

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sec. 705 of the Senate bill, and sec. 804 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

PATRICK MEEHAN,
ROBERT J. DOLD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
LAMAR ALEXANDER,
ORRIN G. HATCH,
JEFF SESSIONS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

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

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1914

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) had been sustained.

No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-639, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 794, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of that resolution.

Each amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 794, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by

section 4 of House Resolution 794, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

□ 1915

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the fiscal year 2017 Financial Services Appropriations Act.

I have been privileged to serve on the subcommittee since the beginning of the 114th Congress. I first want to commend the excellent work of Chairman CRENSHAW, who will be retiring at the end of this Congress, Ranking Member SERRANO, as well as the staffs of both the majority and the minority.

Unfortunately, I will have to oppose this bill on final passage for a number of reasons. For example, I know that it is not the most popular or even the most politically wise thing to defend the Internal Revenue Service, but it does not make any sense to complain about the work of the IRS and then slash its ability to function by cutting its budget \$246 million below the FY 2016 level and \$1.4 billion below the President's budget request.

Severe budget cuts have led to fewer audits, longer appeals, delayed refunds, and poorer service for the American people. It has also led to billions of dollars in lost tax revenue, money that could be used to repair our Nation's infrastructure or reduce the deficit. Instead, the cuts have only served to line the pockets of tax cheats, people who can't be audited and have collection by the Internal Revenue Service.

Taxpayer Services, however, does get funding at the amount requested, which is a positive step for turning around the IRS' customer service issues. At the very least, it is encouraging to see the Congress taking the first steps to improving customer service and tax compliance—resulting from unfair and unnecessary political attacks on the agency—but now they are taking it seriously.

I am also concerned that the FY 2017 Financial Services Appropriations Act contains a number of contentious policy riders that will hinder the government's ability to do its job. First of all, the bill unnecessarily micromanages the District of Columbia's budget and its laws, restricting home rule and the ability of the District of Columbia to manage its own finances.

Also, the Federal Communications Commission is prohibited from implementing its popular net neutrality rules until all lawsuits contesting the rules have been resolved. The Commission has carefully tailored these rules to ensure approval by the courts, and the provision simply delays the implementation of consumer and small business protection from unscrupulous business practices.

The bill severely undermines the Affordable Care Act by prohibiting funds to implement the individual mandate and the transfer of funds to the IRS for the use of implementing the Affordable Care Act.

Additionally, the bill inhibits corporate transparency by blocking the Securities and Exchange Commission from requesting information on political contributions by corporations.

Finally, it continues to prohibit individuals traveling to Cuba for educational exchanges outside of a degree program. That policy is a relic of the last century, and it has absolutely no part in today's globalized economy.

As I said, I cannot support the FY 2017 Financial Services Appropriations Act as it currently stands. While we are still in tough economic times, this bill contains too many harmful policies and does not allocate the resources in a way to grow our Nation's economy.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, we can raise living standards for working families across the country if we use Federal dollars to create good jobs.

My amendment would reprogram funds to create an Office of Good Jobs in the Treasury Department that would help ensure the Department's procurement, grant making, and regulatory decisions to encourage the creation of good, decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices.

Mr. Chairman, I am actually a little bit shocked to know that right now the U.S. Government is America's leading low-wage job creator, funding over 2 million poverty jobs through contracts, loans, and grants with corporate America. That is more than the total number of low-wage workers employed by Walmart and McDonald's combined.

U.S. contract workers earn so little, Mr. Chairman, that nearly 40 percent of them use public assistance, like food stamps, Section 8, and Medicaid, to feed and shelter their families. To add insult to injury, many of these low-wage U.S. contract workers are driven deeper into poverty because their employers steal their wages and break other Federal employment and labor laws.

It is intended that the appropriation for salaries and expenses at the United States Treasury Department be used to establish an Office of Good Jobs in the Department aimed at ensuring that the Department's procurement, grant-making, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices. The office's structure shall be substantially similar to the Centers for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships located within the Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce, Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Small Business Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and U.S. Agency for International Development.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

The aim of this amendment is to create an Office of Good Jobs within the Department of the Treasury. This office would help ensure that the Treasury makes contracting and employment decisions encouraging the creation of decently paid jobs, implementation of fair labor practices, and responsible employment practices.

The Federal Government ought to be setting an example for the Nation when it comes to contracting decisions. Members of Congress who are committed to creating good-paying jobs and supporting workers have a chance with this amendment to see those values reflected throughout our government.

This office will help guide the Treasury to make responsible contracting and employment decisions and do right by the countless men and women who help us perform the Nation's business each and every day.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is duplicative and ignores the existing contractor award system that we already have in place. Contracting officers must already consult the system for award management to ensure a contractor can be awarded a contract.

Businesses on the excluded parties list systems have been suspended or debarred through a due process system and may not be eligible to receive or renew Federal contracts for cited offenses. So the best way to ensure that the government contracts provide grants to the best employers is to enforce the existing suspension and debarment system.

Bad actors who are in violation of the basic worker protections should not be awarded Federal contracts. Everybody agrees with that. That is why the Federal Government has already got a system in place to deny Federal contracts to bad actors. If a contractor fails to maintain high standards of integrity and business ethics, agencies already have the authority to suspend or debar the employer from government contracting.

In 2014, for instance, Federal agencies issued more than 1,000 suspensions and nearly 2,000 debarments to employees who bid on Federal contracts. This amendment is just going to delay the procurement process, with harmful consequences. On numerous occasions, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has highlighted costly litigation stemming from the complex regulatory rules, including from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

So this amendment simply punishes employers who may unknowingly or unwillingly get caught in the Federal Government's maze of bureaucratic rules and reporting requirements. The procurement process is already plagued by delays and beneficiaries.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, this is not duplicative. This amendment actually is not about debarment. Debarment says that, if you are the worst actor, you are going to get a sanction. This amendment says we are going to prioritize contractors who have good employment practices.

Imagine yourself being a businessperson with a government contract and you are over here trying to make sure that you are respecting the union that the workers may have. You are making sure you never get hit with wage theft. You are making sure that you have a good benefits program for your employers. You are a good employer, the kind that we want to have working for the Federal Government, yet you are competing with somebody who does the bare minimum they can do to avoid debarment.

That is the mistake that the gentleman from Florida is making. The Office of Good Jobs would prioritize good employers who make it a priority to say that we value our employees, we are not going to pay them the very

least we can get by with, we are not going to try to force them on government benefits by not paying them a fair wage.

It should be compelling to all of us that 40 percent of contract workers make so little that they are eligible for government welfare programs. These are people who work. They are people who work a job. They might be working at McDonald's, they might be doing cleanup in a Federal building, or they might be doing any number of jobs; but if somebody is making meals for our heroes at the Pentagon, I think they ought to be able to get a fair, decent job, and there ought to be somebody out there who makes sure that it happens. If there is no one to make sure that it happens, it won't happen. That is why our government, today, funds more low-wage jobs than Walmart or McDonald's combined.

It is time to end this race to the bottom. It is time to say that the biggest buyer of goods and services in the world, the United States, should use its power to promote good jobs, not get-by jobs, not substandard jobs that barely eke past debarment, but good jobs.

I would think that everybody in this body would want to use the dollar that way. I think the American taxpayer would want to use the dollar that way. What if the American taxpayer knew that the Federal contractors are paying 40 percent of the workers so little that these workers actually are eligible for welfare programs though they work hard every single day?

Mr. Chairman, we ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment, because I think that everybody in this body wants to see good jobs for the American people.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,748,545)".

Page 8, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,270,929)".

Page 9, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$239,231)".

Page 9, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$497,965)”.

Page 9, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,327,907)”.

Page 10, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,576,889)”.

Page 10, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,074,855)”.

Page 10, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$165,988)”.

Page 10, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$24,898)”.

Page 265, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,748,545)”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

The House Financial Services Committee, in conjunction with the Judiciary Committee, has been engaging in an investigation in regard to bank settlement agreements that were reached that created a slush fund to drive money to third-party organizations.

Now, that is offensive because, if we look at our Constitution, it is the Congress that is supposed to appropriate, not the administration, not the DOJ, but the Congress. In these bank settlement agreements, you have the administration, along with approval from the judiciary, actually appropriating money to groups that this institution did not approve.

So, to be clear, we are looking at funding for CDFI. My amendment will reduce that funding by \$20.7 million. So before you are all shocked, let's actually talk about the numbers. The committee has increased funding by \$16.5 million, bringing the number from \$233.5 million to \$250 million. That is an over 7 percent increase in funding for CDFI.

But if you add in the money that came from the bank settlements, the \$45 billion from bank settlements, this is a \$62 million increase or, as a percentage, it is 26 percent of an increase for CDFI. It is huge. If we want to increase that funding by 26 percent, that is our decision, in this House, not the DOJ, not the President, not the judiciary. It is our decision.

So all I do is say: Hey, let's bring this back by \$20 million. That is all. And still, if you include the \$16 million that is currently in the bill, and then the \$25 million that they got from the slush fund, it is still a 17 percent increase.

This makes sense. I ask you all to join my amendment, join in a little effort to stand up for Article I of the Constitution, and do what is right.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. This happens to be one of the most bipartisan accounts in

the bill, and it is a lean program; it fills a niche that provides capital and credit in areas where often it is difficult. These are competitive grants and it is complicated to a certain extent. It is not as simple as just kind of flowing money back and forth. So I just want to urge people, to say: We don't want to reduce the funding in these areas.

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

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the chairman.

I was going to open up by saying the same thing: This is probably the most bipartisan account that we have in this bill and it has been for years.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This amendment would slash funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, or CDFI Fund, by \$20.7 million. This is a harmful and totally misguided cut.

The fact is that the CDFI Fund helps generate economic growth and opportunity in some of our Nation's most distressed communities. The Fund supports financial institutions recognized for their expertise in providing services and support to distressed communities. These institutions leverage Federal funds to draw in new or increase sources of private funding.

According to the description provided to the Rules Committee, the gentleman's amendment says: to “offset an inappropriate augmentation of this account outside the appropriations process by the Department of Justice through settlement agreements, which required banks to donate \$20.7 million to certified CDFI entities.”

But the fact is that the Fund is not receiving money from DOJ or from any bank. It is completely inaccurate and inappropriate to reduce the CDFI Fund in any amount as a result of the gentleman's assertion.

Any settlement with banks for fraudulent activity during or leading up to the financial crisis was delivered by banks directly to CDFIs. At no point has the Fund benefited or seen an increase in funding as a result.

The fact that some of our large banks have entered into civil settlements with the Department of Justice should not even enter into this discussion. The fact is that the need for investment in these communities is far greater than the resources that have been provided.

The passage of this amendment would do a great deal of harm. We are not just talking about cutting \$20.7 million from the Fund. Because of the leveraging of private sector investment, we are actually talking about an amendment that would effectively cut many times that number of investment in job creation, community facilities, and housing.

I strongly urge a “no” vote.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to Mr. DUFFY's amendment. I have listened to his arguments very closely. My interest in this is the American Indian and Alaska Native and Hawaiian Native. My interest is because this program, the CDFI, is the one program where they have access to moneys, and they cannot get it from the standard lending institutions for their businesses that they are trying to create. And it has worked successfully in Alaska and in the lower 48, too.

I would suggest, respectfully, that a lot of people don't understand, we don't have a road system. Most of our—in fact, all of our villages don't have banks, and this program can work and does work very well to try to improve their lot. And I say they have been successful at creating new jobs that create money.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest one thing. I listened to these arguments about the money we are appropriating, and I wish everybody would understand in this body we cannot create jobs by creating government jobs. That is not real money. That is money that is being consumed. And this body has been neglectful in creating jobs from resources and manufacturing from, have not supported, nor have they made the suggestion that this should be done.

So we talk about these programs, we need to have money available to create jobs that create real money, and a lot of this is done in the rural communities in my State of Alaska and the Indian country in the lower 48.

So I suggest the gentleman has a point, but not a strong enough point to have me vote for his amendment.

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

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

I heard the gentleman from across the aisle talk about harmful cuts. When you look at the money that is going to this program, CDFI, even with my reduction, there is a \$41 billion increase, or a 17 percent increase in funding. You can't disregard the money that went from the bank settlements. That is money that we should have appropriated. That has been taken from us, but we have to consider it. You can't not consider it.

I listened to the debate in this Chamber among my colleagues, especially on the right, and they talk about: Oh, my goodness, we need to regain congressional authority, we want to start an Article I movement where we actually control spending. Well, hey, here is your opportunity.

When the Department of Justice and the administration circumvent the Congress, we should take it seriously, and we should take into account the money that they appropriated through a bank settlement.

I also hear my colleagues talk about: Oh, my gosh, we have a really big debt, \$19 trillion in debt is going to tank our economy. And I agree. If you care about \$19 trillion in debt, we can reduce this fund by \$20 million, and still have it \$41 million more than it was last year.

And, oh, by the way, this appropriations is \$3 million more than the President's request, so we are not harming the Fund. We are not harming people. More money is going to CDFI. It is just that we are considering the amount of money that came through bank settlements that circumvented Congress, and I think that is only appropriate.

I would ask all of my colleagues to join with me and do what is right by this institution, and do what is right by way of our debt and our next generation, and make sure that we consider those bank settlements, and reduce this fund by \$20.7 million.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I wish it were as simple as the gentleman suggests. But it is important to realize this amendment would literally reduce almost every program in the CDFI. And remember, these funding cuts would devastate some of our Nation's most distressed populations, including Native Americans and people with disabilities, people in rural communities. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 127.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Secret money is killing our democracy. More and more, our elections are being driven by organizations that are receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in secret donations. We don't know

and can't find out who is giving all this money.

These secret organizations use the Tax Code to hide the source of their money by operating under a law meant for not-for-profit social welfare organizations. These organizations get tax-exempt treatment and don't have to report the donors of their dollars.

The result is this: What was meant to be for a social welfare organization, organizations we would recognize, like voluntary fire departments or the NAACP, all those organizations are now being used as cover by other organizations which are using the Tax Code to be able to spend hundreds of millions of dollars driving our elections every year now; so much so that, today, those organizations that are so-called social welfare organizations are spending more money than the political parties, the Democratic political party and the Republican political party, spend combined.

In 2006, these so-called social welfare organizations spent about \$1.5 million campaigning, politicking. In 2012, our last Presidential election, these so-called social welfare organizations spent more than \$257 million, more than the two political parties spent in 2012 for the Presidential elections.

Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in this bill that would prevent the IRS from giving guidance to make sure that no one is abusing the Tax Code to influence our politics, and I simply have an amendment that would strike that provision, so that the IRS could tell us what is a social welfare organization and what is really a political organization, so we don't give special tax treatment to these so-called social welfare organizations that are really politicking and we don't let them hide behind that particular tax provision to hide the names of their donors.

We have no idea who is giving this money and, Mr. Chairman, it is time for us to have transparency and openness in our election system, not hide this. Secret money is killing our elections.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, first, let me say that the IRS made a real mess of this 501(c)(4). You remember, that was the section of the Code that they used to single out individuals and groups of individuals based on their political philosophy, then they went around to intimidate them, to bully them, to put extra scrutiny on them, and they made a real mess of it.

But let me interrupt my opposition to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my good friend, the ranking member, to speak in support, and then I will continue.

Mr. SERRANO. That will confuse some people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment. This amendment would strike language that prevents reform of the 501(c)(4) rules that have caused confusion and abuse in the campaign financial field.

We have heard from a number of charities and foundations that these rules governing electoral campaign activity must be made more clear and be effectively enforced. The language in the underlying bill prevents that and should be stricken.

I urge support for the amendment, and I thank my chairman for the minute.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Can the Chairman let me know how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank my distinguished colleague from California for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, in the 2012 Presidential election, dark money groups such as these spent over a quarter billion dollars on partisan political campaign activities. In 2014, we saw the greatest wave of secret special interest money ever raised in a congressional election.

□ 1945

In 2016, dark money groups have spent nearly 10 times what they did at the same point last year.

We must ensure that social welfare groups exclusively spend their money on their social welfare mission like early childhood education or veterans' assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this sensible amendment to help ensure that our elections are transparent.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. BECERRA.

Special interest groups have increasingly been raising dark money for political campaigns by exploiting loopholes in IRS regulations. These groups designate themselves as 501(c)(4) or social welfare organizations, which allows them to operate tax exempt and raise unlimited money completely anonymously.

Tax-exempt status was intended to be limited to social welfare organizations that focus on just that—the social welfare—not political activity. But IRS audits of these organization can take years, and at that point, the damage is already done.

The announcement that the IRS would release clearer guidelines on what constitutes candidate-related political activity should have been welcomed, not blocked by a rider.

Real campaign finance reform is still needed, and passing this amendment striking the rider would be an important step to help the IRS clamp down on organizations illegally funneling anonymous, unregulated money in our elections.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, when you make a contribution to the local volunteer fire department, you know what the money will be used for. When you make a contribution to the League of Women Voters, you know what the contribution will be used for. When you make a contribution to the NAACP, you know what the contribution will be used for.

There are a whole bunch of organizations that we don't understand why they are using their money for something other than social welfare. They are influencing our elections. It has to stop. We can't even find out what the source of the money is. It could be money laundered from some drug sale. It could be money from some foreign government. We don't know where the money from some of these organizations is coming from to influence our elections.

It is time for us to have clarity. This provision in this bill has no reason, no purpose, to be here. It simply keeps secret the dark money that influences our elections. My amendment simply strikes that provision so that the IRS can give us clarity on who can and who cannot use tax-exempt laws to try to be a social welfare organization. It is time for us to have clarity in the law. Get rid of secret money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I said, the IRS made an incredible mess of this section of the IRS code, the 501(c)(4). After they messed it up and they intimidated people and they bullied folks, then they said: Well, let's just write a new regulation.

So in 2013 they came along and said: Here is how we are going to determine tax-exempt status.

A lot of people said: Well, here is an effort to just kind of shut down freedom of speech.

What is interesting is, instead of clearing the air, the IRS generated this incredible firestorm of criticism from all across the political spectrum. Not surprisingly, the American Center for Law and Justice, which represents Tea Party organizations targeted by the IRS, described the regulation as an attack on free speech.

But among the other 160,000 comments that came, the American Civil Liberties Union said: "The proposed rule threatens to discourage or sterilize an enormous amount of political discourse in America."

The IRS has got plenty to do. They always complain they don't have enough money. They don't need to go out and try to write a new rule to kind of clear the air of what they messed up a couple of years ago. The only thing this new regulation did was it just kind of united liberals and conservatives. So the best thing to do is leave it like it is and reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 84, beginning on line 13, strike section 506.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with Ranking Member JOHNSON to strike section 506 of this appropriations bill. This is another anti-consumer provision inserted into a funding bill. It actually doesn't belong here.

The language I ask my colleagues to remove restricts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's ability to curb mandatory arbitration in consumer contracts. Last month, the CFPB proposed prohibitions on class action lawsuits and mandatory pre-dispute mandatory arbitration in financial contracts.

I strongly supported the CFPB's actions. We must limit this well-known scourge on the rights of everyday Americans: forced arbitration clauses. People talk about how the rules are rigged. They say the deck is stacked in favor of powerful interests. Forced arbitration clauses are a perfect example of an unfair system. Powerful corporations rig the rules to make it more difficult for people to hold companies accountable for wrongdoing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ellison

amendment, which strikes section 506 from the bill, a deeply flawed provision that would restrict the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's ability to fulfill its statutory mandate to regulate pre-dispute mandatory arbitration clauses in contracts for financial products and services.

Over the past several decades, forced arbitration clauses have proliferated in countless consumer, employment, and small-business contracts depriving countless Americans of their right to a jury trial in a court of law while insulating corporations from public accountability. That is why when Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act in 2010, we explicitly empowered the CFPB to study pre-dispute forced arbitration, and then based on the study's results, ban or limit the practice through regulation.

In March 2015, the CFPB issued a seminal report finding that forced arbitration agreements restrict consumers' access to relief in disputes involving financial services and products. As overwhelmingly and methodically documented in this report, the CFPB confirmed what we already knew, that forced arbitration clauses blocked consumers from suing wrongdoers in court individually or in class action lawsuits.

Now it is time for the CFPB to ensure that consumers have their day in court by adopting a strong rule banning forced arbitration clauses in contracts for financial services and products. This amendment ensures that the CFPB can do just that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Ellison amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time and also his great work as chairman of the subcommittee. As a proud member of the subcommittee, we are going to miss Mr. CRENSHAW. It has been a delight to work with him as well as the ranking member, Mr. SERRANO, for his tireless effort on behalf of these issues.

Mr. Chairman, for 90 years—for 90 years—Federal law has protected the enforceability of arbitration agreements because arbitration provides an alternative method of resolving disputes that is quicker and cheaper than the expensive, overburdened court system.

Hundreds of millions of contracts are based on this principle: credit card contracts, checking accounts, Internet agreements, cell phones, and cable TV. There are dozens of contracts that have this provision.

Don't let my colleagues across the aisle fool you on this subject. Arbitration empowers individuals. Injured parties can obtain fair resolution of disputes without the need of an attorney. But many oppose this approach, particularly plaintiffs' attorneys, because arbitration proceedings can't be used to bring lawyer-driven class actions that provide millions in legal fees but little or no benefit to the consumer.

Dodd-Frank authorized the CFPB to conduct a study of arbitration and at the same time granted CFPB authority to promulgate a regulation for related products or services within the bureau's jurisdiction. However, this authority was caveated, Mr. Chairman, with the requirement that any rule be in the public interest and for protection of consumers while remaining consistent with the results of the bureau's arbitration study.

Mr. Chairman, Congress wanted any regulation to be based on a fair, complete study of real-world implications of regulating or banning arbitration. Yet, CFPB's study—which led to its May, 2016, proposed regulation effectively eliminating arbitration—fell far short of the requirements set by Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WOMACK. So, Mr. Chairman, that is why the Appropriations Committee approved language in our bill to address this issue, and we did so unanimously. Now Congress has to step in again to restore basic fairness to the effort to regulate arbitration.

Section 506 of this bill simply ensures that no rule issued by the bureau shall be effective until the bureau evaluates the costs and benefits to consumers associated with conditioning or limiting the use of arbitration and specifically, Mr. Chairman, finds that the demonstrable benefits of the rule outweigh the costs to consumers.

Any attempt to strike it would be misguided.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, if you live in Minnesota and you get into a dispute with a bank over a bank account, a credit card or a cell phone company, well, that might just be too bad because the arbitration court is in Delaware. You can pack up and move to a hotel for a week. You don't have any other option. Instead of an impartial judge, your case is going to be decided by an arbitrator chosen and paid for by the firm.

What if the arbitrator makes a mistake in ruling?

We have appellate courts for a reason. If you have forced arbitration and the arbiter makes a mistake, that is too bad for you. The ruling likely cannot be repealed or reversed.

Do you want to know what happened to other people who may have had the same problem with the company?

You are out of luck there, too, because the documents and the arbitrator's decisions are not publicly available.

This is unfair, and it is wrong. It is no way to treat consumers in our country. We should strike this improper provision. We should accord the CFPB with the respect it really does deserve because they examine this issue carefully in the public interests.

Strike section 506 of this appropriations bill. It doesn't belong there. It is anticonsumer, and both Republicans and Democrats have consumers in our districts, and I hope that they are following this debate. Because when they find that a financial product with a forced arbitration clause is hurting them and their family, they are going to know who stood up for them. I hope all Members, as they choose their vote on this particular bill, think carefully about who is on their side and who isn't.

□ 2000

I would just like to add, as I close, that we should split the CFPB's efforts to allow Americans to join our claims together and hold financial companies accountable when they make mistakes and when they break the law. We should encourage, not prevent, a fair financial marketplace. If you want a fair system, if you want greater economic freedom, then those mandatory arbitration clauses need to stop.

Please support the Ellison-Johnson amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, for 9 years arbitration agreements have been legal, and they have been upheld by the courts. They provide an alternative method of resolving disputes. They are quicker and cheaper than the slow, more expensive court system. The provision in our bill before you merely requires the CFPB to stop and further study the use of arbitration before moving forward with this arbitration rule.

In their own study, it is noted that consumers didn't select financial products like credit cards or cell phones based on whether they were subject to dispute resolution clauses or may require arbitration. And actually, studies have shown that consumers receive more compensation in arbitration than they do in class action. So you have to ask yourself: Why is the CFPB trying to go after something consumers say they don't care about but actually financially benefit from?

I urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. McCLINTOCK). The question is on the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-639.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NOS. 5, 6, AND 7 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN EN BLOC

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment Nos. 5, 6, and 7, printed in House Report 114-639, be considered en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment Nos. 5, 6, and 7 made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Strike section 501.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Strike section 503.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Strike section 505.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chair and the ranking member for agreeing to this en bloc amendment request.

These three amendments, offered with Financial Services ranking member Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota, address Republican attacks on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the CFPB.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is one of the central pillars of the Wall Street reform, the Dodd-Frank Act. To date, the Bureau has returned more than \$11.4 billion to 25 million consumers that have been harmed by predatory financial practices.

Let me repeat that for you, Mr. Chairman. \$11.4 billion has been returned to our constituents, 25 million of them, as a result of the work of the CFPB.

Yet our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to again side with

foes of the Bureau, with the predatory and other unscrupulous lenders. Our amendment seeks to preserve the independence and efficacy of this watchdog agency.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

That is right, Mr. Chairman, \$11.4 billion to over 25 million consumers. The CFPB has been working on behalf of consumers.

How many households are stronger, better off because of the CFPB? How much justice has been accorded by the CFPB? And yet here we are, after being so successful with the CFPB, and our friends on the other side of the aisle want to weaken it, water it down, snarl it up, and entangle it up in a bureaucratic mess.

It is a good thing, Mr. Chairman, that the CFPB is independent. It is good that they don't have to worry about the political pressures. It is good that they can have a single-minded focus on one thing, and one thing only: what is good for the American consumer.

By the way, we have plenty of oversight. Just ask Richard Cordray. He must be the most frequent visitor to the Financial Services Committee in the whole of the United States Government. He comes all of the time and has to answer question after question all day long, day in and day out, from our Republican colleagues, and he answers the questions as well as anybody possibly could.

There is accountability. There is a letter writing process. There are questions he has to answer. There are all types of oversight.

But do you know what? There is not the ability for the Republicans to say: We are going to snatch your money if you don't do it our way. We are going to take away your independence and tie down the CFPB in an unwieldy five-person commission if you don't do things our way.

Right now, the consumers have an advocate on their side, and that is the way it should stay. I support and urge support for the Moore amendments.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendments.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike one of the very best and most important provisions of the bill, that is, putting the CFPB under the appropriations process. That is number one.

It also would strike a provision of the current law, which merely requires the CFPB to notify Congress whenever they request money from the Federal Reserve. That is the law today.

And the third thing it does is it strikes the provision that changes this

CFPB, the Director, to a five-member commission.

Now, the combination of these provisions introduces ordinary and customary congressional checks that most every other agency abides by. We are not asking the CFPB to do anything the Department of Defense or the State Department or the Department of Justice or the Treasury Department doesn't already do. I think it is truly ironic that the agency responsible for making consumer financial products more transparent and financial institutions more accountable is nontransparent to the Congress and to the American people.

The Dodd-Frank authorizes the CFPB to fund itself by drawing money from the Federal Reserve to the extent their Director deems "necessary." Now, the Federal Reserve doesn't oversee the agency. It doesn't exercise any authority over it. But the Federal Reserve must transfer the CFPB whatever funds the Director requests without asking any questions.

So the Bureau has already diverted over \$2 billion from the Treasury's general fund and, therefore, increased the Federal debt by \$2 billion without any congressional input or approval of its activities.

Now, other consumer protection agencies, such as the Consumer Product Safety Commission or the Federal Trade Commission, they are both funded through the appropriations process. Why not the CFPB?

With regard to the five-member commission structure, I think some more diverse viewpoints would help the CFPB understand stakeholder concerns and would make the direction of the agency a little bit more accountable. Other consumer investor protection agencies, such as the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, or the Securities and Exchange Commission, they are all funded through the appropriations process, and they are all led by five-member commissions. Why not the CFPB?

So this provision in the bill neither abolishes the Bureau; they don't eliminate the Bureau's funding. Instead, they will increase the Bureau's transparency and leadership, allow us to understand what it is that they are doing and how they are going about it.

Let's just make the CFPB a little more transparent and a little more accountable. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, could the Chair inform me about how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern that the gentleman has about maintaining the budgetary constraints, but that is the very problem that agencies like the FDIC and others have had. They have had the au-

thority, but they have not had the independence. The appropriation process ties the hands of these agencies. The one bright star is the CFPB, which is independent, and it supports consumers.

I just want to point out that changing the structure of the CFPB to a commission would add \$66 million to our deficit.

I look forward to my friends on the other side of the aisle's vote on my amendment since it not only preserves the independence of the CFPB, but it continues to ensure that U.S. markets are the fairest and most robust in the world, and it protects consumers from mischief in this appropriations process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-639. Does any Member wish to take up this amendment?

The Chair understands that amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-639 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 114, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 115, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does one very simple thing, which is to increase the funding for the Securities and Exchange Commission by \$50 million, bringing the funding in this bill for the Securities and Exchange Commission to the level of funding for the SEC in 2016.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that this level of funding is still significantly lower than the President's request of \$1.78 billion.

I would further point out, Mr. Chairman, that the work of the SEC, at its core, is about protecting investors who are essential to the functioning of our capital markets and to protecting the

long-term sustainability of the U.S. financial system.

Mr. Chairman, as I think this body knows, the Dodd-Frank Act—which I understand is controversial in this Chamber, but which has gone a very long way to avoiding the kind of meltdown that we had in 2008 and which destroyed \$17 trillion in American asset value at its worst—as well as the JOBS Act, which attracted strong bipartisan support in this Chamber, those two bills required the SEC to write some 70 new regulations. And yet despite that requirement and all of the advocacy that we saw, particularly from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle for more alacrity in the writing of the rules for the JOBS Act, we are now seeing a real cut in the budget for the SEC.

Just to give you a sense of what the SEC does, it is now responsible for overseeing some 26,000 market participants and over 9,000 public companies. The assets managed by SEC-registered investment advisers have increased 210 percent since 2005 to almost \$70 trillion. That is a lot of money. That is a lot of investment.

This is an organization which is really essential to one of the chief competitive advantages that the United States has, which is the liquidity and the respect that the world has for our capital markets. Again, \$50 million bringing the SEC up to the level of funding that it had last year.

And as a final point, let me point out that the SEC is funded not by taxes, but by fees that it collects.

□ 2015

So this would not have the effect of cutting another program or of raising anybody's taxes; but it would, in fact, simply authorize \$50 million in fees that would be used for the SEC's budget.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the opportunity to offer this amendment, and I would like to thank the cosponsors of this amendment, Representatives MALONEY, HINOJOSA, PERLMUTTER, and SEWELL.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, the bill before us today takes a measured approach to the Securities and Exchange Commission. A lot of people don't realize that that agency has received some of the largest increases over the last decade that a lot of agencies wish they had received.

Today, we cut the SEC's funding by \$50 million from the 2016 because the Commission estimates that \$50 million is carryover funding from last year. In addition, we rescind money from the SEC's reserve fund, which was set up kind of like a slush fund under Dodd-

Frank. That is totally outside congressional oversight.

Because the Commission has been using the reserve fund for important information technology projects, we have increased funding for the IT in the bill. Now, I believe that, if we upgrade information technology, the Commission will be better able to leverage its resources, catch bad actors, and provide the quality of review that security filings deserve.

To that end, the bill targets funding for another area of need within the Commission, and that is the economic analysis. I believe continuing to set aside funding to fully fund the SEC's Division of Economic and Risk Analysis is going to help the SEC's work withstand any kind of judicial review.

I happen to believe that the current Chair, Mary Jo White, is steering the SEC towards prioritizing enforcement and investor protection and not so much the politically charged rulemakings. Because of that, we have kept the SEC's funding at a reasonable level. The level of funding included in this bill is more than fair and does not need to be adjusted in any way.

The fact that this agency is fee-based in no way diminishes the need for congressional oversight over the Commission's funding. I would say the SEC is not starved for resources, and I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's perspective, but I disagree. He is correct that, in fact, the funding for the SEC has risen in the last 8 years, but so has the dramatic amount of work that is required of it.

Mr. Chair, I will close with just one important point, which is that we saw over the course of the last 2 weeks the dramatic market volatility that was introduced by Great Britain's decision to remove itself from the EU. There was not a stock market or an asset market anywhere on the globe that didn't suffer a significant jolt. These are moments of uncertainty—maybe even of chaos—in the capital markets.

We have a fairly significant election coming up this November. We are not looking at a moment in which the capital markets are likely to experience smooth sailing off into the foreseeable future.

We saw, in the last 2 weeks, precisely the volatility that warrants the need to have a cop on the beat to watch. This is not the moment to cut the SEC's funding. I would urge my colleagues in this Chamber to pass this amendment and to fully fund the cop that we need on this beat.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I just want to reiterate that we are treating the SEC very fairly. We want to make sure that the markets are safe and that they are orderly, and they are. Just giving more money to the SEC is not necessarily going to make things better.

Over the years, as my colleague understands, we have increased their funding, and they still miss an occasional Madoff scandal and things like that. You don't just buy the regulation. You spend the money where you ought to spend it—cost-benefit, help them keep the markets orderly—and that is what we do in this bill.

I urge the rejection of this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 115, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$22,703,000)".

Page 265, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$22,703,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 90 seconds.

This bipartisan amendment would zero out funding for an obsolete, archaic system—the so-called Selective Service.

Thirty-nine years ago, the Russians invaded Afghanistan. Jimmy Carter, in one of the moments of his rather pathetic Presidency, decided that we would send two symbols to the Russians: we wouldn't go to the Olympics, and we would reinstate registration for the draft despite the fact that his own Selective Service had just come up with a report showing that the need for Selective Service was obsolete and unnecessary.

They tried to recall all of the reports. They didn't. Senator Mark Hatfield obtained one, and it was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Selective Service, itself, decided its time was gone, but we reinstated it as a symbol of our opposition to the Russians.

So here we are today, 39 years later, wasting \$23 million a year in making every male American, at the age of 18, register for a draft that will never, ever again happen, under penalty of felony of law, of the deprivation of Federal assistance, of Federal jobs, and of other

things—for life—if they fail to register. Yet we are still here tonight to defend it.

The chairman will say: Well, we are going to study this. We are going to study it and decide whether or not we might still need this someday. Yet, of course, the Department of Defense, itself, says: We do not want a draft. We like to select highly qualified people for our all-volunteer military.

In fact, in March, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter said: “The thing I’d like to say about the Selective Service System and the draft, generally, is this: We want to pick our own people. We don’t want people to be forced to serve us.” Yet the chairman of the committee will rise in a vain attempt to defend this wasteful system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I think most of us would hope that we won’t ever need to use the draft again, but I think the agency is an important insurance policy that we can use against unforeseen threats. In an emergency, in a wartime situation, the effects of this amendment could be disastrous. This is a small price to pay for an agency that has the potential to avert a crisis should the draft ever need to be reinstated.

The voluntary military we have maintained for 40 years is, certainly, the preferred method of defending our Nation. We have got the best-trained and the best-equipped military in the world. But the decision on the issue to support and to maintain the Selective Service System is a decision that should be made by the Department of Defense. I believe that this is a small price to pay to make sure that we have this ability should we ever need it.

I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the DeFazio amendment, and I am a proud cosponsor of the amendment.

As the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, the draft ended in 1973. Conscription ended. Then the Selective Service System was put on the shelf, inactivated, and was only activated when, in a show of resolve, President Jimmy Carter, in the aftermath of the December 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, reinstated conscription. He reinstated signing up for the Selective Service System. I think he suspended wheat sales to the Soviet Union as well as our participation in the Olympic Games, which were scheduled to be in Moscow.

It has never been used. During the height of Iraq and Afghanistan, there

has never even been a discussion within the Department of Defense, even with personnel shortages, about using the draft.

In a recent study by the Army Recruiting Command, it determined that something like 75 percent of young people—military-aged people—are ineligible to serve in the United States Army. Either they are overweight; they don’t have high school or have high school but don’t have a high enough score on the Armed Forces Entrance Exam; they have had altercations with the law; or they have drug and alcohol issues.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN. We have extremely high standards today. I think, in my having served in the United States Army when there was a draft, that having conscription—having people being forced to serve—compromises the extraordinary, I think, capability of our military. This is about putting it back on the shelf, as it was in 1973, and if the President, as Commander in Chief, ever felt it needed to come off the shelf, he or she could do so.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For those who persist in the fantasy that, someday, we will need to reinstate the draft, this legislation allows the President the authority to restore funding should he believe that such actions are in the interest of the national defense. Beyond that, the report, actually, from 1979, from the Selective Service, itself, said: We do not have the training capacity of the old days of training, with broomsticks, the young troops to go into war.

Today, we have a professional military—the best in the world. If you believe in our military and if you believe in an all-volunteer force, then you will vote for this amendment. If you want to send a message that, someday, we are going to conscript young men, involuntarily, to go into the military, into a training capacity that doesn’t exist, and have hundreds or thousands or millions of bodies, untrained, go into a massive land war, unlike the way wars are fought today with the professional military and much more targeted with drones and air strikes, then vote for this, say that we are going to go back to Korea, that we are going to go back to the way it was in World War II, that we are going to go back to World War I.

If you believe we have entered into the 21st century and that we are never going to involuntarily conscript Americans to serve in the military again, the all-volunteer force is the best in the world. Yes, it needs to be the best trained and the best equipped. Let’s focus on that. Let’s spend \$23 million on their training and on their equipment instead of wasting it on an obso-

lete system that penalizes young Americans under felony penalty if they don’t register and register their changes of address. By the way, the Selective Service doesn’t know where most people live. Their computers are obsolete, and they don’t work.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I just want to note that the overwhelming “fantasy” that the gentleman refers to was shared on a bipartisan basis, overwhelmingly, in rejecting this amendment a couple of years ago. This is not a brand new idea. And we appreciate the gentleman’s bringing it before us, but in the military, they talk about things that you don’t know. You do not know what you do not know.

I believe that this is a small price to pay to make sure that we have this ability, should a crisis occur, in that we might save thousands—if not millions—of lives.

I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2030

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 613.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this language strikes the anti-abortion language in section 613, which restricts abortion coverage for those who participate in Federal Employees Health Benefit plans. In other words, Federal employees.

Singling out abortion care and requiring its exclusion from health insurance plans is discrimination. Federal employees commit their lives to public service, and they should not be penalized because of the source of their health insurance and who their employer happens to be. Government employees contribute to the cost of their

coverage, and they pay their out-of-pocket expenses. They deserve the same benefits and access to comprehensive health care as those in the private sector. This ban separates public servants from private-sector employees and treats them as unequal.

All Federal employees should have equal access to health care that other employees receive in the private sector. Here, we are saying that one employer, the government, is free to deny care to its employees, something that we would generally not allow in the private sector.

We are also prohibiting these Federal employee plans from covering abortions, and that constitutes political interference in a woman's personal decisionmaking. Restricting abortion coverage in these plans is a bad policy that harms women. Sometime during the course of pregnancy, for instance, one might find out that the fetus is abnormal. That is a personal decision whether to terminate that pregnancy or not that should be made personally, and the government should not weigh in in one way or another in making that decision.

If a woman does decide—either because her life is threatened or because of fetal abnormalities or some other reason—that she wants to terminate the pregnancy, she could be looking at tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars of unreimbursed health expenses. We shouldn't pretend that we are covering people's health coverage needs while allowing them to fall subject to a bill that could be tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Now, lifting this ban does not mandate abortion coverage. It simply permits the Federal Employees Health Benefit plans to cover abortions.

I think we need to get to the heart of the matter, which is this: the most fundamental right of anyone, a man or a woman, is the right to control your own body, and that includes a womb. If liberty means anything, if freedom means anything, that is what it means. That is true for me and it is true for you. It is true for men, and it is true for women; and that includes pregnant women and women who happen to be Federal employees.

Abortion has to be fully legal or women are not fully equal. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the great champions of innocent unborn life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his extraordinary leadership on this bill and on the life issue.

Mr. Chairman, on June 8, 1983, 33 years ago, I sponsored the amendment

to ban the use of taxpayer funds to subsidize abortion in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. The Smith amendment passed 226 to 182, and has been in effect almost continuously ever since.

Today, more Americans oppose taxpayer funding for abortions than ever before. A January 2016 Marist poll found a supermajority of Americans—68 percent of all respondents and 69 percent of women—oppose taxpayer funding for abortion.

Why do Americans continue to trend pro-life?

First, the pro-life movement is comprised of millions of selfless, compassionate human rights defenders, women and men, filled with deep faith in God, hope, love, and indomitable spirits.

Second, post-abortive women are silent no more, courageously speaking to the extraordinary harm they have endured from abortion. As the NGO Feminists for Life have reminded us, women deserve better than abortion.

Third, sonograms, ultrasound imagery, is a game changer. Countless parents have watched with awe and wonder as their child appears on the screen, moving about, even sucking his or her thumb. First baby pictures today are of the child before birth. That first picture is a powerful confirmation that their child exists and that they are parents now and that birth is merely an event in the life of a child.

Ultrasounds have also been an effective tool in helping to diagnose and to treat disease and disability for these young patients. Some unborn children indeed are the youngest patients in need of benign interventions.

I would note to my colleagues that for the past several years, there has been a global movement called The First Thousand Days of Life, providing for nutrition and supplementation to bolster the health and wellness of children and women from conception until the second birthday. The consequences of caring for children before birth is absolutely revolutionary and breathtaking, boosting their immunity as well as their cognitive abilities throughout their entire lifetime.

Abortion, on the other hand, is the polar opposite of life. It is violence against children. Abortion methods dismember, decapitate, or chemically poison innocent babies to death. Later-term abortions inflict excruciating pain and suffering on the child, especially during the dismemberment procedure.

The Grayson amendment would reverse over three decades of prudent public policy that ensures that taxpayers do not subsidize abortion. I would note parenthetically that the law governing the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program specifies that the Federal Government contributes at least 72 percent of the average premium cost for all plans, so it is taxpayers who are footing the bill.

Vote "no" on the Grayson amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a moment to my friend from New Jersey, if he will answer a single question. And the question is this: Does the gentlemen believe that women who have abortions should be incarcerated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Absolutely not. Thank you for the question.

Let me point out that every bill we have brought—the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban, the Born Alive Act, every single piece of legislation that would seek to protect the lives of unborn children—has a specific clause that women are held harmless; that there could be no prosecutions against them.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again, addressing a question to the gentleman from New Jersey: If you maintain that abortion is murder—which is pretty much what you just said—then why do you not believe that the women who have these abortions should be incarcerated? Why do you not believe that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it is the gentleman who called it murder. I call it the taking of human life.

We need to hold the abortionists liable. We, in the pro-life movement, look at the women as co-victims. I have worked—I say to my friend from Florida—with well over 100 women, many of whom were part of the Silent No More Awareness Campaign, all of whom have had abortions, including the niece of Dr. Martin Luther King, Alvita King, who has had two abortions. She has said very, very strongly that in every abortion there was a co-victim, and that is the mother.

Mr. GRAYSON. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate my friend from New Jersey answering those questions.

I would maintain that the simpler answer is that abortion is not murder; it is not the taking of human life.

I yield 1 minute to my colleague from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, the problem with this argument is that it has become an abortion argument and it isn't a debate about abortion. It is an issue about a doctor and a woman and her healthcare decision and an insurance where one person can have certain rights under their insurance plan and another one cannot.

Let's remember that there are some Federal dollars in this plan, but there are also personal dollars, but no rights according to some people.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, it is very clear that our policy is the taxpayers' fund should not be used to fund abortions and, therefore, we have continued this prohibition. Not only has

this prohibition been in place since 1981, it was also requested by the administration as part of its 2017 budget request.

So I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Grayson Amendment Number 12.

This amendment would finally remove a longstanding, harmful appropriations rider that deprives federal employees of coverage for the full range of reproductive health care.

As co-chair of the House Pro-Choice Caucus, I’m routinely dismayed by the repeated inclusion in legislation of divisive riders that interfere with women’s health care decisions. Why must important bills that get the people’s business done be misused by politicians to limit women’s reproductive rights and choices?

For too long, Congress has interfered with women’s health decisions through bans on insurance coverage for reproductive health care. I applaud Mr. GRAYSON for taking action to lift these unnecessary and harmful restrictions in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. However, these restrictions exist in many other places throughout federal law. We should do away with them all.

Every single year, my Republican colleagues feel the need to include provisions attacking women’s health in the Financial Services Appropriations bill. This year is no exception. As usual this year’s bill is riddled with such provisions.

But this time, Republicans have taken it one step further. An amendment filed by Rep. PALMER has also been made in order on this appropriations bill.

Mr. PALMER’s amendment would prohibit Washington, DC from enforcing the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, which the city enacted to help protect women and their families from employment discrimination based on reproductive health choices.

Preventing DC from enforcing this law is egregious. It is beyond inappropriate for Congress to strike down state laws that help protect women from employment discrimination based on choices such as using birth control, undergoing in vitro fertilization, or having an abortion.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 625.

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

from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, this amendment offered by myself and my colleagues would strike section 625 of this bill and, if adopted, would allow the SEC to write regulations requiring corporations to disclose their political contributions. This amendment would not require the SEC to regulate political disclosure. It would simply allow them to do so if they deem it something that would be necessary or important so that investors and citizens and voters know where the tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars spent by corporations are going to affect the outcome of elections.

The Supreme Court decision in Citizens United has opened the floodgate for corporations to spend an unlimited amount of money, affecting our democracy in ways that we, as citizens, can never find out about, that we can never determine, dramatically affecting the outcome of elections, often spending more money than any other candidate or any other political party.

Knowledge is power, and the American citizens have the right to know how corporations are spending money to affect the outcome of elections. This amendment would allow the SEC to write regulations that would allow for that kind of disclosure.

This democracy should not be for sale. Transparency is the key. The citizens of this country have a right to know and to understand how money is affecting the outcome of their elections.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this is the law today that he is trying to remove.

The SEC doesn’t need to be engaged in politically charged, unmandated rulemakings. The language included in this bill just keeps the SEC on track. It prevents them from developing or proposing or issuing a rule that would require disclosure of political contributions in the SEC filings.

Let’s call the amendment what it is. It is an end-run around the Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision.

The SEC has got bigger priorities to focus on, and thank goodness they have been focusing on those. They have been going after people that profit from insider trading. They are trying to stop the fraud that goes on. And the bill continues to support the SEC doing its job; protecting investors, encouraging capital formation.

I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, this is a simple amendment. It strikes a highly partisan policy rider that would bar the SEC from requiring disclosure of political spending by corporations.

Since the Supreme Court’s decision in Citizens United, we have seen an explosive growth in corporate political spending. Even under the twisted interpretation of the First Amendment in that case, disclosure would at least mean some level of accountability.

In that case, the Court decided that corporations get the same free speech rights as people; and now these corporations are taking advantage by funneling unlimited funds through tax-exempt groups to secretly influence our elections.

Section 625 of this bill would completely bar any funds from being used to develop a rule to require disclosure of political contributions to tax-exempt organizations. This represents a behind-closed-doors trick to block the administration from requiring corporations to simply stand behind their political spending.

Corporations shouldn’t be able to hide their political motivations behind complex webs of so-called social welfare groups, not when these groups are little more than P.O. boxes in Virginia.

We have to get money out of politics, but until then, let’s have some disclosure.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 2045

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. KILDEE for this amendment, which promotes more accountability and transparency and disclosure at a time when that is what people are asking for. They want to know where the secret money is coming from, and they want to know where it is going. They say sunshine is the best disinfectant, but yet again, this House is acting to shield corporate and big money donors from the light of day.

It is this Russian doll technique. You open the Russian doll because you think you can see what is inside, and then when you open it, there is another doll inside; and then you open that one, and there is another doll inside that one. You can never get to where the money really is. You can never find out who is actually bankrolling these huge expenditures, these TV commercials

that are coming in, this megaphone that is taking over our politics from secret interests.

All Mr. KILDEE is seeking is that we provide the transparency, the disclosure, the information that the American people are seeking. We need more of that. We need more disclosure. We need more accountability. We need more transparency. That is what the American people are demanding. That is what this amendment would do. Let's pass this amendment and ensure that accountability in our politics.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, if I didn't know better, I would be confused. On one hand, we cut money from the SEC because they shouldn't be the cop on Wall Street that it should be, but then on the other hand we want to continue to cut money and prevent them from telling us where the other money is coming from, which is the one that funds elections.

What is the problem with the American people knowing that such a candidate or such a committee got money from such a corporation? I want to know. They want to know.

So, sure, our ratings are low. You know why our ratings are low? Because there is so much secrecy in what we do, and it shouldn't be. This is a great amendment, and it is one that should be accepted on a bipartisan basis.

Let's stop trying to tell the SEC that they don't exist. They exist.

And I will tell you one last point that is very short. When I was chairman of this committee, they came to us and said: We don't want any more money; we are fine. Then we found out years later why they didn't want more money, because they didn't want to enforce anything. We fell through into a big hole.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, fundamentally, this amendment is simply about the right of the American people to know who is influencing the elections that determine the leadership in this country.

This legislation, as presented, would actually prohibit the SEC from requiring that kind of disclosure. The American people deserve a democracy that is transparent. This amendment would provide the SEC with the tools to make rules that would provide that. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out earlier, this is existing law. This is the law today, and they want to strike that law. I would encourage them to look up something called the Federal Election Commission. That is a place where people disclose their po-

litical contributions, and it is right there for everybody to see. So they want to take existing law that says that is not the role of the SEC; it is the role of the FEC. They want to change the law that basically, today, says the SEC has got better things to do than require—

Mr. KILDEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Are the corporate contributions made under the provisions that we are speaking of disclosed to the Federal Election Commission? Corporate spending under the Citizens United case, for example; are those disclosed by corporations to the FEC?

Mr. CRENSHAW. Reclaiming my time, as I pointed out, I understand this is an end run about that lawsuit, but there is disclosure that takes place. And again, the law today that was added last year, part of the omnibus bill, the SEC ought to be trying to find tax cheats, they ought to be trying to find people doing insider trading, and, quite frankly, they really don't have it high on their list of things to do because right now the law prevents them from doing that.

I think it is just better to keep the law just like it is today. Reject this amendment, and vote "no."

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-639.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 632.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes what I believe is an unnecessary provision in the bill that would block the FCC's net neutrality rules until the court took final action to determine their legality. The provision my amendment strikes was written before the court announced its decision.

On Tuesday, June 14, the Federal appeals court issued its long-awaited ruling in this case, and the decision could not be clearer. The court fully upheld the FCC's net neutrality rules, and that is why I am offering the amendment. It found that the FCC acted within its authority, acted consistent with Supreme Court precedent, consistent with the Administrative Procedure Act, and consistent with the Constitution. Every issue raised by opponents in court was rejected, whether it was procedural or substantive.

Following this clear and decisive ruling, there is simply no reason for Congress to be blocking the FCC's rules. The courts have spoken, and legal scholars agree.

I think the American people also spoke very clearly. Over 4 million offered their comments by filing them at the FCC during the rulemaking process, and the vast majority of them were in support of strong rules. This level of public input broke records at the FCC.

The late Justice Antonin Scalia's dissent in the 2005 Brand X case reflects the same commonsense view the American people expressed in their public comments. Justice Scalia said: "After all is said and done, after all the regulatory cant has been translated, and the smoke of agency expertise blown away, it remains perfectly clear that someone who sells cable-modem service is 'offering' telecommunications."

So Congress need not block these rules now in the hopes that an appeal to the Supreme Court will overturn this clear ruling, and that is why I am offering the amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it and strike what now is an unnecessary section from the bill.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this language is merely a legislative stay on the FCC's net neutrality order, and it is the same language that was in last year's bill. This net neutrality rule was very, very controversial. She mentioned there were 4 million, I guess, inputs under the proposed rule. Some were for, some were against.

Let me be clear. There is no dispute about the desire for a free and open Internet, but I think, when you look at the consumers, you look at the businesses, you look at government, they have benefited greatly from the absence of regulatory restrictions on the Internet. At the end of the day, this is an issue for the courts to decide.

Even in light of recent circuit court decisions, litigation on this rule is no way finished. I think it is just fair in a controversial rule like this to wait until its legality has been finally determined before we implement the rule. So I urge a "no" vote.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman really offers a lack of response to the amendment because the Federal appeals court issued a very broad decision, and it really couldn't be clearer. I understand that this language was written before the court came out with its decision, but now that the court has, I think that this language really doesn't mean anything unless the majority simply wants to leapfrog over the decision, even though they don't like it and have fought it.

I just don't think that this belongs in the legislation anymore. It was put in before the court spoke, and I believe that it is appropriate to remove the language now.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It strikes section 632 of the underlying bill, a controversial FCC rider that prohibits the FCC from implementing its order on net neutrality until three court cases are resolved.

Yet again the majority is trying to hijack the regulatory process for its own ends. This rule went into effect almost a year ago, and none of the fears that were raised about the net neutrality rule have come to pass. There has been increased investment and profits for Internet service providers. There is no reason to continue the crusade against this rule.

Although section 632 sets out to only last as long as the lawsuits are ongoing, the actual text encourages the plaintiffs in these lawsuits to do everything in their power to delay a resolution to the cases in question.

Four million people wrote in about the rule that this committee is now trying to stop. The normal process of objecting to a rule would be that you go to the courts, and that already happened here. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit denied a petition by several telecom companies and industry trade groups to delay implementation of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, net neutrality rules.

Organizations like the Consumers Union have pointed out that there was plenty of public notice with the net neutrality rules. There was an initial notice of proposed rulemaking, an extensive description released before the FCC vote, and waiting 2 months after the Federal Register publication before the rules took effect. Throwing in an additional hurdle departs from established rulemaking practice and simply isn't needed.

Ironically, just last week, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Co-

lumbia upheld the FCC's 2015 net neutrality rules in these cases, giving the agency unquestionable authority to regulate the Internet.

□ 2100

Of course, they could still appeal, which demonstrates how harmful this rider is. It would delay net neutrality while the court process plays out.

Blocking net neutrality means blocking an open Internet. It allows a broadband provider to block any Web site or application it wants and would allow pay-for-priority schemes, where all traffic is slowed down to make the way for the content of deep-pocketed giants who can pay for preferential treatment.

It seems to me that Republicans are trying to give corporations more freedom and options to do whatever they want while trying to place more restrictions and burdens on individual citizens, like denying them access to a free and open Internet. Section 632 is harmful to our economy, our democracy, and should be stricken from the bill.

I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment, and I urge support for the amendment.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. ESHOO. I will close with these comments, Mr. Chairman. I often say to my constituents that we love our history once it has been made, but we don't always appreciate it when we are making history.

I think that this issue relative to the Internet and its entire future will be now, because of the court decision, totally uninterrupted. No company, no ISP, not anyone can block or throttle online traffic or have paid prioritization agreements that would create fast and slow lanes.

Imagine if private companies owned all of the freeways in California, and every time there is an exit or an on ramp, you end up having to pay—pay for something.

The court made very, very clear that the way the FCC drew up its rules is for the protection of the consumer, which is at the heart of this. I think that June 14 was a day of great history made in our country and for the betterment of it, for consumers, for competition, and for our national economy.

It is with all of that in mind that I offer this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I think it makes sense. What was in the bill was drawn up before the court spoke. The court has spoken very clearly.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, we are not here to debate the merits of the net neutrality rule. Everybody knows how controversial it was.

It has been pointed out there are 4 million objections or supporters. I don't know how they were split, but

there were millions for, millions against. It just tells you how controversial it is.

So all this provision says is: let's wait until it is finally resolved. We all know that it is going to end up in the United States Supreme Court. And once it has been determined yes or no, then the FCC ought to enforce it. But until that time, it ought to be stayed through the legislative process. That is what this bill does. That is what the amendment attempts to undo.

So I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 143, beginning on line 10, strike section 637.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would repeal an effort to undermine the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act and an effort to eliminate consumer protections for some of the country's most vulnerable borrowers and invite a return to the kind of predatory mortgage practices that helped fuel the financial crisis of 2008 in the first place.

The manufactured housing industry is growing and highly profitable. In fact, according to its trade association, manufactured housing—what some people might call trailer homes, but actually is accurately called manufactured housing—is an industry that has recorded shipment increases in every month since 2014. Manufactured Housing for Regulatory Reform found that 2014 marked the fifth consecutive year of annual industry productions increases.

Even one of the world's most respected investors, Berkshire Hathaway chairman Warren Buffet, has been touting the profitability of manufactured housing. In a letter to shareholders, he pointed out that Clayton

Homes, Berkshire Hathaway's profitable manufactured housing business subsidiary, earned a total of \$585 million in 2014, an increase of 34 percent over 2013. This is despite the fact that Dodd-Frank protections that this bill seeks to roll back were in place in 2014.

Unfortunately, this is the same Clayton Homes that was the subject of a BuzzFeed and The Seattle Times and Center for Public Integrity investigation that found that this manufactured housing empire profits in every way imaginable from producing to selling, to housing, to the loans that take advantage of vulnerable consumers and leave them with virtually no way to re-finance.

The investigation details a story of disabled Army veteran and Clayton Homes customer, Dorothy Mansfield. Ms. Mansfield's monthly income was less than \$700, but Clayton approved her for a \$60,000, 20-year loan at more than 10 percent interest. The monthly payment of \$673 consumed much of Ms. Mansfield's only income—her Army disability benefit—and within 18 months of purchase, she was behind on payments and Clayton was attempting to foreclose on her home.

This is precisely the kind of predatory practices that Dodd-Frank was enacted to stop. But today, we consider legislation that would pave the way for its return.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and oppose the predatory manufactured housing loans.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. First, just let me say that the provision the gentleman would like to strike is a provision that gives every American the opportunity to pursue what we call the American Dream—that of home ownership.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) to tell us a little bit more about why we ought to oppose this amendment.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and I thank the chairman for the opportunity to address that.

Mr. Chair, I represent a wonderful area of east Tennessee. A lot of folks purchase manufactured homes. It is a great American industry. It is a booming industry. It is a good industry. But more important than that, that great industry is the great American Dream—that dream of home ownership.

Manufactured homes offer an opportunity to men and women, many times, to purchase their first home. These are not the most affluent people in America. These are people who are pursuing the American Dream—or part of it—of home ownership.

What this amendment seeks to do is unfortunate. That is why I oppose it. There is no more fervent opponent to

the Dodd-Frank rule in this house than me, but it protects the Dodd-Frank provisions that were in the law.

This does not violate Dodd-Frank. This is more of an indication of how a bad law spews more bad law. And what this does is it hurts those precious consumers, those poor Americans who are trying desperately to get credit. What it does, Mr. Chairman, is create a situation where, if someone is a loan originator or a salesman, it makes them subject to the constrictions of Dodd-Frank. This was never intended on its worst day—and there are many worst days of Dodd-Frank—to do this.

I ask this House to reject the gentleman's amendment, uphold a great American industry—the manufactured home industry—but even more importantly, to uphold that special precious American Dream, that chance of home ownership.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me just be clear. This is not a matter of whether manufactured housing is good or bad. Manufactured housing is obviously an option that Americans should have available to them.

This amendment is about protecting consumers and making sure that they don't get hit on all sides of the bargain: the sale of the home, the loan, the origination, the insurance, and all over. It is making sure that the mortgage originator is operating in the interests that they are supposed to operate in—under the definition of loan originator or mortgage originator.

This requirement prevents salespeople from being incentivized to steer buyers to higher-cost loans. It is one thing to stand up and say: Hey, we are trying to help people reach the great American Dream, but it is quite another to say: Hey, look, yeah, great American Dream at a fair and affordable price, great American Dream at a price that people can actually afford and that is fair to the consumer.

So that is what we are talking about here. I absolutely believe that if people want to live in manufactured housing, they should. Let me tell you, in my district in Minnesota, I have a lot of people who live in manufactured housing.

There are a lot of success stories, too, Mr. Chairman. I can tell you about people who lived on property owned by somebody else. They bought that property that their manufactured homes were on and now it is theirs. And now they are living in much more security than they ever have. And they got a good deal.

They need people who are going to be looking out after them. This is a very, very important issue, because a lot of these folks don't have that many advocates looking out for them. We should make sure that the requirement that prevents salespeople from being able to

steer buyers to high-cost loans is something that we should not tolerate. It robs families who don't have that many resources of the precious resources they have.

So this is another one looking out for consumers, affirming people's right to live in a manufactured home, if that is choice, recognizing that that is a good choice for many families, but at the same time recognizing that these same families need to be treated fairly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a "yes" vote. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman really wants people to have access to manufactured housing, then I don't think he would be proposing this amendment. If you adopt this amendment and take out the language we have in the bill, then you are going to limit access to quality, affordable housing for an awful lot of people.

That is what happens when the CFPB tries to overregulate an industry. What happens is they limit access to financing and you limit options for manufactured housing.

You have got to understand that these new regulations don't reflect the unique nature of manufactured homes; the sales process, the lenders. The lenders can't offer small balanced loans anymore because of these regulations, and that is what they used to purchase affordable housing.

So if you really care about folks and you want them to be able to access the housing market, if you really want them to be able to pursue the American Dream of owning a home someday, then you will reject this amendment and allow the provision that we put in this bill to stand.

Let me once again urge that my colleagues vote "no" on this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 143, beginning on line 21, strike section 638.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment protecting consumers in manufactured housing. It strikes section 638.

Section 638 weakens rules protecting buyers of mobile homes—or manufactured homes—from being sold products that can ruin them financially. It strikes language that prevents staff at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from protecting buyers of manufactured homes from high-cost financing.

New manufactured homes are of good quality. However, the financing of these homes has a long and sordid history of abuse.

If a site-built homeowner can get a mortgage for 5 percent, why should a manufactured home buyer need to pay 15 percent?

If a home buyer is offered a loan of 15 percent, I think they should receive counseling that lower-cost options might be available.

Two years ago, I wrote letters to the heads of the major financing firms for manufactured homes. I asked them for information on their default rates.

□ 2115

Why should a buyer of a manufactured home be charged three times more than a buyer of a site-built home?

I was told by their trade association that they could share that information, but only if I promised confidentiality. I declined that because I wasn't going to be an aider and abetter to their conspiracy.

This is a paradox. The manufactured housing industry wants permission to charge consumers 10 percent above prime, so 14 or 15 percent, but they are unwilling to say why. But they say it is because that is the only way to attract lenders to the market.

Why do they need to charge manufactured home buyers an interest rate three times as high as that of other buyers? Manufactured home buyers deserve financing that lets them build equity in their home.

Last year, the Seattle Times ran a series of articles on how the financing industry used to prey on manufactured home buyers. I am glad the Democrats created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Democrats gave the CFPB the authority to protect home buyers, including 17 million people who live in manufactured homes.

We have already voted on the majority's goal to stop the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau from protecting manufactured home buyers. Last year, the majority brought forward H.R. 650 with this same language; 162 Members voted against it. President Obama issued a veto threat.

The majority needs 290 votes to override a veto, and the bill only got 263. So people who want to sell buyers high fee and interest loans are trying another tack: authorizing in an appropriations bill. We should oppose their efforts on

procedural grounds, but also on principle grounds.

I urge support of my amendment because absolutely everybody should get a fair shot at being able to get a piece of the American Dream, which is to own their own home, including a manufactured home. But they shouldn't have to pay three times what site-built homeowners have to pay just because they might be in a slightly different situation.

I know that colleagues might say: Oh, we are just standing up for the American Dream here; we are just trying to make sure people can get into a home.

Well, at what price, Mr. Chairman? At what price? Three times what average site-built homeowners have to pay? Three times what your average mortgage holder of a site-built home might pay? I don't think that is right.

I think that we should strike the language in section 638 and should stand up for consumer justice for those people who my colleagues agree are just trying to get a piece of the American Dream. They are just trying to get a piece of the American Dream; but, as they are doing so, there are some mortgage lenders, some lenders that are taking money out of their pockets as they are trying to do that. I think the Congress of the United States should stand with those consumers and not with the big companies that make out so much, that make such an exorbitant profit at their expense.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, we just had a discussion earlier about access to affordable housing, manufactured homes. Manufactured homes are a little bit different, and a lot of times folks that can't afford a house try to buy a manufactured home. And if you put some of these provisions that the CFPB has tried to put in, what you do, you end up denying those folks access to that kind of housing, and I think that is wrong.

I urge Members to reject this amendment like they rejected the last amendment.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Minnesota's amendment, and I thank the chairman for this time.

Perhaps the only thing the gentleman from Minnesota and I agree on is that this amendment is akin to his first amendment which I vigorously opposed and I asked the House to oppose.

Let me reiterate. The manufactured housing industry is a great American industry. The dream of owning a home is part of the American Dream. Manufactured housing offers an opportunity

to those who are less affluent to get part of that American Dream, to buy a house.

Now, what has happened—and again, Dodd-Frank itself, a law which, if I was in this House, I would have voted against. I wasn't here then, but I have vigorously opposed since then—Dodd-Frank actually allows what this gentleman is trying to oppose with his amendment.

So as bad as this law is, and as bad as the law that has come from this very bad law is, and this amendment is indicative of that, I want to talk about what happens when we do this.

This is a miscalculation in a formula by those proponents of the rules of Dodd-Frank, and what it does, it scares away lenders. It scares away those who want to give credit because it opens them up to liability.

Therefore, what does it do? It squeezes the poor American consumer and deprives them of the opportunity to get credit; therefore, it deprives them of the opportunity to get a home; therefore, it deprives them of a part of the American Dream.

If the gentleman would listen to me, I have seen this. Who will profit? Those who are vultures, who actually have capital, who have cash, who are liquid.

When these mobile homes now will not sell, there will be a glut on the market, and what will happen? They will swoop in, and those people who want to see their precious home, their first home, appreciate in value, now it will depreciate in value, and they will be harmed.

This is a perfect example of government overreach. Dodd-Frank is a bad law, and this is an attempt to try to construe Dodd-Frank with CFPB rules that are detrimental to the American consumer.

So do not let it hurt the American Dream. Do not let it hurt this great American industry. I respectfully urge a "no" vote on this gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, the manufactured home industry is a growing industry that is highly profitable. There are loans to be had in this space. There is no need to allow consumers to have to pay three times—three times—what people pay for a mortgage for a site-built home. This is just ringing the dinner bell on people who already are economically vulnerable.

I demanded, Mr. Chairman, information that might justify these higher interest rates for manufactured home buyers, and no information was forthcoming because there is none. This is just a chance to take advantage of people who don't have as much money as some other people.

So American Dream, by all means; consumer predation, no way. I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, just finally, let me say once again, we all appreciate the effort that we have to protect consumers. But you can go so far as basically to regulate people out of the opportunity to own a home, and that is what is happening with this overzealous consumer protection agency, and all we are trying to do is bring some common sense back into that.

So I would urge folks to reject this amendment. Leave the bill as it is, providing an opportunity for people who maybe can't own a great big house, but they can buy a manufactured home that might be less expensive. It might incur a little more risk since it is a mobile home, to a certain extent.

Take all that into consideration, and leave the bill as it is. Reject this amendment. I urge people to vote "no."

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114-639.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 144, beginning on line 12, strike section 639.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the CFPB's recent efforts to rein in predatory practices utilized by payday lenders across this country.

I am opposed to any congressional efforts to weaken or prohibit regulations of these actors. That is why I have offered an amendment striking section 639 of the underlying bill, which prohibits funds from being used by the CFPB to enforce any regulations or rules with respect to payday loans, vehicle title loans, or other similar loans during the fiscal year 2017.

I am proud to be joined by my colleagues, Representatives WATERS, ELLISON, and HINOJOSA, in offering this simple yet critically important amendment.

President Obama's visit to Birmingham, Alabama, in the heart of my district in March 2015 to announce CFPB's efforts to address predatory lending practices was something that was very important to my constituency. During his speech, he noted that there were four times as many payday lenders in Alabama as there were McDonald's. Additionally, there are more title loan lenders per capita in Alabama than any other State.

This stark contrast not only illustrates the pervasiveness of this industry participant but, rather, underscores the critical need for stronger consumer protections to fight against unfair and abusive lending practices.

Oftentimes, African Americans, Latinos, and other minority communities are especially disproportionately impacted by the cycle of long-term debt resulting from payday loans, vehicle title loans, as well as check advance loans. These lenders target our most vulnerable, fiscally underserved communities, including low-income and elderly, while residents with limited access to traditional bank loans or credit are attracted to promises of easy access to fast cash.

Predatory lending compromises the financial security of millions of Americans. It is a problem that is too big to ignore, and the CFPB's efforts to protect these communities should be applauded rather than restricted.

The CFPB's proposed rules are not unduly burdensome. Rather, the majority of payday loans and title lenders who do not ask for any proof of income or whether the borrower has the ability to repay, that, to me, seems to be commonsense regulation. Lenders should be able to make loans to those who have the ability to repay, and asking that question doesn't seem overly burdensome.

Studies show that 69 percent of the borrowers use payday loans to meet everyday expenses such as rent, bills, medicine, and groceries. These CFPB rules would require lenders to make sure borrowers can afford to pay back the loans before giving a loan, in the same way that traditional banks do when they prepare loans. The payday lending industry should be subject to the same regulations as traditional banks when it comes to making sure that people who they are lending money to have the ability to repay.

The rule would also limit the ability of lenders to access borrowers' credit account information through automatic debiting if there are not sufficient funds initially in their checking accounts.

Borrowers should not be at the mercy of predatory lending practices. CFPB's proposed rules would strengthen consumer protections and make it harder to prey on vulnerable communities. CFPB's proposed rules have bipartisan support and empower consumers to make better financial decisions.

I understand that there are needs for short-term cash and for small-dollar-

amount loans that provide consumers with this necessary access. I will continue to work with the CFPB and stakeholders to perfect this rule and create incentives for traditional and responsible lenders to enter this short-term lending space; however, it is unconscionable for any Members of this body to support legislation designed to thwart efforts to protect consumers and the most vulnerable Americans.

I strongly support the adoption of these proposed regulations and would continue to fight for greater consumer protections. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which would allow for resources to be available to the CFPB to enforce these new regulations against payday lenders. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. First, just let me say the provision in question that they are trying to eliminate merely puts a pause on the CFPB's rule until it submits a detailed report. To tell us other good reasons why we ought to reject this amendment, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the chairman. I thank him for his great work on this bill that he has produced tonight. And I have enormous respect for my colleague from Alabama and her concerns.

At risk with this amendment is cutting off access to credit for millions of Americans. Under the plan the CFPB is considering, not only would their regulation eliminate small-dollar loans, but it could also introduce significant new underwriting expenses on every loan. The result? The very consumers that need the money the most will ultimately be left in the dark.

Payday lending needs to be studied, deserves to be studied, should be considered, and carefully considered. Instead, this amendment wants the CFPB to go full bore, full steam ahead, without having thoughtfully answered the question: Where will consumers that need these loans go next?

□ 2130

That is the deeper, harder issue. Outrage is easy. It is. But the tough part, indeed, the most important part for us as policymakers is to make sure that we get this right for those Americans—those millions of Americans—that actually need short-term lending.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

The way that payday loans work is that they rely on the fact that you will borrow the money, and then you have

an exorbitant interest rate, and then you are going to have to borrow money to repay the last loan plus a fee and the interest rate. You roll it over and you roll it over, so before you know it, your whole check is going to pay this loan. No one has ever asked you whether you could afford it. They just took advantage of your desperate situation.

It makes sense for the CFPB to make sure people don't get caught in this cycle of debt. It is the way Americans are going to get back to financial health and not be taken advantage of when they are in a vulnerable financial state.

There are many alternatives. We need to be exploring those, not just doing it for payday lending.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman for yielding me time and for his great work on the underlying bill, including the provisions that are in the bill as we stand.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. While I have great respect for my colleague from Alabama, the language that is proposed would strip bipartisan language that was inserted into the bill that merely puts a pause on the CFPB short-term lending rule, and the result of passing this amendment would hurt millions of consumers having any access to capital.

In fact, the Independent Community Bankers of America and the National Credit Union Association—who don't agree on much—recently wrote a letter to the CFPB voicing their strong opposition to the current rule that is being proposed because they believe that it will drive them out of the short-term credit making market and stop them from serving consumers in their local communities.

In fact, even the CFPB admits that 84 percent of short-term loan volumes will disappear as a result of this rule. That will leave millions of Americans without access to money that they might need to get emergency medical assistance, to pay for unexpected automobile repairs, or to heat or cool their home. This amendment is a problem.

We need to allow the language in the bill to last. All it does is require the CFPB to provide documentation for what they are doing and show where consumers will be able to turn to meet their financial needs. This is a bipartisan amendment that is in the bill now. We should reject the Sewell-Waters amendment.

I urge members to vote "no" on the amendment and urge them to vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I think it is really important that we not reward bad actors. I think that the fact of the matter is that lots of payday lenders—while access to credit is critically important, to reward bad behavior is not

something that I think this House should be about, and I ask Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to reward bad actors. Let me just say that payday lending today is regulated at the State level. My home State of Florida has one of the most progressive and effective small-dollar-lending loan statutes in the country. It has become somewhat of a national example of the successful compromise between strong consumer protection and increased access to capital.

So I hope that when the CFPB exercises the pause that we ask for in this bill, that they will take a look at some of the progressive laws that are around the country and they can balance that without denying folks access, as was pointed out.

So I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 18 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 114-639.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 193, beginning on line 23, strike section 817.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the repeal of the District of Columbia budget autonomy referendum, which allows D.C. to spend its own local funds, consisting of local taxes and local fees, after a 30-day congressional review period.

Astonishingly, House Republicans appear to be so afraid of a local jurisdiction spending its local funds without the approval of a Federal body, the U.S. Congress, that they will be voting for a second time in a little over a month to repeal the referendum.

D.C.'s budget autonomy referendum is in effect as I speak. The D.C. Council

recently passed its first local budget pursuant to the referendum. Therefore, the repeal would be the most significant reduction in the District of Columbia's authority to govern itself since Congress granted the city limited home rule in 1973.

Smart lawyers differed about the validity of the referendum when D.C. enacted it. However, the referendum has been litigated, and there is only one judicial opinion in effect. In March, the D.C. Superior Court upheld the referendum, no appeal was filed, and the court ordered D.C. employees to implement it.

Some House Republicans had either been disguising or simply mistaken in their opposition to the referendum because they are using legalistic arguments. For example, the Speaker revealed a reason that some may oppose the referendum. He said: "There are real consequences. The D.C. government wants to use revenues to fund abortions in the District. House Republicans will not stand for that."

Well, the Speaker was wrong about the effect of the budget autonomy referendum. Congress loses nothing under budget autonomy. Congress retains the authority to legislate on any D.C. matter, including its local budgets at any time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not statehood, I am here to tell the floor this evening. The referendum is a modest attempt by a local jurisdiction to get enough control of its local funds to be able to implement its own budget soon after it is passed, like other American jurisdictions, instead of having it caught up into congressional delays that have nothing to do with our local budget.

Indeed, the riders in this bill prohibiting D.C. from spending its local funds on marijuana commercialization and abortion services for low-income women were changed from those in prior appropriations bills to apply whether or not D.C. has budget autonomy. Historically, D.C. riders applied only to funds included in appropriations bills because only appropriations bills authorized D.C. spending. In this bill, the riders apply to any D.C. funds, however authorized, including those in budgets passed pursuant to budget autonomy. The riders Congress places in D.C. appropriations bills will be untouched by budget autonomy.

Local control over local dollars raised by local taxpayers is a principle much-cited by congressional Republicans and is central, if I may say so, to the American people form of government. Beyond this core principle, budget autonomy has practical benefits for the District, including lower borrowing costs, more accurate revenue and expenditure forecasts, improved agency operations, and the removal of the threat of D.C. government shutdowns because the Federal Government shuts down.

D.C.'s budget is bigger than the budgets of 14 States, Mr. Chairman. It raises more than \$7 billion in local

funds. While D.C. is in a better financial position than most cities and States, with a rainy-day fund of \$2.17 billion on a total budget of \$13.4 billion, budget autonomy would make the district economy even stronger.

Why would anybody in this House oppose that possibility?

The repeal of the referendum is not only bad policy, it is a blight on this country's most revered principle—local control.

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, for his fine work, for his friendship, and I just want to say: You will be missed.

I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This is something that we have debated for many, many hours. She knows full well what is the issue and what is not the issue, Mr. Chairman. I am here tonight to clear the record once again.

To suggest that this is all just about local control and local budget autonomy missed the foundational principles of where they have this limited right in D.C. already. It goes back to our Founding Fathers and the principles found in the Constitution. It goes back to when this was debated and actually signed into law where Democrats and Republicans came together to say that we are going to give D.C. the ability to have local control over local issues with one major exception, and that major exception had to do with the appropriation of funds, and truly the power that rests and resides in this esteemed body.

So to suggest that anything nefarious is happening would be to ignore not only history, but to ignore debate that has happened in this very Chamber before.

The gentlewoman from D.C. has offered a number of times a bill to actually repeal this very right. So to suggest that D.C. automatically has this right to be able to have budget autonomy would go against previous arguments that the gentlewoman has made.

So I am here tonight to say that not only am I in strong opposition, but this is something that we must stand up to for the integrity of this body and certainly because of the principles that our Founding Fathers laid at this incredible city that we call our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C. It was to preserve it in a way that allowed for this body to not only manage and appropriate, but to oversee what is the Nation's city.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I think Mr. MEADOWS said

it well. The bill before us right here continues to appropriate D.C. local funds just like it has been doing for the last 43 years under Democratic and Republican majorities and Democratic and Republican administrations. So this bill is no radical departure from the past.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the gentlewoman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

□ 2145

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, when I became chairman of this committee in the past, I think I was the first chairman ever to say that I wanted less power rather than more power. The reason I said that was because I didn't want to oversee the District of Columbia as chairman of the committee as one overseeing a colony.

For me, that was very important, since I was born in the colony of Puerto Rico and I now represent the Bronx, New York, in Congress. So it is very personal for me that I should not do to others what I don't like people doing to my birthplace.

Let's understand something. This is not a constitutional question any longer. In my opinion, and I have been saying this for years, this is about the ability to say that you stand for things that you really don't stand for in your own districts. So people who can't control the budget in their district go to the newspapers and say: I am very strong on controlling spending. And when you ask them where, they say: Oh, in the District of Columbia.

And then they will tell you: I oppose the needle exchange programs.

And they say: Where? We have one here.

They say: Oh, but I do it in the District of Columbia.

And they say: And I stop women from getting their health services in order and getting abortions.

They say: But it is legal here.

They say: No, but I did it in the District of Columbia.

What has happened is that D.C. has become this playground for Members of Congress to say "I stand strong on these issues," when, in fact, they don't stand strong on those issues. They only stand strong on the issues of the abuse of the District of Columbia.

And we will continue to do this. We will probably see it again and again and again. I mean, just look at this, and I don't want her to feel any worse than she feels already, but she can't vote on her own amendment today because she doesn't have a vote. The gentleman from Puerto Rico is in a similar situation. He can't vote on his own amendment. He sponsored a bill with Mr. DUFFY that he can't vote on. That is the situation we have.

How can we, as the greatest country on Earth—and I don't say that in jest.

I believe it. How can we go and tell countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and the Middle East to be democratic, to be supportive of democracy, and then we don't practice it on a place down the block from us—not down the block, the place where we are situated. How can we tell Puerto Rico that it can't deal with its own situation and yet tell Latin America that it must change its ways, and the Middle East that it must change its ways? We continuously have this contradiction, and we have to take care of it.

This one is a simple one. This one is they passed a referendum, the courts spoke, Congress had an opportunity to say something stronger, it didn't, and now it is trying to come back and make up for it by putting language in the bill where it doesn't belong.

Please, ladies and gentlemen, think of this vote not as a vote that can score you points back home, but a vote that can give people in the District of Columbia the ability to take their own money and spend it as they see fit, no different than North Carolina, than the Bronx, New York, or than any other community. Even Florida does it that way, too.

I ask that you support Ms. NORTON's amendment. I probably can predict the outcome of it, but we will continue to fight this fight because it is right. And the same Constitution that may have said some things about D.C. that we are expanding on and overusing is the same Constitution that guarantees all of us the right to govern ourselves and to govern our resources and to govern how we behave.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. AMODEI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the requirements in section 316(b)(4)(D) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30118(b)(4)(D)) that the solicitation of contributions from member corporations' stockholders and executive or administrative personnel, and the families of such stockholders or personnel, by trade associations must be separately and specifically approved by the

member corporation involved prior to such solicitation, and that such member corporation does not approve any such solicitation by more than one such trade association in any calendar year.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds being used by the FEC to enforce the prior approval requirement for trade associations. The prior approval requirement is the requirement that trade associations must acquire written approval for Member corporations to solicit PAC donations. They must further require stockholders and member companies to only contribute to one trade association. It is a requirement in the FEC laws that is unique amongst all PACs only to those that are trade association-related PACs.

So, therefore, the objective of the amendment is to say, out of all of the PACs out there, we do not need to treat trade associations specially. We should treat everybody the same, all PACs, including trade associations. It was a result of a law that was passed in 1978 which, I would submit to you, for the last 38 years, has been a solution in search of a problem.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMODEI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very good amendment that the gentleman has brought before us. It basically levels the playing field. It is not a partisan issue that is going to impact Democrats or Republicans. I would join him in urging adoption of this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, to quote a great American Republican, Ronald Reagan, "there you go again" trying not to allow things to be out in the open when they should be in the open. This is a new effort to funnel unlimited money into politics.

Current law limits trade association PACs from soliciting member corporations, their stockholders, and their executives without permission from the corporation and limits these solicitations to a single trade association PAC each year. This amendment would remove these solicitation restrictions and expand the number of solicitations a stockholder or corporate executive could get.

I don't know about you, but I think most Americans are pretty sick of politically motivated fundraising emails.

This would expand the number of emails that many people would get.

This is just another way to empower groups, like the Chamber of Commerce, over the needs of ordinary Americans. That is not right.

Last I heard, most trade association PACs were not lacking for money, and most corporations, millionaires, and billionaires had plenty of loopholes in our campaign finance system. But the gentleman from Nevada seems to think differently on both counts.

This bill is not the right place to change campaign finance law, let alone to change it in a way that hurts American voters. I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, to quote the same Ronald Reagan, "facts are stubborn things." Let's take a look at the facts here.

Trade associations may give 2-1 to Republicans, since we brought up the P word for politics; however, the ones that aren't regulated, which are labor PACs, give 9-1 to Democrats. We are not asking you to pick one or the other; we are asking you to treat them all the same.

Oh, and by the way, on this very floor earlier tonight, I believe there was some discussion about we are not hiding anything. If you want to see who gave to whom, you go to the FEC Web site. So it is not a question of are we hiding something.

I want to just give you a couple of more stubborn things, and then I will reserve.

The top 20 PACs in the 2014 cycle were all outside the prior approval rule. The top three are EMILY's List, SEIU, and the National Rifle Association. This is probably the first time those three outfits have been mentioned in the same sentence, but they are not required to do this.

By the way, Independent Electrical Contractors and the Rural Broadband Association should enjoy the same First Amendment rights to participate, which are now prohibited by this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think my Reagan quote was better than the other Reagan quote, and I stand by that comment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, I will concede the point that maybe your Reagan quote was better, and I want to welcome you to the Reagan quote club. We are glad to have you on board.

Let me just say this. This seeks a level playing field. I think we have a 38-year history. I provided some facts that I think are relevant. Nobody is seeking advantage here. It is to treat everybody the same. I believe the word is the E word, which is equality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one of those opportunities to insert language into an appropriations bill that doesn't belong there.

I think the gentleman, who is a very nice guy, should rethink it. Maybe he

can invite us all to his home State and we can discuss it at length, or at least to the chairman's State and we can discuss it at length, or to the Bronx to a Yankee game and we can discuss it at length.

But I think that we are spending too much time here putting things in this bill that don't belong in this bill. And we are reaching a point where we may never again see what I saw when I got here, which is the ability to see a bill stand alone and pass and get signed by the President, or, rather, what we have now where we get these omnibus bills or these continuing resolutions.

We should look at that. We should look at what we are doing to the committee, what we are doing to ourselves, and what we are doing to the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 114-639.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any of the rules proposed pursuant to section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222) and other statutory provisions in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that was adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on March 31, 2016 (FCC 16-39).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds made available by the act from being used to implement, administer, or enforce any of the rules proposed in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking adopted by the FCC on March 31, 2016. That is order FCC 16-39. It is intended to regulate ISP consumer privacy obligations.

□ 2200

Mr. Chair, there are two problems with the FCC's actions that warrant a delay in the adoption of rules by the agency.

First, the FCC's proposed rules are extreme and go well beyond anything they should be doing in this space, and it is a bipartisan concern. In May, Democrats BOBBY RUSH, GENE GREEN, and KURT SCHRADER joined several Republicans in a letter to all of the FCC Commissioners and voiced strong concerns that the FCC's proposed privacy rulemaking "intends to go well beyond" the traditional framework that has guarded consumers from data practices of Internet service providers and "ill-serves consumers who seek and expect consistency in how their personal data is protected."

The FTC has traditionally been our government's sole Internet privacy regulator. A dual privacy enforcement model will create confusion within the existing Internet ecosystem. The FCC simply doesn't have the requisite technical expertise to regulate privacy.

Former FTC Commissioner Joshua Wright testified before the House Judiciary Committee that the FTC has "unique expertise" in "enforcing broadband service providers' obligations to protect the privacy and security of consumer data."

The FCC's proposed rule would create economic harm. Former FTC Commissioner Joshua Wright, a GMU economist, recently said that there has been no economic analysis on the rule's impact. He said, "That's a bad thing, to be clear."

Let me tell you something. The fact that we have an agency that is not studying and working on the economic impact and reviewing what this is going to do to the economy is absolutely unbelievable, especially when you look at the fact that the FCC does not have the authority and expertise to move into privacy. That is the FTC's domain and a place where they work. This new rule has caused the FTC to bring forward two dozen additional questions; the stakeholders have proposed 500 questions; and the rule is a 147-page rule.

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, Americans overwhelmingly agree that online privacy is a fundamental right. According to the Pew Research Center, a large majority of Americans wants the government to do more to protect their privacy. Consumers want a voice in how their data is shared and sold. Despite this loud cry from the American people that we in Congress do more, this amendment would do less. It would make it harder for consumers to decide how their data is treated.

Let me reread the amendment:

"None of the funds made available by this Act can be used to implement, administer, or enforce any of the rules proposed pursuant to section 222 of the Communications Act."

These are privacy protection rules. These are rules that are meant to protect consumers' privacy. If this amendment becomes law, consumers will have little or no choice as to how their Internet service providers sell our most personal data.

We need strong rules to protect consumers' most sensitive information, and we need those rules to be enforced. American consumers need to choose for themselves whether their locations, their search histories, or their purchasing habits, including medical equipment, should be sold, traded, or otherwise used without their permission. I believe that consumers who consistently demand greater privacy protection online would oppose this amendment, which takes away their protections.

My Republican colleagues claim that the FCC's proposed rules for privacy protection will confuse consumers, but let's be clear. The data shows that consumers are already confused when it comes to privacy. Just a few weeks ago, Georgetown law professor Paul Ohm testified before the Communications and Technology Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee that privacy in the U.S. has never been uniformly controlled. For example, there are sector-specific privacy laws for consumers' health, credit, and educational information. This is not to mention the 50-State patchwork of State privacy laws all across this country.

Consumers want to be heard. They want more privacy. We have an obligation to respond to their requests by opposing this amendment. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chair, a couple of points here.

We have a privacy regulator. It is the Federal Trade Commission. The FTC has that jurisdiction. To add the FCC is going to cause confusion as to who is in charge of what. Everyone knows that. Do we need to pass a privacy bill? Absolutely. Do we need to pass a data security bill? Absolutely. That is the responsibility of this body. It is not the responsibility of unelected bureaucrats, who are sitting down at the FCC, who come up with a 147-page rule, and then they are not even looking, necessarily, at where the problem is with privacy. They are going to focus on the ISPs. They are out in front of their skis, if you will, on this one.

We have a privacy regulator. It deserves to keep that authority because it has expertise in that area.

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I warned my colleagues that the other side would say that this is going to be confusing to consumers, but consumers are already pretty confused about their privacy protection. In fact, I will bet that everyone in this room is confused about his privacy protection.

We need a body that can put privacy protection up front and create rules that make sense and that can be enforced uniformly across the country. That is going to make customers more confident that their data is being protected. That is what we need.

Mr. Chair, prohibiting the FCC from using funds to enforce any proposed privacy rules would have the effect of leaving the FCC with very little room to protect consumer privacy. I don't think that is what Americans want. Americans want their privacy protected. If we remove all funds for enforcement capabilities from the FCC we are going to be left with no privacy protection.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chair, what we have is an issue of jurisdiction. The jurisdiction is with the FTC, and they have the funds, and they do a good job of this. Let them do their job. Preemption—yes, that is something that we should discuss and pass in a privacy and data security bill within this body. It should not be done by the FCC, which is saying, Hey, just trust us; just trust a Federal agency, and we will come in here and do this through the rules.

It is a Big Government power grab. I think people have had enough of that. It is expensive. It is confusing. I urge support for my amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-639 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. BECERRA of California.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendments En Bloc by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. HIMES of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. KILDEE of Michigan.

Amendment No. 14 by Ms. ESHOO of California.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 17 by Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

Amendment No. 19 by Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. AMODEI of Nevada.

Amendment No. 21 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 245, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—173

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lofgren
Aguilar	F.	Lowenthal
Ashford	Duckworth	Lowey
Bass	Edwards	Lujan Grisham
Beatty	Ellison	(NM)
Becerra	Engel	Lynch
Bera	Eshoo	Maloney,
Beyer	Esty	Carolyn
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Bonamici	Fudge	McCollum
Boyle, Brendan	Gabbard	McDermott
F.	Garamendi	McGovern
Brady (PA)	Graham	McNerney
Brown (FL)	Grayson	Meeks
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Meng
Bustos	Green, Gene	Moore
Butterfield	Grijalva	Moulton
Capps	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Capuano	Hahn	Napolitano
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Neal
Carney	Higgins	Nolan
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Norcross
Cartwright	Honda	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Huffman	Pascrell
Cicilline	Israel	Payne
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clay	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree
Connolly	Keating	Pocan
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Courtney	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kildee	Quigley
Cuellar	Kilmer	Rangel
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lawrence	Rush
DelBene	Lee	Ryan (OH)
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Deutch	Lewis	T.
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Lipinski	Sarbanes
	Loeback	Schakowsky

Schiff	Swalwell (CA)
Scott (VA)	Takano
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)
Serrano	Thompson (MS)
Sewell (AL)	Titus
Sherman	Tonko
Sinema	Torres
Sires	Tsongas
Slaughter	Van Hollen
Smith (WA)	Vargas
Speier	Veasey

NOES—245

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bost	Buchanan
Brooks (IN)	Clarke (NY)

Vela	Gallego
Velázquez	Hastings
Viselovsky	Luján, Ben Ray
Walz	(NM)
Wasserman	Nadler
Schultz	Nugent
Torres	Takai
Watson Coleman	Turner
Welch	
Vargas (FL)	
Yarmuth	

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

□ 2231

Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. PALAZZO, HOLDING, WALDEN, CARTER of Georgia, and HUNTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on roll-call No. 357, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 254, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

AYES—166

Abraham	Fincher	Loudermilk
Allen	Fitzpatrick	Love
Amash	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Flores	Lummis
Babin	Forbes	Marchant
Barletta	Fox	Marino
Barton	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Benishek	Garrett	McCarthy
Bilirakis	Gibbs	McCaul
Bishop (MI)	Gibson	McClintock
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	McMorris
Black	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Blackburn	Gosar	Meadows
Blum	Gowdy	Messer
Boustany	Granger	Mica
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)
Brat	Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Mulvaney
Brooks (AL)	Griffith	Neugebauer
Buck	Grothman	Newhouse
Bucshon	Guthrie	Olson
Burgess	Hanna	Palmer
Byrne	Harris	Perry
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Pittenger
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts
Chabot	Holding	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hudson	Pompeo
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Posey
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Collins (NY)	Hurt (VA)	Reichert
Conaway	Issa	Renacci
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Rice (SC)
Davidson	Jones	Rigell
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Roe (TN)
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
Donovan	Labrador	Ross
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Russell
Emmer (MN)	Latta	Salmon
Farenthold	Long	Sanford

Scalise	Stutzman	Weber (TX)	Womack	Yoder	Young (IA)	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Schweikert	Thompson (MS)	Webster (FL)	Yarmuth	Young (AK)	Young (IN)	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup				Sewell (AL)	Titus	Wasserman
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Williams		NOT VOTING—13		Sherman	Tonko	Schultz
Sessions	Tipton	Wilson (SC)	Bost	Gallego	Turner	Sinema	Torres	Waters, Maxine
Smith (NE)	Trott	Wittman	Buchanan	Hastings	Westmoreland	Sires	Tsongas	Watson Coleman
Smith (NJ)	Wagner	Woodall	Cole	Nadler	Whitfield	Slaughter	Van Hollen	Welch
Smith (TX)	Walberg	Yoho	Delaney	Nugent		Smith (WA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Stefanik	Walker	Zeldin	Ellmers (NC)	Takai		Speier	Veasey	Yarmuth
Stewart	Walorski	Zinke				Swalwell (CA)	Vela	
Stivers	Walters, Mimi					Takano	Velázquez	

□ 2236

NOES—254

Adams	Grijalva	Neal
Aderholt	Guinta	Noem
Aguilar	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Ashford	Hahn	Norcross
Barr	Hardy	Nunes
Bass	Harper	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hartzler	Palazzo
Becerra	Heck (NV)	Pallone
Bera	Heck (WA)	Pascrell
Beyer	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Payne
Blumenauer	Hill	Pearce
Bonamici	Himes	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
F.	Honda	Peters
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Peterson
Brooks (IN)	Huffman	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Hultgren	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hurd (TX)	Poliquin
Bustos	Israel	Polis
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Calvert	Jeffries	Quigley
Capps	Jenkins (WV)	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Reed
Cárdenas	Johnson (OH)	Rice (NY)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jolly	Roby
Cartwright	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rogers (KY)
Castro (TX)	Katko	Rooney (FL)
Chu, Judy	Keating	Roskam
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Kelly (MS)	Royce
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Clay	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kilmer	Rush
Clyburn	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	King (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	T.
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kline	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kuster	Schakowsky
Costa	LaHood	Schiff
Costello (PA)	Langevin	Schrader
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Crawford	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Crenshaw	Lawrence	Serrano
Crowley	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Levin	Sherman
Culberson	Lewis	Shimkus
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Shuster
Curbelo (FL)	Lipinski	Simpson
Davis (CA)	LoBiondo	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Sires
DeFazio	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeGette	Lowenthal	Smith (MO)
DeLauro	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lucas	Speier
Denham	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Dent	(NM)	Takano
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	(NM)	Tiberi
Dingell	Lynch	Titus
Doggett	MacArthur	Tonko
Dold	Maloney,	Torres
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn	Tsongas
F.	Maloney, Sean	Upton
Duckworth	Matsui	Valadao
Edwards	McCollum	Van Hollen
Ellison	McDermott	Vargas
Engel	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McHenry	Vela
Esty	McKinley	Velázquez
Farr	McNerney	Visclosky
Fleischmann	McSally	Walden
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walz
Foster	Meeks	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Schultz
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Waters, Maxine
Fudge	Mooney (WV)	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Moore	Welch
Garamendi	Moulton	Westerman
Graham	Mullin	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Murphy (FL)	
Green, Al	Murphy (PA)	
Green, Gene	Napolitano	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 239, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

AYES—183

Adams	Duckworth	Lowenthal
Aguilar	Edwards	Lowe
Ashford	Ellison	Lujan Grisham
Bass	Engel	(NM)
Beatty	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray
Becerra	Esty	(NM)
Bera	Farr	Lynch
Beyer	Foster	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Blumenauer	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bonamici	Gabbard	Matsui
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	McCollum
F.	Garamendi	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Graham	McGovern
Brown (FL)	Grayson	McNerney
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Meeks
Bustos	Green, Gene	Meng
Butterfield	Grijalva	Moore
Capps	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Capuano	Hahn	Murphy (FL)
Cárdenas	Hanna	Napolitano
Carney	Heck (WA)	Neal
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Nolan
Cartwright	Himes	Norcross
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Honda	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Pascrell
Cicilline	Huffman	Payne
Clark (MA)	Israel	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Clay	Jeffries	Peters
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Cohen	Kaptur	Pocan
Connolly	Keating	Polis
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Cooper	Kennedy	Quigley
Costello (PA)	Kildee	Rangel
Courtney	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Crowley	Kind	Richmond
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kuster	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Langevin	Rush
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Dent	Lawrence	T.
DeSaulnier	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lewis	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schrader
F.	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Lofgren	

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—11

Bost	Hastings	Turner
Buchanan	Lipinski	Westmoreland
Delaney	Nugent	Whitfield
Ellmers (NC)	Takai	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2240

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLI-
SON) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 181, noes 236,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—181

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

Van Hollen	Visclosky	Watson Coleman
Vargas	Walz	Welch
Veasey	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Vela	Schultz	Yarmuth
Velázquez	Waters, Maxine	

NOES—236

Abraham	Graves (GA)
Aderholt	Graves (LA)
Allen	Graves (MO)
Amash	Grothman
Amodei	Guinta
Ashford	Guthrie
Babin	Hanna
Barletta	Hardy
Barr	Harper
Barton	Harris
Benishek	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler
Black	Hice, Jody B.
Blackburn	Hill
Blum	Holding
Boustany	Hudson
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp
Brat	Huizenga (MI)
Bridenstine	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Hunter
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)
Buck	Hurt (VA)
Bucshon	Issa
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX)	Jolly
Chabot	Jordan
Chaffetz	Joyce
Clawson (FL)	Katko
Coffman	Kelly (MS)
Cole	Kelly (PA)
Collins (GA)	King (IA)
Collins (NY)	King (NY)
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)
Conaway	Kline
Cook	Knight
Costello (PA)	Labrador
Cramer	LaHood
Crawford	Lamborn
Crenshaw	Lance
Cuellar	Latta
Gutiberson	LoBiondo
Curbelo (FL)	Long
Davidson	Loudermilk
Davis, Rodney	Love
Denham	Lucas
Dent	Luetkemeyer
DeSantis	Lummis
DesJarlais	MacArthur
Diaz-Balart	Marchant
Dold	Marino
Donovan	Massie
Duffy	McCarthy
Duncan (SC)	McCaull
Duncan (TN)	McClintock
Emmer (MN)	McHenry
Farenthold	McKinley
Fincher	McMorris
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers
Fleischmann	McSally
Fleming	Kildee
Flores	Meadows
Forbes	Meehan
Fortenberry	Messer
Fox	Mica
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)
Garrett	Moolenaar
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Gibson	Mullin
Gohmert	Mulvaney
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Gosar	Neugebauer
Govdy	Newhouse
Granger	Noem
	Nunes

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Grijalva	Takai
Bost	Hastings	Turner
Buchanan	LaMalfa	Westmoreland
Delaney	Nadler	Whitfield
Ellmers (NC)	Nugent	
Griffith	Ruppersberger	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2243

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. MOORE
OF WISCONSIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendments en bloc offer-
ed by the gentlewoman from Wis-
consin (Ms. MOORE) on which further
proceedings were postponed and on
which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 179, noes 243,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—179

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

NOES—243

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

NOT VOTING—11

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2247

So the en bloc amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 238, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—183

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

NOES—238

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

NOT VOTING—12

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2251

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 294, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]
AYES—128

Amash	Gosar	Norcross
Beyer	Grayson	Pallone
Bishop (UT)	Green, Al	Palmer
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Payne
Bonamici	Griffith	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	Perry
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Pingree
Burgess	Harris	Pocan
Capps	Hensarling	Polis
Capuano	Herrera Beutler	Rangel
Carney	Hudson	Ribble
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Rice (SC)
Cartwright	Jones	Richmond
Chaffetz	Kaptur	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Rokita
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Clay	Labrador	Rush
Cleaver	Lance	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sanford
Coffman	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Cohen	Lee	Schrader
Collins (GA)	Levin	Schweikert
Courtney	Lewis	Sensenbrenner
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Sessions
Cummings	Lipinski	Sires
Davidson	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Stewart
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Titus
Doggett	Lummis	Tonko
Doyle, Michael F.	Massie	Torres
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Upton
Edwards	McDermott	Vargas
Ellison	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	Meadows	Vela
Farr	Meeks	Velázquez
Fudge	Mica	Waters, Maxine
Gabbard	Mulvaney	Watson Coleman
Garrett	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Gohmert	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOES—294

Abraham	Boustany	Collins (NY)
Adams	Brady (TX)	Comstock
Aderholt	Brat	Conaway
Aguilar	Bridenstine	Connolly
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Conyers
Amodei	Brown (FL)	Cook
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Cooper
Babin	Buck	Costa
Barletta	Bucshon	Costello (PA)
Barr	Bustos	Cramer
Barton	Butterfield	Crawford
Bass	Byrne	Crenshaw
Beatty	Calvert	Cuellar
Becerra	Cárdenas	Culberson
Benishkek	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)
Bera	Carter (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DelBene
Black	Cicilline	Denham
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Dent
Blum	Cole	DeSantis

DeSaulnier	Kilmer
DesJarlais	Kind
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)
Dingell	King (NY)
Dold	Kinzinger (IL)
Donovan	Kline
Duckworth	Knight
Duffy	Kuster
Duncan (SC)	LaHood
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa
Engel	Lamborn
Esty	Langevin
Farenthold	Latta
Fincher	Lawrence
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo
Fleischmann	Long
Fleming	Loudermill
Flores	Love
Forbes	Lowe
Fortenberry	Lucas
Foster	Luetkemeyer
Fox	Lynch
Frankel (FL)	MacArthur
Franks (AZ)	Maloney,
Frelinghuysen	Carolyn
Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Garamendi	Marchant
Gibbs	Marino
Gibson	Matsui
Goodlatte	McCarthy
Gowdy	McCaul
Graham	McClintock
Granger	McHenry
Graves (GA)	McKinley
Graves (LA)	McMorris
Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Grothman	McNerney
Guinta	McSally
Guthrie	Meehan
Hahn	Meng
Hardy	Messer
Harper	Miller (FL)
Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Moolenaar	Moore (WV)
Mooney (WV)	Moore
Moulton	Mullin
Mullin	Murphy (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Murphy (PA)
Napolitano	Neugebauer
Neugebauer	Newhouse
Noem	Nunes
Nunes	O'Rourke
O'Rourke	Olson
Olson	Palazzo
Palazzo	Pascrell
Pascrell	Paulsen
Paulsen	Pearce
Pearce	Pelosi
Pelosi	Peters
Peters	Pittenger
Pittenger	Pitts
Pitts	Poe (TX)
Poe (TX)	Poliquin
Poliquin	Pompeo
Pompeo	Posey
Posey	Price (NC)
Price (NC)	Price, Tom
Price, Tom	Quigley
Quigley	Ratcliffe
Ratcliffe	Reed
Reed	Reichert
Reichert	Renacci
Renacci	Rice (NY)
Rice (NY)	Kennedy

NOT VOTING—11

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2255

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 245, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]
AYES—177

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

NOES—245

Abraham	Benishkek	Brat
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Black	Buck
Babin	Blackburn	Bucshon
Barletta	Blum	Burgess
Barr	Boustany	Byrne
Barton	Brady (TX)	Calvert

Carter (GA) Hultgren
 Carter (TX) Hunter
 Cartwright Hurd (TX)
 Chabot Hurd (VA)
 Chaffetz Issa
 Clawson (FL) Jenkins (KS)
 Coffman Jenkins (WV)
 Cole Johnson (OH)
 Collins (GA) Johnson, Sam
 Collins (NY) Jolly
 Comstock Jones
 Conaway Jordan
 Cook Joyce
 Costello (PA) Kaptur
 Cramer Katko
 Crawford Kelly (MS)
 Crenshaw Kelly (PA)
 Cuellar King (IA)
 Culberson King (NY)
 Curbelo (FL) Kinzinger (IL)
 Davidson Kline
 Davis, Rodney Knight
 Denham Labrador
 Dent LaHood
 DeSantis LaMalfa
 DesJarlais Lamborn
 Diaz-Balart Lance
 Dold Langevin
 Donovan Latta
 Doyle, Michael F. Lipinski
 Duffy Long
 Duncan (SC) Loudermilk
 Duncan (TN) Love
 Emmer (MN) Lucas
 Farenthold Luetkemeyer
 Fincher Lummis
 Fitzpatrick MacArthur
 Fleischmann Marchant
 Fleming Marino
 Flores Massie
 Forbes McCarthy
 Fortenberry McCaul
 Foxx McClintock
 Franks (AZ) McHenry
 Frelinghuysen McKinley
 Garrett McMorris
 Gibbs Rodgers
 Gibson McSally
 Gohmert Meadows
 Goodlatte Meehan
 Gosar Messer
 Gowdy Mica
 Granger Miller (FL)
 Graves (GA) Miller (MI)
 Graves (LA) Moolenaar
 Graves (MO) Mooney (WV)
 Griffith Mullin
 Grothman Mulvaney
 Guinta Murphy (PA)
 Guthrie Neugebauer
 Hardy Newhouse
 Harper Noem
 Harris Nunes
 Hartzler Olson
 Heck (NV) Palazzo
 Hensarling Palmer
 Herrera Beutler Paulsen
 Hice, Jody B. Pearce
 Hill Perry
 Holding Peterson
 Hudson Pittenger
 Huelskamp Pitts
 Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Bost Hastings
 Buchanan Nadler
 Delaney Nugent
 Ellmers (NC) Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2258

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE)
 on which further proceedings were

postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 186, noes 236,
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

AYES—186

Adams Gallego
 Aguilar Garamendi
 Ashford Gibson
 Bass Graham
 Beatty Grayson
 Becerra Green, Al
 Bera Green, Gene
 Beyer Grijalva
 Bishop (GA) Gutiérrez
 Blumenauer Hahn
 Bonamici Heck (WA)
 Boyle, Brendan F. Higgins
 Brady (PA) Himes
 Brown (FL) Hinojosa
 Brown (NJ) Honda
 Brownley (CA) Hoyer
 Bustos Huffman
 Butterfield Israel
 Capps Jackson Lee
 Capuano Jeffries
 Cárdenas Johnson (GA)
 Carney Johnson, E. B.
 Carson (IN) Kaptur
 Cartwright Keating
 Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)
 Castro (TX) Kennedy
 Chu, Judy Kildee
 Cicilline Kilmer
 Clark (MA) Kind
 Clarke (NY) Kirkpatrick
 Clay Kuster
 Cleaver Langevin
 Clyburn Larsen (WA)
 Cohen Larson (CT)
 Connolly Lawrence
 Conyers Lee
 Cooper Levin
 Costa Lewis
 Courtney Lieu, Ted
 Crowley Lipinski
 Cuellar Loeb sack
 Cummings Lofgren
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal
 Davis, Danny Lowey
 DeFazio Lujan Grisham
 DeGette (NM)
 DeLauro Lujan, Ben Ray
 DelBene (NM)
 DeSaulnier Lynch
 Deutch Maloney,
 Dingell Carolyn
 Doggett Maloney, Sean
 Doyle, Michael F. Matsui
 Duckworth McCollum
 Edwards McDermott
 Ellison McGovern
 Engel McNerney
 Eshoo Meeks
 Esty Meng
 Farr Moore
 Foster Moulton
 Frankel (FL) Murphy (FL)
 Fudge Napolitano
 Gabbard Neal
 Nolan

NOES—236

Abraham Benishek
 Aderholt Bilirakis
 Allen Bishop (MI)
 Amash Bishop (UT)
 Amodei Black
 Babin Blackburn
 Barletta Blum
 Barr Boustany
 Barton Brady (TX)

Carter (GA) Hultgren
 Carter (TX) Hunter
 Chabot Hurd (TX)
 Chaffetz Hurd (VA)
 Clawson (FL) Issa
 Coffman Jenkins (KS)
 Cole Jenkins (WV)
 Collins (GA) Johnson (OH)
 Collins (NY) Johnson, Sam
 Comstock Jolly
 Conaway Jones
 Cook Jordan
 Costello (PA) Joyce
 Cramer Katko
 Crawford Kelly (MS)
 Crenshaw Kelly (PA)
 Culberson King (IA)
 Curbelo (FL) King (NY)
 Davidson Kinzinger (IL)
 Davis, Rodney Kline
 Denham Knight
 Dent Labrador
 DeSantis LaHood
 DesJarlais LaMalfa
 Diaz-Balart Lamborn
 Dold Lance
 Donovan Latta
 Duffy LoBiondo
 Duncan (SC) Long
 Duncan (TN) Loudermilk
 Emmer (MN) Love
 Farenthold Lucas
 Fincher Luetkemeyer
 Fitzpatrick Lummis
 Fleischmann MacArthur
 Fleming Marchant
 Flores Smith (NJ)
 Forbes Marino
 Fortenberry Massie
 Foxx McCarthy
 Franks (AZ) McClintock
 Frelinghuysen McHenry
 Garrett McKinley
 Gibbs McMorris
 Gohmert Rodgers
 Goodlatte McSally
 Gosar Meadows
 Gowdy Meehan
 Granger Messer
 Graves (GA) Mica
 Graves (LA) Miller (FL)
 Graves (MO) Miller (MI)
 Griffith Moolenaar
 Grothman Mooney (WV)
 Guthrie Mullin
 Guthrie Mulvaney
 Hanna Murphy (PA)
 Hardy Neugebauer
 Harper Newhouse
 Harris Noem
 Hartzler Nunes
 Heck (NV) Olson
 Hensarling Palazzo
 Herrera Beutler Palmer
 Hice, Jody B. Paulsen
 Hill Pearce
 Holding Perry
 Hudson Pittenger
 Huelskamp Pitts
 Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Bost Hastings
 Buchanan Nadler
 Delaney Nugent
 Ellmers (NC) Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2301

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentlewoman from California (Ms.
 ESHOO) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the noes
 prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

AYES—182

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

NOES—238

Abraham	Boustany	Coffman
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Cole
Allen	Brat	Collins (GA)
Amash	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Barletta	Buck	Cook
Barr	Bucshon	Costa
Barton	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Benishek	Byrne	Cramer
Bilirakis	Calvert	Crawford
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Culberson
Black	Chabot	Curbelo (FL)
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Davidson
Blum	Clawson (FL)	Davis, Rodney

Denham	Joyce	Renacci
Dent	Katko	Ribble
DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Dold	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Donovan	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Kline	Rohrabacher
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Rokita
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rooney (FL)
Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Roskam
Fincher	Lamborn	Ross
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Latta	Rouzer
Fleming	LoBiondo	Royce
Flores	Long	Russell
Forbes	Loudermilk	Salmon
Fortenberry	Love	Sanford
Fox	Lucas	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Garrett	MacArthur	Sensenbrenner
Gibbs	Marchant	Sessions
Gibson	Marino	Shimkus
Gohmert	Massie	Shuster
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Simpson
Gosar	McCaul	Smith (MO)
Gowdy	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Granger	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Stefanik
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Stewart
Green, Gene	McSally	Stivers
Griffith	Meadows	Stutzman
Grothman	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Guinta	Messer	Thornberry
Guthrie	Mica	Tiberi
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Hardy	Miller (MI)	Trott
Harper	Moolenaar	Upton
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Valadao
Hartzler	Mullin	Wagner
Heck (NV)	Mulvaney	Walberg
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer	Walker
Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Walorski
Hill	Noem	Walters, Mimi
Holding	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hudson	Olson	Webster (FL)
Huelskamp	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Huizenga (MI)	Palmer	Westerman
Hultgren	Paulsen	Williams
Hunter	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Hurd (TX)	Perry	Wittman
Hurt (VA)	Pittenger	Womack
Issa	Pitts	Woodall
Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)	Yoder
Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Yoho
Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Young (AK)
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Young (IA)
Jolly	Price, Tom	Young (IN)
Jones	Ratcliffe	Zinke
Jordan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—13

Bost	Nadler	Westmoreland
Buchanan	Nugent	Whitfield
Delaney	Sires	Zeldin
Ellmers (NC)	Takai	
Hastings	Turner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2304

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 255, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

AYES—167

Adams	Gabbard	Moore
Aguilar	Gallego	Murphy (FL)
Ashford	Garamendi	Napolitano
Bass	Graham	Neal
Beatty	Grayson	Nolan
Becerra	Green, Al	Norcross
Bera	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grijalva	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Hahn	Payne
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins	Perlmutter
F.	Himes	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Polis
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capps	Israel	Rangel
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carlson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Castor (FL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Castro (TX)	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Chu, Judy	Sánchez, Linda
Ciçilline	Ciçilline	T.
Clark (MA)	Clark (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Clarke (NY)	Sarbanes
Clay	Clay	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Cleaver	Schiff
Clyburn	Clyburn	Schrader
Cohen	Cohen	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Connolly	Serrano
Conyers	Conyers	Sires
Courtney	Courtney	Slaughter
Crowley	Crowley	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Cuellar	Speier
Cummings	Cummings	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Davis (CA)	Takano
Davis, Danny	Davis, Danny	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	DeGette	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	(NM)	Titus
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Dingell	Carolyn	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Vela
F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Duckworth	McDermott	Visclosky
Edwards	McGovern	Walz
Ellison	McNerney	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks	Schultz
Eshoo	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moore	Watson Coleman
Farr	Moulton	Welch
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Fudge	Neal	

NOES—255

Abraham	Bucshon	Culberson
Aderholt	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Allen	Byrne	Davidson
Amash	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Carney	DeFazio
Babin	Carter (GA)	Denham
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Dent
Barr	Chabot	DeSantis
Barton	Chaffetz	DesJarlais
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Coffman	Dold
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Donovan
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Black	Collins (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Comstock	Duncan (TN)
Blum	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Boustany	Cook	Farenthold
Brady (TX)	Cooper	Fincher
Brat	Costa	Fitzpatrick
Bridenstine	Costello (PA)	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Cramer	Fleming
Brooks (IN)	Crawford	Flores
Buck	Crenshaw	Forbes
Bucshon	Cuellar	Fortenberry

Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long

Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NOT VOTING—11

Bost
Buchanan
Delaney
Ellmers (NC)

Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2308

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLI-
SON) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 162, noes 255,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

AYES—162

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

NOES—255

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold

Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra
Bost
Buchanan
Delaney
Ellmers (NC)
Hastings

□ 2310

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SE-
WELL) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 182, noes 240,
not voting 11, as follows:

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Kinzinger (IL)
Pompeo
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock

Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Olson
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Zinke

Lee
Love
Meeks
Nadler
Nugent
Takai

Turner
Van Hollen
Westmoreland
Whitfield

[Roll No. 369]
AYES—182

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

NOES—240

Abraham	Carter (TX)	Emmer (MN)
Aderholt	Chabot	Farenthold
Allen	Chaffetz	Fincher
Amash	Clawson (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Coffman	Fleischmann
Ashford	Cole	Fleming
Babin	Collins (GA)	Flores
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Barr	Comstock	Fortenberry
Barton	Conaway	Foxx
Benishek	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Garrett
Bishop (MI)	Cramer	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gohmert
Black	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Cuellar	Gosar
Blum	Culberson	Gowdy
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Granger
Brady (TX)	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Bridenstine	Denham	Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Griffith
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Guinta
Brown (FL)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bucshon	Dold	Hardy
Burgess	Donovan	Harper
Byrne	Duffy	Harris
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)

Hensarling	McMorris	Royce
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Russell
Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Salmon
Hill	Meadows	Sanford
Holding	Meehan	Scalise
Hudson	Messer	Schweikert
Huelskamp	Mica	Scott, Austin
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hunter	Mooleenaar	Shimkus
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Hurt (VA)	Mullin	Simpson
Issa	Mulvaney	Sinema
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)
Jenkins (WV)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (TX)
Jolly	Nunes	Stefanik
Olson	Olson	Stewart
Palazzo	Palazzo	Stivers
Palmer	Palmer	Stutzman
Paulsen	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Pearce	Pearce	Thornberry
Perry	Perry	Tiberi
Peterson	Peterson	Tipton
Pittenger	Pittenger	Trott
Pitts	Pitts	Valadao
Poe (TX)	Poe (TX)	Wagner
Pompeo	Pompeo	Walberg
Posey	Posey	Walden
Price, Tom	Price, Tom	Walker
Ratcliffe	Ratcliffe	Walorski
Reed	Reed	Walters, Mimi
Reichert	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Renacci	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Ribble	Ribble	Wenstrup
Rice (SC)	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Rigell	Rigell	Williams
Roby	Roby	Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN)	Roe (TN)	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Lummis	Womack
Rogers (KY)	MacArthur	Woodall
Rohrabacher	Marchant	Yoder
Rokita	Marino	Yoho
Rooney (FL)	Massie	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	McCarthy	Young (IA)
Roskam	McCaul	Young (IN)
Ross	McClintock	Young (ND)
Rothfus	McHenry	Zeldin
Rouzer	McKinley	Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2313

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from the District of Co-
lumbia (Ms. NORTON) on which further
proceedings were postponed and on
which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 182, noes 238,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

AYES—182

Adams	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Bass	Becerra

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

NOES—238

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

Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin

Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Neom
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratchliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—13

Bost
Brat
Buchanan
Buck
Delaney

Ellmers (NC)
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Takai

Turner
Westmoreland
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2316

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 370, I mistakenly voted “yes,” when I intended to vote “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. AMODEI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]
AYES—235

Grothman
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratchliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Love
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)

Brownley (CA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

NOES—185

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer

Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebisack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Wilson (FL)
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Royal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bost
Buchanan
Crawford
Delaney
Ellmers (NC)

Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Rigell
Takai

Turner
Westmoreland
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2319

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 187, not voting 14, as follows:

Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio

[Roll No. 372]

AYES—232

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

NOES—187

Adams	Bustos	Clyburn
Aguilar	Butterfield	Cohen
Ashford	Capps	Connolly
Bass	Capuano	Conyers
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cooper
Becerra	Carney	Courtney
Bera	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beyer	Cartwright	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Davis, Danny
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cicilline	DeFazio
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeBene
		DeSaulnier

Deutch	Langevin	Quigley
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)
Doyle, Michael F.	Lawrence	Richmond
Duckworth	Lee	Rigell
Edwards	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Ellison	Lewis	Ruiz
Engel	Lieu, Ted	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	Lipinski	Rush
Esty	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Lofgren	Sánchez, Linda T.
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Loretta
Foster	Lowey	Sarbanes
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Schakowsky
Fudge	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Schiff
Gabbard	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Gallego	MacArthur	Scott, David
Garamendi	Maloney, Carolyn	Serrano
Graham	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Graves (LA)	Matsui	Sherman
Grayson	McCollum	Sinema
Green, Al	McDermott	Sires
Green, Gene	McGovern	Slaughter
Rohrabacher	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Rokita	Hahn	Speier
Rooney (FL)	Hanna	Swalwell (CA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Heck (WA)	Takano
Roskam	Higgins	Thompson (CA)
Ross	Himes	Thompson (MS)
Rothfus	Moore	Titus
Rouzer	Moulton	Tonko
Royce	Murphy (FL)	Torres
Russell	Napolitano	Tsongas
Salmon	Neal	Van Hollen
Sanford	Nolan	Vargas
Scalise	Norcross	Veasey
Schrader	O'Rourke	Vela
Schweikert	Pallone	Velázquez
Scott, Austin	Pascrell	Visclosky
Sensenbrenner	Payne	Walz
Sessions	Pelosi	Wasserman
Shimkus	Perlmutter	Schultz
Shuster	Peters	Waters, Maxine
Simpson	Peterson	Watson Coleman
Smith (MO)	Pingree	Welch
Smith (NE)	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Polis	Yarmuth
Smith (TX)	Price (NC)	
Stefanik		
Stewart		
Stivers		
Stutzman		
Thompson (PA)		
Thornberry		
Tiberi		
Tipton		
Trott		
Upton		
Valadao		
Wagner		
Walberg		
Walden		
Walker		
Walorski		
Walters, Mimi		
Weber (TX)		
Webster (FL)		
Wenstrup		
Westerman		
Williams		
Wilson (SC)		
Wittman		
Womack		
Woodall		
Yoder		
Yoho		
Young (AK)		
Young (IA)		
Young (IN)		
Zeldin		

NOT VOTING—14

Bost	Hurt (VA)	Turner
Buchanan	Issa	Westmoreland
Delaney	Nadler	Whitfield
Ellmers (NC)	Nugent	Zinke
Hastings	Takai	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2322

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

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

FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS SAFEGUARDS ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 803 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4361.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2325

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4361) to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security of Federal information systems, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-666 offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-666 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 5 by Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 239, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

AYES—183

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