of goods made in America, stealing jobs from American workers. The American Policy Institute estimates that foreign currency manipulation has already cost millions of American jobs and threatens hundreds of thousands more in the coming years.

We need strong, enforceable currency standards in our Customs laws. Yet, Republicans have stripped out this tough, bipartisan provision, cracking down on currency manipulation in the Senate bill. It is time to crack down on countries who have manipulated their currencies for years to protect their industries and undercut American jobs. In any trade legislation, our top responsibility must be to strengthen the paychecks of America's workers.

Since I have lost my voice, let us reject this deeply flawed bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Ways and Means Committee who is fighting for American agriculture, furniture, and other local businesses.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Right now there are over 120 anti-dumping and countervailing duty cases against China. When China violates the rules of international trade, small- and medium-sized manufacturers in Missouri and across America are harmed. The ENFORCE Act included in this report would strengthen America's ability to identify and go after those who break international law.

One company in Missouri found itself unfairly competing against an illegal product originating from China, but using a fake address. The ENFORCE Act allows this company to now take real and meaningful action against foreign perpetrators.

This spring, as the Ways and Means Committee worked on TPA, there were many constructive conversations about what our trade enforcement bill was going to look like. I am grateful to Speaker RYAN, Chairman BRADY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BOUSTANY for their willingness to work with me to get the ENFORCE Act included in this bill. It was a team effort, and the bill we have before us reflects that.

American workers and American products can compete with anybody in the world. When countries cheat, our manufacturers are significantly harmed. This bill helps end those unfair practices.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair tell us the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, by the way, I thank Chairman BRADY for allowing the leader to go out of turn.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his and other members of the Ways and Means Committee's outstanding work on this legislation. I am here to talk about another aspect of it.

Time is short. A temporary ban on State taxation of Internet access is expiring. Section 922 of the conference report aids taxpayers by making this ban permanent.

If the ban on Internet access taxes is not renewed, the potential tax burden on Americans would be substantial. It is estimated that Internet access tax rates could be more than twice the average rate of all other goods and services. Low-income households could pay 10 times as much as high-income households as a share of income.

Congress has passed numerous temporary bans with enormous bipartisan support. Earlier this year a permanent ban passed the House by voice vote.

Section 922 merely prevents Internet access taxes and unfair multiple or discriminatory taxes on e-commerce. It does not tackle the issue of Internet sales taxes. My committee is working assiduously on that issue and making progress.

Studies show that taxes affect Internet adoption rates. As price rises, demand falls. The Internet has become an indispensable gateway to scientific, educational, and economic opportunities. Section 922 preserves unfettered access to one of the most unique gateways to knowledge and engines of self-improvement in all of human history.

I thank the conferees for including this protaxpayer collision. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill today, which is in a much better form than the bill I opposed this summer. Yes, there are still terrible, extraneous provisions.

Climate is the worst example, but that is actually going to be more of an embarrassment to my Republican friends in the future, that they trotted this out at a time that the rest of the world is working in Paris to try and deal with it. As a practical matter, it is not going to make that much difference.

I disagree with my learned friend, the ranking member. There will not be a

reason that we can't harmonize, for example, fuel standards. There are lots of reasons to do that. The Trans-Pacific Partnership's deforestation provisions will probably have as much impact on fighting climate change as anything that is going on in Paris.

Peru is still troubling. I fought hard for those provisions. As recently as this week, I have been pushing on the administration to do more. It is certainly better than if we hadn't enacted those provisions before. As a matter of fact, that is why we have worked so hard to establish the trust fund.

I appreciate the cooperation of my friend, the chairman, who has worked hard to make sure there is guaranteed funding for the next 10 years, \$30 million a year, when the whole USTR budget is less than \$60 million.

These trade enforcement provisions are complex, they are expensive, they are tedious, and they are hard. It takes money to do it. This provision includes—the legislation that I worked on with Senator CANTWELL—being able to make sure we can do a better job of enforcing it.

The bill is not perfect, but it is much better than what we had this summer. It represents movement in directions that we can all take pride in. There are a number of provisions that make a huge difference for the people I represent in the Pacific Northwest as well as modernizing the Customs provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that this is a step forward. I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that it is, in fact, enforced in the future so that we can get the benefits people are talking about.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I do want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for his very thoughtful, constructive efforts to help us craft the right trade enforcement remedies. Going forward, I look forward to working with you on other trade remedy issues.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) whose hard work, along with that of the Michigan delegation, enhanced our hand on currency manipulation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from southeast Michigan, which is home of America's domestic auto industry where we build absolutely the finest quality cars and trucks on Earth. We know our products can compete against anyone anywhere in the world. All we ask for is a level playing field.

□ 1200

Unfortunately, American car companies have suffered decades of economic devastation due to unfair currency manipulation practices from overseas competitors, like Japan, China, and South Korea.

That is why I support this bill, Mr. Speaker. After decades of doing nothing—decades of doing nothing—this bill

contains very strong measures to protect American products from nations that manipulate their currency.

Now, there will be a three-part test that will identify countries that manipulate their currency and, once identified, they must be reported to Congress, and action must be taken.

I certainly appreciate the help of the House leadership as well as the Committee on Ways and Means, because these provisions will level the playing field, Mr. Speaker.

All of us want free trade, but it must be fair trade.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with nothing but the utmost respect for my colleague from Michigan and agree with her on the need to address currency manipulation.

Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Ways and Means first began considering this bill, it represented a real opportunity to improve our system of trade and eliminate loopholes that allow foreign nations and bad actors to avoid our trade laws. Currency manipulation is the number one trade abuse that must be addressed.

Unfortunately, this bill has become the Christmas tree of the holiday season, and it is being used to put lipstick on the pig that is our current trade negotiations. It ties our negotiators' hands on even negotiating common emissions standards by restricting any consideration of climate issues, and it prevents them from negotiating immigration-related language as well. Further, it weakens existing trade laws designed to prevent human trafficking.

The ribbon on this Christmas surprise is a totally new provision on Internet taxation that isn't even in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and could have unintended consequences that could bankrupt local governments.

There are good provisions at the core of this bill to help improve our Customs system, but they are outweighed by the political gamesmanship that has made this legislation impossible to support. We have seen far too many other examples of last-minute political provisions inserted in bills over the years, and we risk unintended consequences of these political provisions as well.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who worked hard to ensure that trade agreements are for expanding trade, not expanding immigration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—and I am delighted he is the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—for yielding.

I rise in support of the conference report of the Customs bill. It has got many provisions within it which I am happy about and happy to support. The

currency manipulation provision is one of them.

I am pleased to be here to be able to say that there were those that had significant heartburn over trade promotion authority. I am one of them. There were two provisions that I so badly wanted to be included within the TPA legislation, because I have a bit of a history of working to keep the immigration components out of trade deals. Congress needs to be passing immigration law, not trade negotiators.

Well, that language is an amendment that is in here in the conference report, along with language that prohibits the negotiations under trade promotion authority on climate change. So we are protected from executive decisions imposed upon this Congress and a usurpation of article I authority by two pieces of language in here: No negotiations under TPA can include climate change under this language; and no negotiations under TPA can include immigration.

Congress can speak to that, but they cannot negotiate that under TPA. That is very important to me. It is important to a lot of people across this country. I am standing here saying thank you to now-Speaker RYAN, who negotiated this with me and others. He regrets that he wasn't able to shake my hand as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. That is fine with me, Mr. Speaker.

I am happy to shake the hand of KEVIN BRADY as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and say to a number of people who had significant apprehension about whether this would come together on all of the language necessary to get support for trade promotion authority, to say to them upon the passage of this conference report here today and the anticipated signature, merry Christmas to all of you who wanted to step down the line to preserve article I authority for the United States Congress.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), my friend and colleague and neighbor.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support free and fair trade. Where I come from in Houston, Texas, we are an export city. We make a lot of things, and we sell them all over the world, so I support trade.

Let's go back to the year 1898, Mr. Speaker. The Spanish-American War existed then. To help finance the war, Congress taxed a newfangled contraption called the telephone. The war was over. Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders had stormed San Juan Hill before the tax was actually completely collected, but World War I came around, and the tax reemerged.

Mr. Speaker, that war tax over 100 years ago is still on your telephone bill. You pick up your phone bill, and if you have a landline, you are still paying that war tax.

The point being, Mr. Speaker, once Congress imposes a tax, it seems like it never goes away. But, shock, in this legislation, it prohibits a tax that is already being collected in some States. Some States tax Internet access.

This bill does away with that tax. But it fairly allows States like Texas to phase it out until 2020. Good compromise. So let's eliminate a tax on Americans.

Mr. Speaker, don't get too excited. We may be eliminating one tax, but that war tax over 100 years ago that was implemented—still exists. Maybe we will get around to eliminating that eventually.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, free trade is enforceable trade.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), who has fought for enforceable trade laws.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report before us. Manufacturing is critical to the Hoosier economy and my district. A study by the Economic Policy Institute found that manufacturing jobs account for almost 17 percent of all jobs in Indiana. That is the highest rate in the Nation. Manufacturing jobs account for 23.1 percent of the jobs in my district, second highest in the Nation.

This legislation will make our manufacturers so much more competitive by eliminating the red tape and removing supply chain bottlenecks. It provides new tools to tackle evasion of U.S. trade remedies and intellectual property theft.

To be sure, I would like to have seen a new miscellaneous tariff bill process, and I thank the new chairman for his commitment to finding a path forward on that. But, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly urge my colleagues to support this legislation that will help manufacturers in my district and across the country.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for his graciousness. I rise in support of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015. It is a significant improvement over the original Customs bill, which I opposed.

There are human trafficking reporting requirements that have been added. There is currency language that expands U.S. action on currency manipulation. It codifies the ENFORCE Act, some of the most strict enforcement provisions ever on trade by U.S. legislation. It creates an interagency trade enforcement center. It creates a trade enforcement trust fund. It provides protections for small businesses and bans child and forced labor.

I would prefer to see stronger proenvironmental provisions, but this enforcement bill, trade enforcement

bill is a significant move forward. I am pleased to support the underlying legislation and the conference report. I thank all who contributed to it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas also has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, let me first address climate change. It is interesting that some of the people who speak in favor say how regrettable it is that this provision is even here. The gentleman from Iowa made clear why this provision is here. It was an effort to get votes for TPA.

My feeling is, no matter how people voted on TPA, they should oppose this conference report. One of the reasons relates to global warming. It is really disgraceful this provision is here at the same time virtually everybody in the world is trying to address climate change.

I just want to read the exact language. It says: to ensure that trade agreements do not establish obligations for the U.S. regarding greenhouse gas emission measures.

That is the exact language. There is no way to fuzz it over. There is no way to fuzz it over.

Let me just, then, say a word about currency. This conference report deletes a meaningful, very, very concrete way to address currency manipulation. The language here in this conference bill just essentially, in the end, says nothing that is meaningful.

It says: If the President determines there is a problem with a country's currency—it won't even mention the words "currency manipulation"—then the President shall do such-and-such—things he can already do—and there is a waiver for the President if he doesn't want to take any of the steps.

The currency provision essentially takes away what was in the Senate bill, and we passed the same or a similar measure a number of years ago. So that is as to currency. This is very much in the wrong direction.

The same is true in terms of human trafficking. Essentially what it says is: If a country is in tier 3—the worst in terms of human trafficking—and takes some concrete steps, they can still receive all the benefits of a trade negotiation, even if they still have the most egregious conditions in their country on human trafficking, both sex and labor human trafficking. That is really also, I think, worse than unwarranted.

Let me just finish by saying a few words about enforcement. I guess no one has worked, if I might say, more than I have in terms of enforceability. The provisions that we have put in place—for example, those regarding worker rights, environment, and medicines—need to be enforced. The problem with this legislation is, in most of the cases, it really doesn't change anything much, if at all.

As I said earlier, it establishes an enforcement center that is already existing. It renews Super 301. There is no need to do that. The administration has the ability to do that already. It does set up an enforcement trust fund, but there is no appropriation of the money. Enforcement is already under-appropriated. So now we are setting up a new trust fund without any indication that it is going to be appropriated.

This bill is very close in spirit and in language to the bill that almost all of us on the Democratic side voted against. I urge strong opposition to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1215

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Expanding trade and giving our American workers and companies more opportunities around the world creates jobs here in America: better paychecks, better opportunities, and a stronger economy for our country. Critical to that is to make sure our trade agreements and trade rules are enforced. That is what this bill is all about.

This bill establishes the strongest enforcement and revenue laws ever put on the books in the United States of America. It incorporates issues against currency manipulation; protections and remedies on a number of other areas within our economy that never before have been placed into effect; and it creates a working trust fund, a source of existing revenue, to focus on enforcing those rules.

It also streamlines the way we do trade in America. That is important as well, because it is important for consumers to lower prices. It is important for our local businesses as they manufacture products to sell and compete both here in America and around the world. In fact, it has been more than a decade since we have reauthorized Customs and those processes.

This is about modernizing it, making it more efficient, more effective, more accountable, all of which helps grow our economy and helps working class families.

As important from our side of the aisle, this fulfills the commitment of then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, PAUL RYAN, and our leadership to the Members in the House to make this an even better law. And we have succeeded, working with Representatives KING and SESSIONS on immigration language, to make sure this is a trade-only agreement; working with members of the Steel Caucus—Representatives BARLETTA, MURPHY, DAVIS, BOST, and many others—to ensure that we have strong remedies in those areas; working with Representative MILLER and the Michigan delegation against currency manipulation; working successfully with Representative ZINKE of Montana to make sure there is strong oversight of the Office

of the U.S. Trade Representative and we have more access to negotiating rounds; working with Chairman ROYCE of California on human trafficking; working with Chairman CHABOT of Ohio on small business provisions; working with Mr. CRENSHAW of Florida to ensure that there are trade preferences for Nepal as they struggle in this bill; and working with Mr. WALDEN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. REED, and Mr. BOUSTANY on key provisions.

I say all that to make the case this is a bipartisan measure. It is thoughtful, it is effective, it is long overdue, and it is important to expanding trade and making that effective here in America. I urge its support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, today, we are making critical changes to our domestic trade laws to ensure that U.S. companies compete on a level playing field. Manufacturers in my district have suffered a competitive disadvantage from trade cheaters in China and other foreign countries that don't follow the trade rules we already have on the books.

Unfortunately, there are companies in China who cheat. American companies cannot compete with products that are subsidized by foreign governments and therefore priced below market value. American companies waste valuable time and legal fees bringing cases against unfairly subsidized products that are dumped into the United States. When American companies win these dumping cases, they deserve to have the penalties enforced.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, American companies have not been competing on a level playing field. Those same trade cheaters that dumped their goods into our U.S. markets are adding insult to injury by evading the duty or penalty. When they ship the product from a country that doesn't have a penalty for dumping, they are skipping out on paying the penalty for cheating in the first place.

We need a better referee to level the playing field. We need the penalties to be enforced. That's why I negotiated for the inclusion of the ENFORCE Act in the final Customs Bill and defended their importance throughout this Conference process.

This bill will ensure that Customs and Border Protection (CBP) must investigate cases of duty evasion within 300 days. If for some reason CBP begins rubberstamping these decisions, the company can go to a U.S. court to have the case reviewed. These are critical reforms that are necessary to ensure that American companies are on a level playing field. I thank my colleagues and friends Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. TIBERI, Chairman BRADY, Speaker RYAN, Dr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SMITH, and the Steel Caucus for working with me on this important reform.

Every foreign company wants to sell their goods on American store shelves to American consumers. We must make sure we have the tools we need at the border to prevent foreign trade cheaters from sneaking their goods onto our shelves without paying the appropriate duties. We must protect American manufacturers and American jobs from trade cheaters.

Additionally, I urge support for this bill because of critical protections against misguided attempts to use trade agreements to rewrite

our domestic immigration laws and environmental regulations. While this bill is not perfect, the permanent improvements to our trade laws and the bans on misuse of trade agreements make it worthy of our support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 560, the previous question is ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DOGGETT. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Given all the injustices promoted by this conference report, I am strongly opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Doggett moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 644 to the committee on conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to—

(1) disagree to subsections (b) and (e) of section 914 of the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference; and

(2) insist on sections 701 through 706 of the Senate amendment to the bill as passed the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DOGGETT. 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, and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 560, I call up the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-53) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting "December 16, 2015".

This Act may be cited as the "Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016".

Amend the title so as to read: "Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Kentucky moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 560, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2250.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H.R. 2250, a short-term continuing resolution that will fund the government through December 16.

As you know, our current funding mechanism expires today, at midnight. At this point, it is, unfortunately, necessary for us to have a little more time to complete our negotiations.

This continuing resolution extends current levels of funding for critical government programs for 5 additional days, ensuring our government stays open until midnight next Wednesday. The Senate passed this same bill yesterday. So, with approval in the House, this bill will go to the President today.

I believe we are making good progress, Mr. Speaker, on a final, full-year appropriations package. While I had hoped that we would be done by this point, there are still many moving pieces. It is my hope and expectation that the final omnibus legislation will be completed by this new deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the biggest fan of continuing resolutions. They tend to be wasteful and inefficient. However, at this point, I see this procedure today as the best way forward. This continuing resolution is very short and limited in scope, simply buying us enough time to wrap up our negotiations and bring a full-year bill to the floor without a lapse in important government services. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I have a sad announcement to make. On Wednesday morning, the committee

lost one of its longstanding staff, who has been associated with the legislative branch for 25 years: Chuck Turner. We mourn his loss. As soon as we have further details on services, we will provide that information to the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in half-hearted support of the continuing resolution before us. While it saves hardworking Americans and our economy from a disastrous government shutdown, it reflects a failure of Congress to carry out one of our most basic constitutional responsibilities.

It has been 2½ months since the beginning of fiscal year 2016 and 6 weeks since we passed a bipartisan, 2-year budget agreement to set the guidelines for appropriations. There is no good reason we should not have passed spending bills by now to keep the government operating for the 2016 fiscal year.

The bill before us today should be bipartisan legislation that makes crucial investments in biomedical research, job training, and national security. The bill before us today should provide relief from harmful sequester caps that are hurting economic growth and families' pocketbooks. Instead, Republicans' insistence on including dangerous, harmful policies in the spending bills has halted progress.

Since the budget agreement, terrorist attacks in Paris and San Bernardino have brought to bear the need for improved security and closure in lax gun safety laws. Yet the majority wants to continue to deny even basic research on causes of gun violence at the Centers for Disease Control, not to mention we should be acting immediately to stop the legal purchase of guns by those on terrorist watch lists, an amendment I have introduced four times in 5 years that has been defeated every time in committee.

The process has stalled because Republicans insist on demonizing legal, women's reproductive health decisions, even putting women's jobs at risk if their employers do not agree with their health choices.

And finally, 2015 is on track to be the hottest year on record, with droughts leading to hunger and wildfires, and rising sea levels threatening to wipe away island nations. Yet Republicans demand measures that harm the environment, put the health and safety of Americans, their children, and the entire planet at risk.

I hope my colleagues will work together in the coming 5 days to agree on appropriations bills that invest in biomedical research, education, infrastructure, job training, and a strong national defense. Together, we can provide opportunities for hardworking families and build a 21st century workforce and a secure America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 560, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to concur by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

The motion to concur was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 644;

Adoption of the conference report on H.R. 644, if ordered;

And agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 644, TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 644) to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 172, nays 239, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 692]

YEAS—172

Adams	Castro (FL)	Delaney
Ashford	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Bass	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Beatty	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Becerra	Clark (MA)	Deutsch
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Doggett
Bonamici	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	F.
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Duckworth
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Edwards
Bustos	Conyers	Ellison
Butterfield	Courtney	Engel
Capps	Crowley	Eshoo
Capuano	Cuellar	Esty
Cardenas	Cummings	Farr
Carney	Davis (CA)	Fattah
Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny	Foster
Cartwright	DeGette	Frankel (FL)

Fudge	Lowey	Ryan (OH)	Poe (TX)	Royce	Valadao
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Poliquin	Russell	Wagner
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sarbanes	Posey	Salmon	Walberg
Graham	Lynch	Schakowsky	Price, Tom	Sanford	Walden
Green, Al	Maloney, Carolyn	Schiff	Ratcliffe	Scalise	Walker
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)	Reed	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Scott, David	Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Walters, Mimi
Hahn	McCollum	Serrano	Renacci	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Hastings	McDermott	Sewell (AL)	Ribble	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Sherman	Rice (NY)	Simpson	Weststrup
Higgins	McNerney	Sinema	Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Himes	Meng	Sires	Rigell	Smith (NE)	Whitfield
Hinojosa	Moore	Slaughter	Roby	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Honda	Moulton	Smith (WA)	Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Speier	Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Wittman
Huffman	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Womack
Israel	Napolitano	Takai	Rohrabacher	Stutzman	Woodall
Jackson Lee	Neal	Takano	Rokita	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Jeffries	Norcross	Thompson (CA)	Rooney (FL)	Thornberry	Yoho
Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Titus	Roskam	Tipton	Young (IA)
Jones	Pascrell	Tonko	Ross	Trott	Young (IN)
Kaptur	Payne	Torres	Rothfus	Turner	Zeldin
Keating	Pelosi	Tsongas	Rouzer	Upton	Zinke
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Van Hollen			
Kennedy	Peters	Vargas			
Kilmer	Peterson	Veasey			
Kirkpatrick	Pingree	Vela			
Langevin	Pocan	Velázquez			
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Visclosky			
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Walz			
Lawrence	Quigley	Wasserman			
Lee	Rangel	Schultz			
Levin	Richmond	Waters, Maxine			
Lewis	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman			
Lieu, Ted	Ruiz	Welch			
Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)			
Loeb sack	Rush	Yarmuth			
Loftgren					
Lowenthal					

NAYS—239

Abraham	Dold	Kelly (PA)
Aderholt	Donovan	Kind
Allen	Duffy	King (IA)
Amash	Duncan (SC)	King (NY)
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Babin	Ellmers (NC)	Kline
Barletta	Emmer (MN)	Knight
Barr	Farenthold	Labrador
Barton	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Benishek	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Beyer	Fleming	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Flores	Lance
Bishop (MI)	Forbes	Latta
Black	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Foxo	Long
Blum	Franks (AZ)	Loudermilk
Blumenauer	Frelinghuysen	Love
Bost	Garrett	Lucas
Boustany	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Gibson	Lummis
Brat	Gohmert	MacArthur
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	Marchant
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Marino
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Massie
Buchanan	Granger	McCarthy
Buck	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Byrne	Griffith	McKinley
Calvert	Grothman	McMorris
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	Rodgers
Carter (TX)	Hanna	McSally
Chabot	Hardy	Meehan
Chaffetz	Harris	Meeks
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Messer
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Mica
Cole	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Comstock	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Holding	Mullin
Cook	Hudson	Mulvaney
Cooper	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Costa	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Newhouse
Cramer	Hunter	Noem
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Nugent
Crenshaw	Hurt (VA)	Nunes
Culberson	Issa	Olson
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Palmer
Demais	Jolly	Paulsen
Dent	Jordan	Pearce
DeSantis	Joyce	Perry
DesJarlais	Katko	Pittenger
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Pitts

Poe (TX)	Royce	Valadao
Poliquin	Russell	Wagner
Posey	Salmon	Walberg
Price, Tom	Sanford	Walden
Ratcliffe	Scalise	Walker
Reed	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Walters, Mimi
Renacci	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Ribble	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Rice (NY)	Simpson	Weststrup
Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Rigell	Smith (NE)	Whitfield
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Womack
Rohrabacher	Stutzman	Woodall
Rokita	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Rooney (FL)	Thornberry	Yoho
Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Roskam	Tipton	Young (IA)
Ross	Trott	Young (IN)
Rothfus	Turner	Zeldin
Rouzer	Upton	Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Aguilar	Guinta	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Sanchez, Loretta
Boyle, Brendan	Jenkins (KS)	Schrader
F.	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
DeFazio	Kildee	Sessions
Fincher	Kuster	Stivers
Gallego	Meadows	Westmoreland
Green, Gene	Nolan	

□ 1257

Messrs. FLEISCHMANN, MILLER of Florida, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, GRIFFITH, MCHENRY, and MEEKS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Messrs. SMITH of Washington and PETERS changed their 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 conference report.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. 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 256, noes 158, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 693]

AYES—256

Abraham	Bridenstine	Costa
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Amodei	Buchanan	Crawford
Ashford	Buck	Crenshaw
Babin	Bucshon	Cuellar
Barletta	Burgess	Culberson
Barr	Byrne	Curbelo (FL)
Barton	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Benishek	Carter (GA)	Denham
Bera	Carter (TX)	Dent
Beyer	Chabot	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	DesJarlais
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Clyburn	Dold
Black	Coffman	Donovan
Blackburn	Cole	Duffy
Blum	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blumenauer	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bonamici	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Bost	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Boustany	Connolly	Farenthold
Brady (TX)	Cook	Farr
Brat	Cooper	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
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn

NOES—158

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro

Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
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
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aguilar
Boyle, Brendan F.
DeFazio
Fincher
Green, Gene
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Kildee
Kuster
Meadows
Nolan
Pompeo
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Schweikert
Sessions
Stivers
Westmoreland

□ 1304

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 693 I was unable to vote due to the death of my wife Shirley. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 687 on the motion to suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, the DHS Science and Technology Reform and Improvement Act of 2015, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 688 on the motion to Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 689 on the motion to suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, First Responder Identification of Emergency Needs in Disaster Situations Act, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 690 on ordering the previous question on the rule providing for consideration of both the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 644—Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 and the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250—Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 691 on the rule providing for consideration of both the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 644—Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 and the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250—Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 692 on the Motion to Recommit with instructions, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 693 on the Adoption of the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 644—Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on December 11, 2015 due to recovery from eye

surgery and missed the following votes. Had I been present I would have voted:

On vote 690, On Ordering the Previous Question for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, and for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250, I would have voted "no."

On vote 691, On Agreeing to the Resolution providing for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 644 and for consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 2250, I would have voted "no."

On vote 692, On the Motion to Recommit Conference Report with Instructions of H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, I would have voted "aye."

On vote 693, On Agreeing to the Conference Report to H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Friday, December 11, 2015 on the five-day Continuing Resolution and the Conference Report for the Customs bill due to a family engagement in my district in Houston.

If I had been able to vote that day, I would have voted as follows: on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 2250, I would have voted "no."

On H. Res. 560, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate Amendments to H.R. 2250 and Conference Report to H.R. 644, I would have voted "no."

On the Democratic Motion to Recommit the Conference Report to H.R. 644, I would have voted "yea."

On Agreeing to the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 644—Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (H. Rept. 114—376), I would have vote "no."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1301

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1301.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JACKIE SPEIER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena issued in connection with court-martial proceedings.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

JACKIE SPEIER,
Member of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before we get started, I would like to discuss a matter of deep importance to the gentleman and myself, of a dear friend, John Stipicevic. He is a trusted aide for many years on this floor, and he will be departing us. He wants to spend more time with his wife, Kristin, and their new baby, Lucy Grace. I would like to thank him for his service to this country and his service to this conference. I know he is a good friend, also, to the gentleman across the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the public's perception—because that is what is covered most—is the confrontation that occurs between the parties, the differences that we have. But one thing that is a reality that the public ought to feel good about is they have extraordinarily good staffers, staffers who are committed to their country, to the House, and to the American people, who do wonderful work.

Stip is a wonderful, wonderful positive participant, who made this House a better place in which to work, who made the substance of what we did more understandable for Members. He facilitated cooperation. He did not create confrontation. And we will miss it.

We wish him the best, of course, as he leaves the House of Representatives, like so many of our staffers do, who go on to do better than most of us are doing, at least from a certain perspective. I want to wish him the very, very best. I want to thank him on behalf of not only myself, because he is a good friend, but also on behalf of my staff with whom he has worked very closely over the years. I know all of them appreciated the relationship they had, and have, with him. So I want to congratulate him and wish him good luck and great success.

I yield, again, to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind words about Stip.

Let me get to the schedule.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, no votes are expected in the House on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that first votes of the week are expected at 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and the remainder of the week, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

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

Mr. Speaker, the House may also consider a bill to extend certain provisions of the Tax Code.

Additionally, I expect the House to consider an omnibus appropriations bill.

Mr. HOYER. Just to repeat—of course, the majority leader announced it yesterday, and again today—we will not be having votes on Monday.

Has the gentleman decided whether there will be a pro forma session yet on Monday?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are still looking at that, and I will let the gentleman know as soon as possible.

□ 1315

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for that information.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the Members, as the majority leader has indicated, will not be having votes until, at the earliest, 6:30 on Tuesday.

I believe that the balance of the week—or such time as may be necessary in order to complete the work of this session of the Congress—will dictate the length of time that we go on the schedule. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes. It is my intention that we will stay until we get our work done, but when we get our work done, we will depart for the holiday season.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

To further clarify, I know there has been some talk about a CR that may be sufficient to get us into next year. As I understand what the majority leader is saying, it is our intention not to do that, but to, in fact, complete the appropriations process and the funding of government for the balance of the year until September 30 of next year. Is that accurate, sir?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

Yes. As the gentleman knows, we just passed a CR moving into next Wednesday. It is our intention to have our

work done and to not need to pass any further CRs.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I would say to him that—and I think he knows and I know—although I don't think either of us is directly involved in the hour-to-hour negotiations that are going on—but, nevertheless, negotiations still go on, Mr. Speaker—I am hopeful that, on both sides, we can see that which is unacceptable to the other side and put that aside for a later day.

The appropriations process, of course, is about funding government. The appropriations process is about keeping government open. The appropriations process is about how do we best serve the American people.

I am hopeful that that will not get mired down or prevent our success in coming to an agreement on the omnibus because of issues on which, clearly, there are significant policy differences and which can be argued on another day and in another bill, but will not undermine the completion of the appropriations process.

I presume the majority leader hopes that as well. Hopefully, over the next few hours and, really, over the next couple of days, we will work on that because, if we don't, we are going to be here on the 17th, the 18th, the 19th, or the 20th, according to what the majority leader said, in order to get our work done.

Is that accurate, Mr. Leader?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

It is our intention to get an omnibus done in a bipartisan manner. Those are the negotiations that are going on now. I'm hopeful that we can get that done and finished by next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

The only thing I would add, Mr. Speaker, is there is also a tax extender bill that is being discussed. The tax extenders are some of the items that Members on both sides of the aisle believe are appropriate and necessary to help grow our economy and create jobs, which has support on both sides of the aisle.

But it is clear that the extender bill, as I understand it, is a bill that can be very, very large—as large as \$800 billion in unpaid tax cuts—which, from our perspective on our side in the House of Representatives, will substantially exacerbate our deficit, and that will undermine the viability of getting tax reform done in the next session or in the years to come.

We think, therefore, that it would be far preferable to have pending getting tax reform done—hopefully, next year if we can do so in a bipartisan fashion—and to have a shorter term. The Senate passed a 2-year bill, which is really a 1-year lookback to 2015 and a year forward to 2016. We need to certainly do that. I think we could get a bipartisan vote for that. I don't know where the negotiations are on that bill.

I would like to inform the majority leader, as he probably knows privately, that we have great concerns on this side of the aisle about a bill of the magnitude that is being discussed and the impact it will have on our deficit, on discretionary spending, and on our opportunity to pass major needed—and a bipartisan expectation of doing—tax reform so our tax system is simpler, fairer, is producing the revenue that we need, but it is also making sure the American people understand and can be provided a much simpler system for them to have to respond to.

If the majority leader wants to make any remarks on that, I yield to the gentleman. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2015, TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, December 15, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION'S ATTACK ON GUN RIGHTS

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, the horrific attacks in San Bernardino underscore the pressing need to defeat ISIS and radical Islamic extremism. But instead of trying to fix his failed policies, which contributed to the very rise of ISIS in the first place, the President is instead attempting to divert and distract the American people by leveraging this tragedy to announce his plans to issue an executive order on gun control.

Just yesterday the White House called the San Bernardino attack an incident of gun violence. Mr. Speaker, it was terrorism, and I refuse to let this President use acts of terrorism as a means to try another end run around this Congress.

Earlier this year I stood up against the administration's attempted ammunition ban and I was successful in getting that unconstitutional policy rescinded.

So today I am again standing up against this latest attack on our constitutional gun rights in this country because, if this administration refuses to take terrorism seriously, then the American people will need their Second Amendment rights more than ever before.

CLIMATE DAMAGE WIPES OUT LIVELIHOODS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, while many around the world are watching the climate talks in Paris, some of my constituents along the San Francisco Peninsula are watching the Pacific Ocean. That is because an unusually warm climate and water has led to a record toxic algae bloom that contaminates the crabs. Our critical Dungeness crab fishery is closed, and our fishermen are suffering.

One Half Moon Bay fisherman said: "If you had asked me 6 months ago about crab, I would've told you we're going to feed our families, we're going to send our kids to college. And I'm not talking just the junior college. If they want to go to Princeton, crab can make this happen with my work ethic. This situation is a new one. This was like getting the legs pulled out from under you."

So if my Republican colleagues are wondering if climate damage is real or if it is affecting real people, I encourage them to see the docked fishing boats and the landlocked crab pots in my district. Climate damage is wiping out people's livelihoods. We cannot let this become the new normal.

CBO REPORT ON WORK REDUCTION FROM AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(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 to detail a report from the Congressional Budget Office that was released this month, which says the Affordable Care Act will lead to a reduction in work hours equivalent to 2 million jobs over the next decade.

The key reason for the work reduction, according to the CBO, is healthcare subsidies which are tied to income, which will raise effective tax rates for Americans and will create a disincentive for people who are seeking promotions or new, higher paying jobs.

The report also points to tax increases and penalties as a reason for the work reduction, including the employer mandate, which imposes penalties on those companies with more than 50 employees that do not provide insurance.

The House and the Senate recently passed legislation that would repeal key parts of the Affordable Care Act, including the employer mandate. Unfortunately, President Obama has pledged to veto it.

We can't allow these job losses to become a reality. This is why I will continue to work with my colleagues to make commonsense changes that will improve our Nation's healthcare sys-

tem and will revitalize economic growth and jobs.

MAJOR CAMERON GALLAGHER

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the service of Major Cameron Gallagher.

I first met Cameron in 2013, when he was serving as a military fellow in my office, advising me on a range of defense and foreign policy issues. For the past 2 years, Cameron has worked in the Army's Office of the Chief Legislative Liaison, where he has continued to be a trusted adviser to me and to other Members of the House. Cameron's service will now take him and his family to Fort Carson, Colorado, where he will serve as a battalion executive officer in the 4th Combat Aviation Brigade.

Cameron truly represents the very best our Armed Forces and our Nation have to offer. Intelligent and dedicated, Cameron is such an optimist that he sent me trash talk emails for days in the lead-up to last year's Stanford-Army football game. Stanford won 35-0, but that is not really the point.

Cameron, we will miss having you here in Congress. We wish you, C.C., and Henry all the best in your new assignment. And don't forget the Schiff Hotel California policy. You can check out anytime you like, but you can never leave.

MINING SCHOOLS ENHANCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, we need more mining engineers. Approximately 70 percent of the mining industry's technical leaders will reach retirement age over the next 10 to 15 years.

In our mining engineering programs, almost all current faculty members will need to be replaced by the coming decade.

At our Federal agencies, there is already a dangerous lack of employees with the necessary technical expertise to carry out their essential duties, such as permitting and inspections.

Mr. Speaker, this is irresponsible, and it can have catastrophic consequences like we saw with the Gold King Mine disaster.

In order to sustain our Nation's mining schools, we need to ensure that vital Federal funding is made available for faculty to conduct more research and to better educate the next generation of mineral scientists and engineers.

It can be done by using the existing funding streams under SMCR.A. My bill, H.R. 3734, the Mining Schools Enhancement Act, will accomplish this goal.

AMERICA'S VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, Manchester, Illinois, April 24, 2013: Brittney Lynn Luark, 23 years old; Nolan James Ralston, 5 years old; Brantley Jack Ralston, 1 year old.

Fort Hood, Texas, April 2, 2014: Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson, 39 years old; Staff Sergeant Timothy Owens, 38 years old; Sergeant Carlos A. Lazaney-Rodriguez, 37 years old.

Columbus, Ohio, June 14, 2015: Michael Ballour, 41 years old; Daniel Sharp, 36 years old; Angela Harrison, 35 years old; Tyajah Nelson, 18 years old.

Hialeah, Florida, July 26, 2013: Italo Piscioti, 79 years old; Samira Piscioti, 69 years old; Patricio Simono, 64 years old; Merly Niebles, 51 years old; Carlos Javier Gavilanes, 33 years old; Priscilla Perez, 17 years old.

Mohawk Valley, New York, March 13, 2013: Harry Montgomery, 68 years old; Thomas Stefka, 62 years old.

□ 1330

TRENTON TIGERS

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Trenton Tigers on winning Florida's 1A State football championship. This talented group of young men ended the season a perfect 14-0 and broke the State record for "running clocks" on all 10 regular-season opponents. This is a feat that has never been done before. Trenton soundly defeated Port St. Joe 56-21. This gives the Tigers their second championship in just 3 years.

An impressive achievement like this cannot be accomplished without hard work and dedication: the hard work of a two-a-day practice schedule, the hard work of each individual team member playing as one for a common goal, and the hard work of a talented coaching staff to guide the team to victory.

I also want to congratulate Coach Andrew Thomas and his staff for doing an exceptional job coaching these young men. Coach Thomas' leadership has not gone unnoticed. He has recently been named the Class 1A Coach of the Year by the Florida Dairy Farmers.

Coach Thomas, thanks for carrying on your great winning tradition and continuing to make the town of Trenton, Florida, and Gilchrist County proud of our young athletes.

TERRORISTS AND GUN LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal this week about what is proposed as a common-sense fix to our Second Amendment, and that is, okay, surely you can agree that anyone on the no-fly list should not be able to walk in and buy a gun.

We have had friends across the aisle that pointed out, like the Times Square bomber, he could have gone in and bought a gun. I am told now that that is not actually the case, that he specifically could not have. The guy made a bomb. He was going to blow up New York Times Square. He didn't need a gun. He was going to blow people up.

A lot of us, when we first hear, "well, shouldn't that be a no-brainer?" if you are on the no-fly list, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. Then when you find out that the no-fly list is composed of names—and we can't even get a number, even a ballpark number. Is it 47,000? Is it 470,000? Is it 700,000? Is it over a million? When you find out you can't actually find any specific criteria for getting on the no-fly list, then you realize the no-fly list is basically anybody this administration says needs to be harassed or looked at further.

As I was leaving London a year ago after speaking to some groups in London, a man that was head of that little area of whatever their TSA is there in the London airport came up and said: Congressman, I know who you are and I am really, really sorry, but apparently your Department of Homeland Security indicates you need to be thoroughly searched personally and your bags. Really sorry.

Anyway, for those people that say no administration would ever be into political revenge, you can look at some of the groups that the IRS went after. In fact, a huge majority of rank-and-file Federal workers in Homeland Security and in the IRS, they would never dream of doing the kind of things that Lois Lerner and her hacks did. They used the power of government to go after political enemies.

Nobody will ever be able to say specifically how much it helped President Obama in 2012 to prevent conservative groups from getting their tax status cleared through the IRS. They did prevent a lot of groups from being able to form. If you don't have the clearance from the IRS, then you can't bring contributions in together to organize and do like many of the unions do that get Federal money. These groups were not going to get Federal money. They were going to get contributions.

The more we see the abuses within this administration, the clearer it is. Whether it was a Democrat or Republican administration, the last thing you would ever want to do is tell a President and administration that you just list anybody on a list; there is no requirement as to the specifics as why. You just put anybody on a list that you have concerns about, and they will never be able to buy a gun. You could keep them from flying if you want to.

You just list them on the list. You don't have to tell Congress. You don't have to tell anybody else. Just put people you are not happy with on a list and say you have concerns about them, and they will never be able to buy a gun.

Before we go ripping away people's constitutional Second Amendment right or any other right, which should be a right to get on a plane and fly unless you are a threat, we do not need to have an obscure process where nobody can identify the specifics that gets you on the no-fly list or, in this case, as people are proposing, the no-gun list. Just let an administration list them. We have got to do a lot more soul-searching in America.

As we have seen, there are so many groups and individuals that were listed as unindicted, but coconspirators in the biggest terror financing trial in American history, the Holy Land Foundation trial. We found out that a group that called itself charitable and got clearance from the IRS and they don't really say where their money comes from, when the FBI drilled down and found out, saw where it was going, they were able to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the five principals in the Holy Land Foundation trial were guilty of financing terrorism. There were many people, many groups listed as coconspirators.

Some, like this Islamic Society of North America of which Imam Magid is past president, ISNA was trying—one of those groups, CAIR, they wanted their names off the unindicted list. If there were no evidence of any ties to the Holy Land Foundation's terrorist funding, then they should have gotten a judge. The judge would have signed the order.

Both the district judge and the Fifth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals looked at the evidence and said there is plenty of evidence here to show that these groups, like the Islamic Society of North America, principals in these groups, they are affiliated with—there is evidence to show they are coconspirators with these terrorist financing people. So they would not allow their names to be removed from the pleadings. They remained in the pleadings.

Unfortunately, for those of us who want justice in America, for those who would destroy our government, Eric Holder became Attorney General immediately after the conviction by the Bush administration in very late 2008. Under his guidance, they never pursued those people that the Federal district court and the Court of Appeals said there is plenty of evidence to support that these people are part of the terror financing network. They never pursued them.

In fact, Imam Magid out at the All Dulles Area Muslim Society—ADAMS, they called themselves. The Secretary of Homeland Security was just out there last week and applauding their efforts and thanking Imam Magid as

the White House has thanked Imam Magid. He has helped the President, we know, with at least one speech. That was the one the President delivered while Netanyahu was on the way over here and wrongly said that everybody involved, including Israel, had agreed to the pre-'67 borders.

Since that was so factually wrong when the President stated it publicly, you can't help but feel like, since Imam Magid advised him on the speech, was there in the inner sanctum of the State Department, in that extremely secure setting when the President delivered his speech—he was even asked for an interview about the speech immediately afterwards—you know that there were people with ties to people this administration shouldn't use as their advisers that this administration is using as advisers.

Anyway, there is a reason that America has become extremely skeptical about what they are told. When this administration and my friends across the aisle start saying, "Hey, we can trust this administration. Just let them list anybody they want to as they currently can on the no-fly list and they will never be able to buy a gun and that will stop terrorism," well, it wouldn't have stopped the pipe bombs that Farook and his fiancée—wife, whatever she was, terrorist, female companion—had built and put together.

Also, the President keeps pushing for better background checks. There was a great article from Dr. John R. Lott, Jr., December 3. Dr. Lott has had positions with the University of Chicago, Yale University, Stanford, UCLA, Wharton, and Rice. He was the chief economist at the United States Sentencing Commission during '88 and '89. This guy is an expert when it comes to guns and gun laws.

Dr. Lott had an article that made clear—it is dated December 3; there is a national review online—that there is nothing at all that President Obama or Loretta Lynch had proposed that would have stopped the 14 people being killed and 21 injured out in San Bernardino. In fact, there is nothing that this President proposed in the light of violence in Colorado that would have changed the shooting in Colorado.

In fact, if you go back to the prior shooting in Colorado, we know that the gunman went by at least a couple of theaters that were closer to him because those were not gun-free zones and there were likely people in the theater who had guns who would have stopped the shooter before he killed and shot as many people as he did.

When it comes to Oregon, they have very strict gun control laws. There is nothing the President or the Justice Department proposed that would have prevented the shooting at the community college in Oregon. Those are places where the gun laws are already as strict or stricter than what the President is asking be applied everywhere else.

So it just seems disingenuous for anyone to say we need gun control laws like in California so that we can stop the violence when it didn't stop the very violence they are using as an excuse to take away people's Second Amendment rights. I would commend that great article by John Lott.

When it comes to the Syrian refugees, most people in America have figured out this has to be stopped because we don't know who is coming in. I have mentioned it here on the floor before, Mr. Speaker, last week and previously, that we had information—I had information that ISIS had probably taken over areas where there were printing facilities so they could probably print passports that we would not be able to know were they legitimate or not.

□ 1345

As this administration keeps saying, we need to bomb Assad out of existence, or at least try to take him out. Well, Assad is not very favorable toward giving this administration all of his criminal records and passport records about the people of Syria. We have no idea who these people are. God bless the Director of the FBI, Comey. He comes in more than once and says: Yes, we will vet them, but you have to understand, even though we will do the best vetting we possibly can, we have nothing to go on.

With Iraqis, as he explained, we had fingerprints. We had fingerprints from IEDs. We had all kinds of information. We had the official records of the Iraqi Government that could help tell us whether somebody coming from Iraq was the person they said they were, or whether they were not. Were they a threat? Were they a danger?

Even with all of that, we find out a couple of guys get to Kentucky and have been there a couple of years. One of them was certainly a terrorist whose fingerprints were on an IED that had been exploded in Iraq, and they didn't catch his fingerprints, even though they had them. If you can't catch a terrorist that you let into Kentucky, and you had his fingerprints and compared them, and it didn't show up initially, then how much worse will it be? How many more terrorists will you let into America from within the Syrian refugees?

Then it has also been disclosed this week what many of us in America knew already. It was only common sense that people who have sworn they want to destroy our country, kill as many Americans and Jews and Israelis as possible, that they would use this refugee crisis not to get into Israel—because they are very protective, thank God—but to get into Western Europe and to get into the United States. Now we know those are the facts.

Most Americans that I have talked to—I think in my telephone townhall, there was about 90 percent of the people in east Texas, of the thousands on the call, they indicated about 90 per-

cent were concerned that we couldn't properly vet the Syrian refugees good enough, and that we needed to pause and hold up and wait until we had more information. That is just common sense.

Then we also, there was an article from Mark Krikorian November 16. He pointed out, and I will quote from his article:

"The 5-year cost to American taxpayers of resettling a single Middle Eastern refugee in the United States is conservatively estimated to be more than \$64,000 compared with U.N. figures that indicate it costs about \$5,300 to provide for that same refugee for 5 years" if he or she is in their native region.

So for every person we arrogantly think, gee, we should bring that person into America, as Mark Krikorian points out, actually that is a bit immoral, because if we weren't so arrogant to think we need to get them into America, we could save 12 of them in their native region.

They say, 3 to 4 million people coming out of Syria, out of that area, gee, they need to come to the United States, and yet Saudi Arabia has accommodations for 3 million. So many people have seen a photograph of the massive tent area there for 5 days out of 365. That is during the Hajj, the pilgrimage to Mecca, kitchen facilities, bathroom facilities. It just seems like if they would help take care of the 3 million, make those available, we could work something out to take care of the people that come in for 5 days in the Hajj, that that would be a better solution than this administration forcing Syrian refugees that could not be properly vetted into this country.

Then I was told last night that actually the female terrorist in San Bernardino was using a name that certainly would not have been given to her at birth, and that if we had people that were allowed to study radical Islam, the tenets of its belief, as this one person said, she had a name that is actually a guy's name, and for anyone who has spent their adult life studying radical Islam, like this administration for 7 years, has not allowed the FBI, the intelligence agency, State Department, Justice Department. They purged their records of anything that offended terror and unindicted coconspirator to finance terrorism. So when this unindicted co-conspirator CAIR complained about anything, it was purged from this administration's training records.

As this individual, this friend pointed out, when you spend so many of your years of your adulthood studying this, for her to have proper screening by somebody that had studied radical Islam, you would ask the question: When did you get this name? This clearly was not given to you at birth. He said it would be like an American going into Europe and someone there saying: Now, come on, your name is not George Washington. It wasn't given to you at birth. Where did you get it?

When you start inquiring, then you find out the madrassas she had been to, the places she had been to, but you have to get to secondary screening, further questioning, which there should be red flags all over somebody's record like that. We have the information available that this administration didn't prevent it from being used to properly screen radical Islamists. But before you can properly screen radical Islamists, you have to admit that there is a thing called radical Islam.

Carolyn Glick writes for the Jerusalem Post. She is a brilliant lady. She pointed out one of the problems with my friend, President George W. Bush's position that we are not at war with Islam, and then this administration's taking that and running with it to extremes, they fail to acknowledge that there is pluralism within Islam. Saying that "If it is bad, it could not possibly be part of Islam," is ridiculous. What that does to moderate Muslims, who don't want radical Islamists governing them and cutting their hands off, horsewhipping them, whatever, stoning them to death, they would like to live in peace without worrying about a tyrannical, radical Islamist leader.

We do them a disservice by not pointing out that radical Islam is an element of Islam, and it is a fact. Therefore, moderates are left to say nothing because if they say this is an element of Islam we have got to stand up against, then they come against the wrongheaded positions of the Obama administration.

We actually can help moderate Muslims stand up, as some are starting to do, a few have been doing for a long time, stand up against radical Islam, and say—God blessing President al-Sisi in Egypt, as he stood and talked to a group of imams, said we have got to get control of our religious beliefs, our Islam back from the radicals. We have got to stand up against them. We help them. The al-Sisi regime administration over in Egypt, I have talked to some of them. I don't know if I am still the only Member of Congress that has met with their director of intelligence. We had a very informative meeting for a couple of hours.

They don't understand why this administration appears to be helping radical Islam and standing against the moderates, like President al-Sisi, like the 30 million of the 90 million Egyptian people that went to the street a couple years ago. Wow, that was such a huge deal.

There has never been a group that big, in the history of the world, go to the streets of their country and demand a peaceful regime change. But because the constitution that we helped Egypt with when Morsi was elected did not contain an impeachment provision, they had no other way to go. There was no other way to peaceably remove a president who was violating their own constitution over and over than to go to the streets, as they did.

The Coptic Christian Pope there in Cairo has told me more than once how deeply moving it was to see moderate Muslims, Christians, Jews, secularists go to the street as a part of that 30 million, and so many coming up to the Pope and saying: We are so sorry for the way you have been treated.

Has this administration given any accolades whatsoever to the Egyptian people for passing a constitution with over 90 percent vote that in that constitution, a majority of the ones approving were Muslim, it says in the constitution that when the Muslim Brotherhood, radical Islam, they put Muslim Brotherhood on their terrorist watch list. This administration gets their advice. That administration in Egypt puts them on the terrorist watch list.

They say when the Muslim Brotherhood or any other like-minded radical Islamist group burns down a church, we will rebuild it with government funds. It is incredible. The people of Egypt deserve at least an "atta boy."

What was this administration's response? We are going to hold up sending you any helicopters. We sent jets and helicopters and tanks to the Muslim Brotherhood when they were in control under Morsi, but now that the Muslim Brotherhood, this terrorist organization is not in control, we are not going to send you things.

As President al-Sisi once asked me, does your President not understand? We use the Apache helicopters to keep the Suez Canal open. So it was quite a slap in the face to our friends in Egypt that are against radical Islam, our Muslim friends there, when this President didn't go, as I think 47 other leaders or so went. He didn't send the Vice President, didn't send the Ambassador, didn't send anybody from Washington to say: Congratulations, Egypt.

Since moderate Muslims have been in control in Egypt, they have done something earthshaking: They dug another lane, a second lane to the Suez Canal. Countries all over the world went, wow, Egypt, that is enormous.

It was embarrassing to me last year in Egypt as people were asking: Was your country really excited when we got this second lane dug to the Suez Canal? The mainstream media hardly reported anything about it. It was a big deal. It was a free people standing up and doing something monumental. Since it wasn't done by radical Islamists, this administration chose not to give it any credibility.

Then we get the report now. Just hours ago, there was an article from Victoria Taft:

"After the latest Paris terror attack, French President Hollande swore he'd go after radical Muslims who pulled off the mass slayings.

"Now we're learning what he meant by that.

"As HotAir reports:

"The French have kicked in the doors on 2,235 homes and taken 232 people into custody or placed them on house arrest."

In the sleepy French town of Lagny-sur-Marne just 18 miles from Paris . . . French police went to the local mosque where they found:

The Salafist mosque . . . about 30 kilometers east of the French capital was closed down by police on the 2nd of December. In subsequent raids, the prefect for the Seine-and-Marne department said '7.62 millimeter ammunition for a Kalashnikov rifle and propaganda videos' had been seized, AFP reported. The locations of the raids were not given.

Both ISIS and al Qaeda adhere to the radical Sunni Salafist Muslim teachings. Radicals used some mosques and other home-based unpermitted mosques to stockpile weapons."

□ 1400

It was reported that, just in the last 15 days, the French have uncovered about a third of the illegal weapons they normally recover in an entire year just from these mosque areas and the homes that they have raided.

Now, I have serious concerns when I see homes being raided in these numbers. The French do not have our protections under our Bill of Rights. They don't have nearly the protections we do. I don't want this many homes busted into. I don't want mosques raided unless there is probable cause to believe there is a problem or that they have committed a crime. You get warrants for those things. The same with the home, the same with somebody's Internet, and the same with their bank records.

Yet this administration is using the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to do what nobody in American history—any administration—has done before, and that is to get people's bank records, whether or not you want them to or not. They claim: We want to be able to watch so if somebody gets messed around by a bank, we can go after them.

Well, when I was a judge, if you wanted to get bank records, you had to have probable cause that a crime was committed and probable cause that the person whose records you wanted had committed it; otherwise, I didn't sign a warrant because the Constitution didn't allow it. If I did sign a warrant, it had to be specific to place and time and what was being seized.

But this administration gets your bank records—all they want—through the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They get all your medical records through ObamaCare requirements. They get all kinds of information about individuals. They get your phone logs, as they have been doing. Now, there is some question whether they still are or not.

I have this article from Michele McPhee and Brian Ross. ABC News reports: "ISIS May Have Passport Printing Machine, Blank Passports." I am glad they finally caught up with the news on that.

I want to revisit an issue.

Senator GRASSLEY sent a letter to Secretary Jeh Johnson, February 3, 2014, so it will be going on 2 years in February. He included an email. Senator GRASSLEY included a redacted copy of the email exchange. I have seen the unredacted email exchange. And even from the redacted email exchange, it is indicated that Secretary Napolitano had a hands-off list.

Apparently, when there were indications Muslim leaders should be secondarily screened, pulled aside from their first stop, asked further questions, the indication is this guy is in a group, they say: Well, he is on the Secretary's hands-off list.

Well, not only can we not get specifics of exactly why somebody is on the no-fly list or the terrorist watch list—just that this administration has a bad feeling about them—we can't find out just how you get on the hands-off list. That is another matter that requires some looking into.

Then we find out this week that an ex-Guantanamo detainee now is an al Qaeda leader back in Yemen. And it talks about al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, released a new video featuring former Guantanamo detainee Ibrahim al Qosi, whose name is also Sheikh Khubayb al Sudani.

In 2010, he pled guilty to charges of conspiracy and material support for terrorism before a military commission. It ended up that this administration transferred him to his home country of Sudan. Now he is back where he wanted to be, helping al Qaeda. We already knew he was a terrorist—he pled guilty—and this administration sent him back.

The question still out there and remains: How many Americans will be killed because this administration decided closing Guantanamo is more important than saving American lives? They traded five murderous terrorists, coconspirators, for a guy who, all the indications are, deserted his American military post. I wonder how many American lives will be lost because of that.

I have an article from KY3 saying that on Saturday, around 3:50 a.m., two men buying a large number of cell phones at Walmart in Lebanon set off a concern. "'Somebody went in and bought 60 cell phones from Walmart. That's not normal for this area,' explained Nacled County Sheriff Wayne Merritt.

"After talking with the men, officers didn't have a legal reason to detain them so the men were allowed to leave, according to the Lebanon Police Department incident report." That is in Missouri. "Sheriff Merritt said calling law enforcement officers was the right move."

But, unfortunately, because of the statement of our Attorney General in recent days in the aftermath of the San Bernardino killings, she has made clear that, in the aftermath of all of those Americans being killed, specifically targeting Christians and Jews—appar-

ently, there was a Muslim shot, but the targets were Jews and Christians, them telling one Jewish man before he was shot: Now you will never get to see Israel—targeting the Christians specifically, instead of going off on how clearly this was a hate crime, the Attorney General says her big concern is that people are not prejudiced against Muslims.

It made it clear to people like the terrorists' neighbors that, if you see radical Islamists gathering and you are suspicious of—maybe they are making pipe bombs in the garage—and you call that in, there is a good chance that Attorney General Loretta Lynch is going to come after you for being biased and bigoted.

What a ridiculous thing to say. Basically, she is saying, if you see something and say something and that something involves Muslims, then I am coming after you. What a ridiculous, terrible thing for the chief law enforcement officer of our country to say.

Then, this article today from Liam Deacon, Breitbart News, "Homeland Security Shut Down Investigation Into Farook And Malik Linked Islamist Group To Protect 'Civil Liberties' of Potential Terrorists":

"The Department of Homeland Security has been accused of deleting intelligence records relating to dangerous Islamists linked to terrorists Sayed Farook and Tashfeen Malik, because they wanted to protect the 'civil liberties' of members of the caliphate-supporting network.

"Phil Haney, a U.S. Customs and Border Patrol analyst"—now retired—"says he was ordered to stop investigating Deobandi Islamist groups and his work on them was erased. He even says he was subjected to discipline when he attempted to blow the whistle.

"If he'd been allowed to continue his investigation, he claims Malik's visa application would have been flagged for greater scrutiny.

"He explained: 'The administration was more concerned about the civil rights and liberties of foreign Islamic groups with terrorist ties than the safety and security of Americans.'

"Analyst Phil Haney told Fox News that he once worked as a researcher looking into potential terrorists in the Passenger Analysis Units at the Department of Homeland Security in Atlanta, as well as at the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's National Targeting Center.

"Mr. Haney says that he had been identifying and tracking members of the al-Huda and Tablighi Jamaat groups, offshoots of the radical Deobandi school of Islam, which was founded in British colonial India specifically to oppose western culture.

"Tablighi Jamaat is a Deobandi revivalist movement whose mandate is, according to its leading advocate Ebrahim Rangooni, to save the Muslim world 'from the culture and civilization of the Jews and the Christians' . . . To this end, he has suggested cultivating

'such hatred for their ways as human beings have to urine and excrement.'

"Tablighi Jamaat have been linked to 80 percent of all recent terrorist related crimes in France.

"Mr. Haney's work tracking the radical movement was considered so important that he says he was given an agency award for identifying potential terrorists, and he was asked to become part of the National Targeting Center, which works to connect the dots and build a bigger picture of terrorist activity.

"However, after more than six months of tracking the Deobandis, Homeland Security unexpectedly halted his investigation on the request of the State Department's Office of Civil Rights."

Anyway, that is what happens. Phil Haney is one of the most patriotic, finest people ever known. He cares so deeply about this country.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, his appearance decries his intellect and knowledge about radical Islam. So, he has done no telling how many secondary screenings in his time in the Middle East, his knowledge of the language, the culture, the moderate Islamic culture, the radical Islamic culture. He knows the teachings of the radicals and who they are. He has been able to get massive amounts of information that I would never have dreamed people would admit to him.

I have been working with him for a number of years to try to get information to people in the administration who would protect the information, and instead, when they realized how much information he had of what others in Homeland Security had deleted, they thought was gone—Janet Napolitano talked about connecting the dots. She forgot to mention that they had been deleting dots like crazy. I knew that Phil's information was so damaging to this administration that, if it were not handled properly, they would destroy the man.

So what happens after he gets an award for identifying so much information? He used the tech system. All he did was enter data. He would look even at social media, and if he found that somebody under consideration was in a photograph with somebody we knew to be a radical Islamist, he would enter that information. There is a massive amount of information out there in social media that this administration has not even availed themselves of.

Previously, when our Embassy in Yemen was surrounded by Houthis, radical Islamist rebels, I got a call from a constituent whose son is over there and is isolated in a hotel and can't get to the Embassy. In talking to a friend who had a friend, it ends up some guy is going through a training or practice session. They set aside their hypothetical practice scenario and took on the real-life scenario of getting four Americans from a hotel in the capital of Yemen to the Embassy and trying to get more in the Embassy

out. They used social media. They were able to find pictures being taken by Houthi radical Islamists at different places where they obviously were. So they knew which places to avoid.

□ 1415

They were able, using people in place in Yemen, American assets, and using social media, were able to get those people from the hotel, get them to the Embassy and get them out, even though this administration would only pay for a commercial airline flight where they sat with some people who may have been part of the rebels that wanted to kill them. Not the best way to get people out of an Embassy, but they got out.

I have heard again recently from my former constituent, and he is doing well. He is a good man. He is a patriot. He wants to help the country.

So it should also be noted that although, in our country, the Attorney General is more concerned about prejudice against Muslims, the Euro Parliament president—this article by Dr. Thomas D. Williams, the 3rd of December, points out that the Euro Parliament president says Christians are not safe on our continent.

In a high-level meeting on religious persecution in Brussels, the president of the European Parliament said that Europe cannot afford to continue ignoring the faith of Christians, who are “clearly the most persecuted group” in the world.

In Wednesday’s meeting, EP President Martin Schulz said that the persecution of Christians is undervalued and does not receive enough attention, which also has meant that “it hasn’t been properly addressed.”

I applaud the efforts of Glenn Beck trying to save Christians over in areas of radical Islam, because, as the European Parliament President says, radical Islamists’ number 1 goal is not other Muslims; it’s Christians and Jews. Yet, this administration’s big focus is helping Muslims.

Then we find out from the U.N. that actually they locate their refugee centers in urban areas where you rarely find many Christians. And we find out the reports, hear from people that say we are afraid to go into the U.N. refugee camps, because they are virtually all Muslim, and we are targeted, and we can’t go there. We can’t allow our families to go there.

Yet, it is the U.N. refugee camps that this administration brings the refugees, and wants to bring refugees from.

Glenn Beck, realizing that Christian refugees were being under-appreciated, undervalued by the Obama administration, has gone over and tried to do something about it. I applaud his efforts.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we close out this week, the bill we just passed with regard to the Customs conference report, I just want to go back to January 29, 1961. In about over a month, it will be the 55-year anniversary of President John F. Kennedy’s speech. It was a message to commemorate Roosevelt Day for Franklin Roosevelt.

So, in his speech, he points out that 28 years ago, Franklin Roosevelt assumed the leadership of a stricken and demoralized Nation. Poverty, distress, economic stagnation, blanketed the land.

He goes on in the speech, recognizing Franklin Roosevelt. And I would just like to read John F. Kennedy’s words, because they are such a contrast to the current President’s words, as he wants to take away people’s Second Amendment rights.

He wants to have the ability, since he controls, completely controls the no-fly list, nobody in Congress gets to know who he is putting on, why they are putting on, what criteria he is using to put them on. He gets exclusive control of who he wants to put on the no-fly list, he or his assignees. President Obama wants to restrict those rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude today, and this week in the House, with the words of John F. Kennedy. President John F. Kennedy, January 29, 1961, part of his speech that day said:

“To meet these problems will require the efforts, not only of our leaders or of the Democratic Party, but the combined efforts of all of our people. No one has a right to feel that, having entrusted the task of government to new leaders in Washington, he can continue to pursue his private comforts unconcerned with America’s challenges and dangers. For, if freedom is to survive and prosper, it will require the sacrifice, the effort, and the thoughtful attention of every citizen.

“In my own native State of Massachusetts, the battle for American freedom was begun by the thousands of farmers and tradesmen who made up the Minute Men, citizens who were ready to defend their liberty at a moment’s notice.”

President Kennedy goes on with these words:

“Today, we need a Nation of Minute Men, citizens who are not only prepared to take up arms, but citizens who regard preservation of freedom as a basic purpose of their daily life and who are willing to consciously work and sacrifice for that freedom. The cause of liberty, the cause of America, cannot succeed with any lesser effort.”

The words of John F. Kennedy, January 29, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical leave.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family engagement in my district in Houston.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, December 11, 2015.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11. These revisions are designated for the conference report accompanying H.R. 22, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (Public Law 114-94), which passed the House on December 3, 2015, and the conference report accompanying H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015. Corresponding tables are attached.

The adjustment for H.R. 22 is made pursuant to section 4509 of S. Con. Res. 11, a deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation. For purposes of budget enforcement, this adjustment is consistent with section 3302 of such concurrent resolution. Section 3302 requires transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year in which the transfer occurs. Pursuant to section 3403 of S. Con. Res. 11, these revisions to the allocations and aggregates shall take effect upon the enactment of the conference report accompanying H.R. 22.

The adjustment for H.R. 644 is made pursuant to section 4506 of S. Con. Res. 11, a deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements. Pursuant to section 3403 of S. Con. Res. 11, these revisions to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while the conference report accompanying H.R. 644 is under consideration or upon its enactment.

These revisions represent an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.

Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal Year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,040,743	1
Outlays	3,092,541	1
Revenues	2,675,967	32,233,099
Adjustment for passage of H.R. 22, the FAST Act:		
Budget Authority	72,880	1
Outlays	70,252	1
Revenues	22,137	65,837
Adjustment for H.R. 644 the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015:		
Budget Authority	20	1
Outlays	20	1
Revenues	-7	18
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,113,643	1
Outlays	3,162,813	1
Revenues	2,698,097	32,298,954

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Ways and Means	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	963,250	962,255	13,218,695	13,217,578
Adjustment for passage of H.R. 22, the FAST Act	-7	-7	-2,780	-2,780
Adjustment for H.R. 644 the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015	20	20	-98	-98
Revised Allocation	963,263	962,268	13,215,817	13,214,700

TABLE 3—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Energy & Commerce	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,341,991	4,346,043
Adjustment for passage of H.R. 22, the FAST Act	0	0	-6,200	-6,200
Revised Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,335,791	4,339,843

TABLE 4—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	57,975	16,407	520,762	184,208
Adjustment for SA to H.R. 22, the FAST Act	72,603	70,000	87,778	70,000
Revised Allocation	130,578	86,407	608,540	254,208

TABLE 5—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Natural Resources	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	4,823	5,759	25,492	27,975
Adjustment for SA to H.R. 22, the FAST Act	284	259	275	275
Revised Allocation	5,107	6,018	25,767	28,250

TABLE 6—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Agriculture	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	10,828	12,428	344,113	340,226
Adjustment for SA to H.R. 22, the FAST Act	0	0	3,520	3,038
Revised Allocation	10,828	12,428	347,633	343,264

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 209. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources; 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.

S. 993. An act to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2250. An act Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016.

H.R. 2693. An act to designate the arboretum at the Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in Richmond, Virginia, as the "Phyllis E. Galanti Arboretum".

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until Tuesday, December 15, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3752. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter in response to the Senate Report 113-174, page 13, focusing on military properties made available as a result of Base Realignment and Closure; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3753. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0822; FRL-9939-52] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3754. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Name Change from the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) to the Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM) [FRL-9936-38-OSWER] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3755. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Maryland's Negative Declaration for the Automobile and Light-Duty Truck Assembly Coatings Control Techniques Guidelines [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0530; FRL-9939-99-Region 3] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3756. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; El Paso Particulate Matter Contingency Measures [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0205; FRL-9940-03-Region 6] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3757. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Naphthalene Acetates; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0769; FRL-9937-22] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* MBI600 (antecedent *Bacillus subtilis* MBI600); Amendment to an Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0762; FRL-9939-54] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Choline Chloride; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0023; FRL-9935-81] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3760. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Interstate Transport of Ozone [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0334; FRL-9940-05-Region 10] received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3761. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Harrisburg, PA and Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN18) received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3762. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Human Resources Management Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3206-AM69) received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3763. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Eagle Foothills Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2015-0006; T.D. TTB-131; Ref. Notice No.: 150] (RIN: 1513-AC18) received December 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 4237. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of explosives licenses to known or suspected terrorists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SABLÁN, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act and the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 to modernize terms relating to minorities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 4239. A bill to require intelligence community reporting on foreign fighter flows to and from terrorist safe havens abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 4240. A bill to require an independent review of the operation and administration of the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and subsets of the TSDB, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 4241. A bill to establish the United States Copyright Office as an agency in the legislative branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4242. A bill to strengthen the Federal statutes designed to deter money laundering and terrorism financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KILMER (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4243. A bill to improve Federal disaster relief and emergency assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4244. A bill to prohibit the admission of certain aliens as refugees until the costs of admission and resettlement of such refugees have been addressed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr. POLIQUIN):

H.R. 4245. A bill to exempt importation and exportation of sea urchins and sea cucumbers from licensing requirements under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. YOHO (for himself, Mr. SCHRAMMER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution supporting the Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC) and recognizing 50 years of organized academic veterinary medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr.

PEARCE, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BARR, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 564. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the symbols and traditions of Christmas should be protected for use by those who celebrate Christmas; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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 Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 4237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 4239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government including those under Title 50, are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power . . . to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; ". . . to raise and support armies . . ."; and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4240.

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, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by security for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Clause 18 "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper . . ."

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 4244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 4245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

Amendment XVI to the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 228: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 383: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 470: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 592: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 721: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 745: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 775: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 814: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 822: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 911: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 985: Mr. NUNES and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 986: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 997: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1076: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1142: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1174: Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1197: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1217: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1218: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1258: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1274: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1288: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1342: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1399: Mr. GIBSON and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1457: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1460: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1475: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1571: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1748: Mr. HONDA and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1786: Mr. KLINE and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2003: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 2036: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 2050: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2058: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 2067: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 2070: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2072: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2124: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2125: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2142: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2144: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2205: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2293: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 2302: Ms. BASS and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2311: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2380: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 2412: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2493: Ms. EDWARDS and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2540: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2612: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2624: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2680: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2698: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2739: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2789: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2880: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2896: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2903: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2916: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 2917: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2984: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3024: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3036: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3040: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3136: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3151: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 3222: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 3268: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 3299: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3314: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3323: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3326: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 3364: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3381: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 3411: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 3437: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 3463: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3513: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3516: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 3520: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3558: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 3662: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3666: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3694: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3734: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3756: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3799: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 3808: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 3858: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3885: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3917: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3926: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 3940: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 3952: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 3961: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3970: Mr. STIVERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3991: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4000: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4007: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 4012: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4027: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4043: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4055: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 4057: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4062: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4085: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4112: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4113: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4144: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 4171: Ms. NORTON and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 4172: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 4177: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 4183: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4185: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BILL-RAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4186: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. POSEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 207: Mr. TROTT and Mr. KILMER.

H. Res. 214: Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 393: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H. Res. 435: Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Res. 451: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H. Res. 454: Mr. GIBSON.

H. Res. 469: Mr. TROTT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. BARR.

H. Res. 536: Mrs. TORRES.

H. Res. 540: Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 559: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. REICHERT.

H. Res. 561: Miss RICE of New York.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1301: Mr. ZINKE.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 3, December 7, 2015, by Mr. THOMPSON of California on H.R. 1076, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Kildee, Ms. DelBene, Mr. Pallone, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Foster, Mr. McNerney, Ms. Edwards, Mr. Gutiérrez, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. McDermott, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Delaney, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Serrano, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Heck of Washington, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Lowenthal, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Kuster, Ms. Castor of Florida, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Al Green of Texas, Mr. Bera, Ms. Lofgren, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Tsongas, Mr. Honda, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Esty, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Michael F. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hinojosa, Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Titus, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Cicilline, Ms. Adams, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Veasey, Mr. O'Rourke, Ms. Pingree, Ms. Matsui, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Keating, Ms. Frankel of Florida, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Hahn, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Takano, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Nolan, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Swalwell of California, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Murphy of Florida, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Ryan of Ohio, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Cohen, Ms. Eddie Bernice John-

son of Texas, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Hoyer, Mrs. Torres, Ms. Kaptur, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Levin, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Sires, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Lynch, Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham of New Mexico, Mr. Loeb sack, Mr. Vargas, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Brown of Florida, Mr. Carney, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Cummings, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Farr, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Ashford, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Crowley, Ms. Meng, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Moore, Mr. Conyers, Ms. Bass, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Engel, Mr. Israel, Mr. Payne, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Neal, Mr. Polis, Mr. Takai, Ms. Lee, Ms. Maxine Waters of California, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Mr. Rush, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Clay, Mr. Butterfield, Ms. Speier, Mrs. Bustos, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Welch, Mr. Himes, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Peters, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Lewis, Ms. Pelosi, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Ms. Sinema, Mr. Grijalva, Mrs. Dingell, and Mr. Lipinski.