ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4745, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4681, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–465) on the resolution (H. Res. 604) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4745) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 585 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. 4660.

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

□ 1845

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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1845

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 81, line 24.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used to discriminate against or denigrate the religious or moral beliefs of students who participate in programs for which financial assistance is provided from those funds, or of the parents or legal guardians of such students.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 513. Any funds provided in this Act used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act.

SEC. 514. (a) The Inspectors General of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Legal Services Corporation shall conduct audits, pursuant to the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App.), of grants or contracts for which funds are appropriated by this Act, and shall submit reports to Congress on the progress of such audits, which may include preliminary findings and a description of areas of particular interest, within 180 days after initiating such an audit and every 180 days thereafter until any such audit is completed.

(b) Within 60 days after the date on which an audit described in subsection (a) by an Inspector General is completed, the Secretary, Attorney General, Administrator, Director, or President, as appropriate, shall make the results of the audit available to the public on the Internet website maintained by the Department, Administration, Foundation, or Corporation, respectively. The results shall be made available in redacted form to exclude—

(1) any matter described in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) sensitive personal information for any individual, the public access to which could be used to commit identity theft or for other inappropriate or unlawful purposes.

(c) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a banquet or conference that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a banquet or conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(d) Any person awarded a grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act shall submit a statement to the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, the Administrator, Director, or President, as appropriate, certifying that no funds derived from the grant or contract will be made available through a subcontract or in any other manner to another person who has a financial interest in the person awarded the grant or contract.

(e) The provisions of the preceding subsections of this section shall take effect 30 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, determines that a uniform set of rules and requirements, substantially similar to the requirements in such subsections, consistently apply under the executive branch ethics program to all Federal departments, agencies, and entities.

SEC. 515. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the National Science Foundation to acquire a high-impact or moderate-impact information system, as defined for security categorization in the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Federal Information Processing Standard Publication 199, ''Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems'' unless the agency has—

(1) reviewed the supply chain risk for the information systems against criteria developed by NIST to inform acquisition decisions for high-impact and moderate-impact information systems within the Federal Government;

(2) reviewed the supply chain risk from the presumptive awardee against available and relevant threat information provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other appropriate agencies; and

(3) in consultation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other appropriate Federal entity, conducted an assessment of any risk of cyber-espionage or sabotage associated with the acquisition of such system, including any risk associated with such system being produced, manufactured, or assembled by one or more entities identified by the United States Government as posing a cyber threat, including but not limited to, those that may be owned, directed, or subsidized by the People's Republic of China.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to acquire a high-impact or moderate-impact information system reviewed and assessed under subsection (a) unless the head of the assessing entity described in subsection (a) has—

(1) developed, in consultation with NIST and supply chain risk management experts, a mitigation strategy for any identified risks;

(2) determined that the acquisition of such system is in the national interest of the United States; and

(3) reported that determination to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

SEC. 516. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture by any official or contract employee of the United States Government.

SEC. 517. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or treaty, in the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended or obligated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to pay administrative expenses or to compensate an officer or employee of the United States in connection with requiring an export license for the export to Canada of components, parts, accessories or attachments for firearms listed in Category I, section 121.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations (International Trafficking in Arms Regulations (ITAR), part 121, as it existed on April 1, 2005) with a total value not exceeding $500 wholesale in any transaction, provided that the conditions of subsection (b) of this section are met by the exporting party for such articles.

(b) The foregoing exemption from obtaining an export license—

(1) does not exempt an exporter from filing any Shipper's Export Declaration or notification letter required by law, or from being otherwise eligible under the laws of the United States to possess, ship, transport, or export the articles enumerated in subsection (a); and

(2) does not permit the export without a license of—

(A) fully automatic firearms and components and parts for such firearms, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada;

(B) barrels, cylinders, receivers (frames) or complete breech mechanisms for any firearm

listed in Category I, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada; or

(C) articles for export from Canada to another foreign destination.

(c) In accordance with this section, the District Directors of Customs and postmasters shall permit the permanent or temporary export without a license of any unclassified articles specified in subsection (a) to Canada for end use in Canada or return to the United States, or temporary import of Canadian-origin items from Canada for end use in the United States or return to Canada for a Canadian citizen.

(d) The President may require export licenses under this section on a temporary basis if the President determines, upon publication first in the Federal Register, that the Government of Canada has implemented or maintained inadequate import controls for the articles specified in subsection (a), such that a significant diversion of such articles has and continues to take place for use in international terrorism or in the escalation of a conflict in another nation. The President shall terminate the requirements of a license when reasons for the temporary requirements have ceased.

SEC. 518. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the current fiscal year and any fiscal year thereafter, no department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this Act or any other Act shall obligate or expend in any way such funds to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to deny any application submitted pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)(B) and qualified pursuant to 27 CFR section 478.112 or.113, for a permit to import United States origin ''curios or relics'' firearms, parts, or ammunition.

SEC. 519. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to include in any new bilateral or multilateral trade agreement the text of—

(1) paragraph 2 of article 16.7 of the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement;

(2) paragraph 4 of article 17.9 of the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement; or

(3) paragraph 4 of article 15.9 of the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement.

SEC. 520. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to authorize or issue a national security letter in contravention of any of the following laws authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to issue national security letters: The Right to Financial Privacy Act; The Electronic Communications Privacy Act; The Fair Credit Reporting Act; The National Security Act of 1947; USA PATRIOT Act; and the laws amended by these Acts.

SEC. 521. If at any time during any quarter, the program manager of a project within the jurisdiction of the Departments of Commerce or Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the National Science Foundation totaling more than $75,000,000 has reasonable cause to believe that the total program cost has increased by 10 percent or more, the program manager shall immediately inform the respective Secretary, Administrator, or Director. The Secretary, Administrator, or Director shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days in writing of such increase, and shall include in such notice: the date on which such determination was made; a statement of the reasons for such increases; the action taken and proposed to be taken to control future cost growth of the project; changes made in the performance or schedule milestones and the degree to which such changes have contributed to the increase in total program costs or procurement costs; new estimates of the total project or procurement costs; and a statement validating that the project's management structure is adequate to control total project or procurement costs.

SEC. 522. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence or intelligence related activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2015 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 523. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract in an amount greater than $5,000,000 or to award a grant in excess of such amount unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, the contractor or grantee has filed all Federal tax returns required during the three years preceding the certification, has not been convicted of a criminal offense under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and has not, more than 90 days prior to certification, been notified of any unpaid Federal tax assessment for which the liability remains unsatisfied, unless the assessment is the subject of an installment agreement or offer in compromise that has been approved by the Internal Revenue Service and is not in default, or the assessment is the subject of a non-frivolous administrative or judicial proceeding.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 524. (a) Of the unobligated balances available for ''Department of Commerce, Departmental Management, Franchise Fund'', $2,906,000 is hereby rescinded.

(b) Of the unobligated balances available to the Department of Justice, the following funds are hereby rescinded, not later than September 30, 2015, from the following accounts in the specified amounts—

(1) ''Working Capital Fund'', $54,000,000;

(2) ''Legal Activities, Assets Forfeiture Fund'', $193,000,000;

(3) ''United States Marshals Service, Federal Prisoner Detention'', $122,000,000;

(4) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office on Violence Against Women, Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'', $12,200,000;

(5) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office of Justice Programs'', $59,000,000; and

(6) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Community Oriented Policing Services'', $26,000,000.

(c) The Department of Justice shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report no later than September 1, 2015, specifying the amount of each rescission made pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 525. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase first class or premium airline travel in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States unless such conference is a law enforcement training or operational conference for law enforcement personnel and the majority of Federal employees in attendance are law enforcement personnel stationed outside the United States.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chair, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

As the gentleman from Virginia is aware, I have serious concerns about the nonresponsiveness of certain Federal officials to legitimate congressional oversight activities. In some of these situations, there have been actions taken by the House to hold these officials in contempt of Congress.

As the gentleman is aware, I was considering offering an amendment to this bill that would simply prohibit funding for any Federal employee who has been found in contempt of Congress. It is my firm belief that the American people should not be footing the bill for Federal employees who stonewall Congress or rewarding government officials' bad behavior. If the average American failed to do his or her job, she would hardly be rewarded.

However, based on conversations I have had with the chairman and other Members, I do not plan to offer such an amendment to the bill, with the understanding that the chairman and the committee will continue to work with me to assure that this matter is considered in an appropriate bill.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he would commit to working with me to find a satisfactory vehicle for addressing the issue of compensation for public officials found in contempt of Congress.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to address this important issue, and it is an important one. I can assure him that we will work with him on this as we move forward in the appropriations process.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 527. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws to preserve the ability of the United States—

(1) to enforce vigorously its trade laws, including antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws;

(2) to avoid agreements that—

(A) lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies; or

(B) lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(3) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market-access barriers.

SEC. 528. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk. The amendment would strike both section 528 and 529 so I ask that they would be considered en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment at this point?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 528 and 529.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Sections 528 and 529 of this bill would restrict the Department of Justice from transferring detainees to the United States. The problem with this is that Guantanamo is now a rallying cry for extremists around the world. Until we transfer and try these detainees, there is no denying that Guantanamo is hurting our national security, and so my amendment would strike sections 528 and 529.

Mr. Chair, we are currently spending $2,670,000 per detainee per year at Guantanamo compared to $34,000 per year at a high-security Federal prison here in the United States.

In fiscal year 2014, the Department of Defense estimates that it is going to spend $435 million in operations and personnel costs to operate this facility. That money could so much better be spent on military readiness, medical research, improving the quality of life for our men and women in uniform.

The fact is, Mr. Chair, nearly 500 defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism have been successfully convicted in the United States since 9/11, quoting a former Gitmo detainee: the Times Square bomber; the shoe bomber; and a 9/11 co-conspirator, Zacarias Moussaoui. All of them are incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons here in the United States with no security incidents.

Now, by comparison, military commissions, which is the alternative, have managed to prosecute eight cases in that time, and many of them have, in fact, been overturned on appeal.

There are six DOD facilities where Gitmo detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent capacity.

The political and legal expediency of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay is not worth the cost to America's reputation around the world nor to the erosion of our legal and ethical standards here at home.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank the gentleman. We visited Guantanamo Bay together. I think any Member who has not been down there, you should go down and see what is there. These are important provisions that have been put in appropriation bills for the last several years. They represent a strong and enduring consensus in Congress.

Striking these provisions would have unknown consequences for U.S. communities. Imagine bringing Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who beheaded Daniel Pearl, and who was the mastermind of the 9/11 attack. About 170 people from my district died in the attack on the Pentagon. Can you imagine, they were initially going to bring him to New York City, and Mayor Bloomberg and Senator SCHUMER all opposed it because they knew what the impact was going to be and the security requirements. So this would have an unbelievable impact on communities.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and, I think, disastrous. Former FBI Director Mueller stated: ''To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.''

One of the things I think Members have to understand is this. There was a pirate, if you saw the movie ''Captain Phillips.'' He was arrested. He was arrested and tried. And they said that he would be convicted, and there would be no way that he would ever be released.

You ought to go see ''Captain Phillips.'' It is a fascinating movie.

He was tried and he was acquitted, and now he is seeking asylum. He is in Virginia. He is seeking asylum maybe in Virginia.

There was another case, if you recall, Attorney General Holder said there is no way that this guy will ever get off, and he was only convicted on one count; and had that count not been a conviction, he would have been released.

Lastly, there were Uighurs that were arrested in Tora Bora in a training camp run by Osama bin Laden. They were there to learn how to kill Americans, but also to kill Chinese, if you follow the concerns of the Uighur issue in China. The administration had reserved apartments. They were in Guantanamo Bay. They reserved apartments in northern Virginia at Seven Corners for them to live here.

□ 1900

I know the gentleman is well meaning, but I think to bring Guantanamo Bay detainees here, people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, people like that, and then what if they ever were tried here and were acquitted, and then can you imagine they then apply for asylum, because we are now going to see a case where one pirate acquitted is applying for asylum and now is living in Virginia and may very well want to stay in Virginia.

I urge defeat of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I understand that there is an irrational fear of bringing Guantanamo detainees into the United States, even though we would only do so to bring them to justice. In contrast to the military commissions at Guantanamo, which have not reached one verdict other than by plea, the Federal Court system in the United States has been extremely successful at prosecuting terrorists and safely imprisoning them for long periods of time.

One of the 9/11 terrorists is in a U.S. prison. The shoe bomber is in a U.S. prison. The underwear bomber is in a U.S. prison. The Times Square bomber is in a U.S. prison. One of the Boston Marathon bombers is in a U.S. prison. We have tried and convicted terrorist masterminds in U.S. courts in my own district.

But others are being held at Guantanamo without any prospect of a trial. Ever since Magna Carta, we have denied the government the power to imprison and punish people on mere accusation. Just because the government labels someone a terrorist doesn't make him one. The government must be asked to prove the accusation in court. That has always been a bedrock American principle until we opened Guantanamo. Now we imprison people indefinitely without trial. By what claim of right do we do this?

How can we be sure we are punishing actual terrorists and not actual people when we hold no trials? Mr. WOLF said someone may be acquitted. If he is acquitted he should be released. That is our basic principle of justice for the last thousand years.

Guantanamo should be closed and its inmates either tried or released. It is beyond time to close Guantanamo so it can no longer be used to rally our enemies to recruit terrorists, to undermine our ability to bring terrorist suspects to justice, and to violate bedrock American principles of due process of law.

I am astonished, frankly, that I would hear on the floor of the United States Congress someone say that people might be acquitted, therefore, they should be held in jail forever because maybe the evidence doesn't exist because someone in the government in

the all powerful, almighty, all knowing bureaucracy says that if someone is a terrorist that person must be held in jail indefinitely because maybe we don't have the proof. That is not America.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, Politico talks about this case and said:

> The failed prosecution of an alleged Somali pirate—and the fact that that failure could leave him living freely, and permanently, inside U.S. borders—is highlighting anew the risks of trying terror suspects in American courts.
>
> Just a few weeks ago, Ali Mohamed Ali was facing the possibility of a mandatory life sentence in a 2008 shipjacking off the coast of Yemen—an incident much like the one dramatized in the film 'Captain Phillips.' Now, the Somali native is in immigration detention in Virginia and seeking permanent asylum in the United States.
>
> One current Federal terrorism prosecutor said the Ali case and the potential for his eventual release is another reason why foreign al Qaeda suspects picked up overseas should not be brought to the United States but should instead be detained at Guantanamo or some other facility.

I personally would think the very thought of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, or some of the people when you go down to Guantanamo Bay and see them, walking the streets here in the United States should they be acquitted—they ought not to be brought to the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the person that my good friend refers to is not a Guantanamo detainee. The reality is that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is not representative of the vast majority of Gitmo detainees who were brought 13, 14 years ago. There are a handful several years later that were brought to Guantanamo. They are really bad guys. They are kept separately. But I am talking about the people, 86 percent of whom were turned in for bounties, the majority of whom were not involved in combat activity against the United States or its allies.

We ought to look at this Guantanamo population and do what this country, our Founding Fathers, intended that we do. Give them a right to trial, prosecute them, and punish them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

As for myself, I believe that America and our ideals, the notion that someone could have their liberty taken, be held with secret evidence, be denied an opportunity to appear before a court of law, be denied counsel or outside contact, is something that our country would never engage in.

The problem with this theory is that we are engaged in it. The problem is that, under President Bush, Sr., he would say about China: You all are arresting people with no charges, no public evidence, no tribunal of any sort, and that this is not part of the civilized world.

I remember questioning the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich. We had a talk right after 9/11. He was talking, and I said: Well, if we are a Nation of laws, how are we going to reconcile that in this new circumstance? He said: It is going to be very difficult. And here we are. It is very difficult.

We are spending $3 million per prisoner to house people in a foreign land under charges that we are not prepared to make public, no offering of a trial, most of whom were turned over for bounty or for ransom paid out by our government. I don't know how it is that we suggest that we want to project to the rest of the world what a Nation of laws actually looks like, but as for me and my district, I am going to cast a vote in favor of this amendment because the Constitution of the United States was drafted and written and signed in Philadelphia, and somehow I believe that the notion that our country would ever come to this moment is the voice from the source of those who wrote that document at that time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 529. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SEC. 530. To the extent practicable, funds made available in this Act should be used to purchase light bulbs that are ''Energy Star'' qualified or have the ''Federal Energy Management Program'' designation.

SEC. 531. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving funds appropriated under this Act to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts and include in its annual performance plan and performance and accountability reports the following:

(1) Details on future action the department, agency, or instrumentality will take to resolve undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(2) The method that the department, agency, or instrumentality uses to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(3) Identification of undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts that may be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(4) In the preceding 3 fiscal years, details on the total number of expired grant accounts with undisbursed balances (on the first day of each fiscal year) for the department, agency, or instrumentality and the total finances that have not been obligated to a specific project remaining in the accounts.

SEC. 532. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) or the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to effectuate the hosting of official Chinese visitors at facilities belonging to or utilized by NASA.

(c) The limitations described in subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to activities which NASA or OSTP has certified—

(1) pose no risk of resulting in the transfer of technology, data, or other information with national security or economic security implications to China or a Chinese-owned company; and

(2) will not involve knowing interactions with officials who have been determined by the United States to have direct involvement with violations of human rights.

(d) Any certification made under subsection (c) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than 30 days prior to the activity in question and shall include a description of the purpose of the activity, its agenda, its major participants, and its location and timing.

SEC. 533. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to deny, or fail to act on, an application for the importation of any model of shotgun if—

(1) all other requirements of law with respect to the proposed importation are met; and

(2) no application for the importation of such model of shotgun, in the same configuration, had been denied by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 2011, on the basis that the shotgun was not particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes.

SEC. 534. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal

investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 535. The Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation shall submit spending plans, signed by the respective department or agency head, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 536. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 537. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 538. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty.

SEC. 539. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to report information to the Department of Justice regarding the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns to the same person.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. I would like to offer and withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, strike lines 7 through 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 539 of the bill.

Section 539 is an unnecessary and harmful gun rider that would bar the ATF from using any funds to investigate straw purchases or trafficking of certain highly dangerous weapons.

This ''long gun'' requirement, which has been in effect since 2011, is an essential tool for law enforcement to combat drug cartels and weapons trafficking.

In fact, in the first 8 months after the rule was enacted, more than 100 criminals and traffickers were identified for prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the reporting requirement is keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, and the ATF must be able to continue to do this important work.

I thank my colleagues who are in support of our gun violence prevention efforts, today and every day.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, law-abiding Americans shouldn't have to sacrifice their right to privacy to exercise their Second Amendment rights because they live in the southwestern part of the United States.

I don't understand why they want to take the people who stand on the border and take this onslaught of the failure of the administration to defend and prosecute those who violate the laws of our country, and they want to have something that imposes upon our right to privacy and our right to exercise our Second Amendment rights.

Law enforcement tools are not taken away by the fact that we have limited this intrusion upon the rights of the people in the States that are on our southwestern border. In fact, law enforcement has the right to at any time walk into a Federal firearms dealer and request any sales records, and they mandatorily must provide them. A bouncer can walk into a Federal licensed firearms dealer and get these records every day. The amendment doesn't prohibit gun dealers from reporting multiple sales of purchases. It just doesn't mandate on four States of this Union a violation of their right to privacy.

The playing field should be level in anything we do under the law. But the fact is we are unleveling the playing field for the very people that stand down in the direct onslaught of the invasion coming across our southern border as a result of this administration's failure to properly enforce immigration policy.

This is something that we shouldn't even be discussing, limiting the ability and making reporting requirements on four States and involving their right of privacy contrary to the rest of the union. I don't understand why this is even being discussed.

I oppose the attempts to toss out the Second Amendment rights of the people of the State of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO, my colleague.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Congresswoman ESTY's amendment, which strikes a dangerous rider that would bar the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives from enforcing a reporting requirement on certain semiautomatic weapons in four southwest border States.

It is over 16 months since the tragedy in Newtown, Connecticut, where six adults and 20 children were murdered in cold blood. It has been almost a week since the latest mass tragedy that occurred in California. Nineteen people were shot, and four were killed in New Orleans last weekend.

Even before what happened at UC Santa Barbara, over 80 Americans were killed by guns last week, and all of the families who have lost loved ones—the families in Newtown, in Santa Barbara, and all across America—are still waiting for Congress to act.

It is no secret that the appropriations bills have been used to incrementally chip away at the Federal Government's ability to enforce the gun laws and to protect the public from gun crime.

This is yet another example of the same bad behavior. Currently, licensed gun dealers in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas are required to report to the National Tracing Center when a dealer sells multiple assault rifles to one individual, just as all dealers have reported multiple handgun sales for over 20 years.

This requirement is narrowly tailored, applying only to the sales of rifles that are semiautomatic, that are greater than the .22 caliber, and that hold a detachable magazine.

Multiple assault rifle sales reports help law enforcement crack down on gun trafficking along the southwest border, where dealers are disproportionately fueling Mexican cartel violence.

This reporting requirement is effective. During the first 8 months it was in effect, the ATF initiated 120 investigations based on reports of multiple sales of assault rifles and recommended the prosecution of more than 100 defendants in 25 separate cases.

Furthermore, every Federal court has addressed this issue and has found that requiring dealers in these four border States to report multiple assault rifle sales is well within the ATF's authority. This requirement is critical to identifying straw purchasers who put guns in the hands of criminals.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will continue to give ATF the tools it needs to combat gun trafficking and to keep the public safe.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this recordkeeping is directed at multiple rifle and shotgun sales of a semiautomatic character. It becomes a habit around here to call anything that will fire six shots when you pull the trigger an assault rifle.

In fact, this requires the reporting of semiautomatic shotguns, as well as of semiautomatic rifles. People all over the United States—and particularly in our State—hunt every day with these weapons. Families have these weapons

in their homes. They are not assault weapons. They are semiautomatic shotguns and rifles. This reporting requirement is on those weapons, and it doesn't say anything about assault weapons.

I question the logic of this whole thing when we are talking about the privacy of the individual under the Second Amendment and about the right for Americans to keep and bear arms.

Therefore, I think that the language that is in place today is the right language for the policies of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my colleague.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Representative ESTY's amendment to remove this misguided rider that will only prevent law enforcement from doing its job.

Since the ATF launched this initiative—the so-called long gun rule—to track multiple purchases of rifles and assault weapons, it has become a crucial tool with which to investigate and prosecute straw purchasers who enable the flood of illegal guns to cities and towns across our Nation. In my home city of New York, 85 percent of guns used in crimes were originally sold in a different State.

When we see the toll that illegal guns takes on our streets, why do we in Congress stand idle, now blocking law enforcement from addressing this crisis?

In the first 8 months of this initiative, the Bureau launched 120 investigations into gun trafficking in high-powered assault weapons, and a former special agent has called this rule a huge tool to combat illegal sales.

Please vote ''no'' on this misguided rule.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this law pertains only to the southwestern border States and that my friends from Connecticut and New York are not affected by this rule. There is no reason why you can't buy long guns in New York or in Connecticut and ship them down to the border. This is discriminatory against four States and four States only. It is bad policy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of points.

One is that this requirement is in place now and has been in place, and it has not disrupted life. It has saved lives, however.

This requirement does not actually apply to normal shotguns or to hunting rifles. I think it is important for the House to understand that it applies to semiautomatics that are greater than a .22 caliber and that can hold a detachable magazine. All this says is, if somebody shows up and buys 1,000 of these, the Federal firearms license dealer needs to report that multiple sale. It is a reasonable thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank the outstanding ranking member of this committee for his work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Let me be very clear. The long gun rider currently in this bill makes it easier for drug cartels to smuggle weapons across the border and more difficult for law enforcement to identify straw purchasers and get weapons out of the hands of dangerous people.

The reporting of multiple purchases for powerful semiautomatic firearms is the same policy we have had for handguns for decades, and it saves lives.

Let me be very clear, my friends. The long gun reporting requirement would not stop a law-abiding person from purchasing a firearm. It only allows the reporting of multiple sales of powerful, semiautomatic rifles—greater than the .22 caliber—and only if they can hold detachable magazines.

The Justice Department found that more than half of the guns recovered in Mexico in connection with drug cartels originated in the United States of America. A case study of firearms trafficking by one drug cartel found that, during a 15-month period, the cartel purchased 251 assault rifles from U.S. gun dealers, all but one of which was purchased as part of a multiple sale.

Law enforcement needs more, my colleagues, not less to fight drug cartel violence. Support this amendment. Help law enforcement stop the trafficking of weapons and save lives.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

I appreciate the kind words of my colleagues and their support for this amendment.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, here I stand in support of an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriation Act. Specifically, the proposed amendment would strike Section 539 of this bill to allow funding to be used to mandate reporting to the Justice Department the name of an individual who has purchased multiple long-barreled arms in five days. The Republicans attempted to disallow the Justice Department from keeping these records, even though these records are crucial in cracking down on gun trafficking and straw purchasing.

I stand in the wake of another unconscionable mass shooting. A recent wound not yet healed, our nation still mourns the lives that were cut short by a mentally unstable gunman. I stand not only as a Member of Congress but also as a concerned United States citizen, outraged by the fact that no measures have been taken to defend our nation's people against gun violence. I stand just as many of my distinguished colleagues have, to implore the Republicans to finally pass gun control legislation. I also stand in frustration, knowing that the Republicans will decry such acts of violence as the recent UC-Santa Barbara massacre but will refuse to take action to protect our nation's innocent citizens.

I will do everything in my power to convince my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to defend our nation's people while also upholding the second amendment of our Constitution.

Dare I invoke the names of the hundreds of victims of mass-shootings in the last few years? Should I mention the alarming number of Americans murdered by guns every day which averages to more than 30 people? Or perhaps I should comment on the startling statistic that 140 Americans are taken to the emergency room every day to be treated for a gun assault.

Of course, Republicans are aware of the thousands of people who are injured and murdered by guns every year. They know the toll that gun violence is taking on the American people. I am sure they also acknowledge that their pillar of conservatism, the 40th President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, supported gun control.

Yet, Republicans still attached a gun rider to this bill to bolster their NRA ratings at the risk of the safety of the American people. They don't seem to care that less than a week ago, an individual documented for struggling with mental illnesses legally purchased a firearm and proceeded to use said firearm to deprive families of their loved ones. Well, according to the FBI, more than 400 people were murdered in my home state of New York in 2012 alone and I am outraged.

It is in the honor of the victims of the UC-Santa Barbara tragedy and their families that I support this amendment. It is in the honor of those lost in other tragedies, who are not forgotten, and all victims of gun violence and their families who have wept at funerals that I support this amendment.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, once again, Americans are heartbroken by a gun violence tragedy, mourning the students killed in Santa Barbara.

Since that mass shooting on Friday, more than 120 others have lost their lives at the hands of a gun, including an 18-month-old who was shot in front of his mother this morning in West Palm Beach.

This mother will never see her child go to school, graduate from college, or walk down the aisle—she will never hear him say, ''I love you Mom.''

As a former Mayor of an urban city, I've seen firsthand how gun violence disrupts entire communities and devastates families.

Too many lives have been taken. Too many families have lost their daughters and sons, their sisters and brothers. And too many people have endured unimaginable pain and grief caused by senseless acts of gun violence.

And, it is unbelievable to me about in the wake of more heartbreaking killings with firearms that the reaction of some in this Congress is to weaken gun laws. That's why I support the Esty amendment to keep strong laws against gun trafficking on the books.

Not only should we pass this amendment, we must do much more to improve our national background check system and strengthen mental health intervention and research.

From California to Florida, American families are counting on us to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and keep our children safe.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 540. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery'' may be used for grant guidelines or requirements to establish minimum riparian buffers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For the past 15 years, a large part of the success of the salmon recovery in the Northwest and in other States has been through locally driven solutions funded through the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund, and I continue to support this program.

This amendment will ensure, however, that these funds continue to benefit salmon through on-the-ground projects, but without questionable buffer guidelines imposed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, as a condition of their use.

Agriculture is the background of my central Washington district, and it is estimated that these and other similarly imposed land set-aside guidelines by NOAA could restrict the use of vital crop protection tools on as much as 50 acres of farmland per mile. I am not alone in my concern about NOAA's use of unverifiable salmon buffer requirements in other instances.

Last year, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals found similar NOAA salmon buffer requirements in a biological opinion that were based on scientific standards that ''did not always appear to be logical, obvious, or even rational.''

In my home State of Washington, over two dozen agricultural associations strongly oppose NOAA's recommendation of large buffers on agricultural lands, and one local recovery board group that has successfully used these funds to improve salmon survival in the upper Columbia River opposes mandatory buffers tied to these important salmon grant funds.

Let me be very clear. This amendment won't cut Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery funds, nor will it prohibit riparian buffers where they are appropriate, but it will ensure that NOAA does not make them a prerequisite for these funds to be awarded for on-the-ground projects, respecting unique geographical priorities of agricultural areas and locally driven solutions to salmon recovery.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be approved, so that the Federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery funds, which have been proven effective over the years for farmers and local projects, will not be used as a backdoor way for NOAA to implement other controversial guidelines for these buffers.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, this is an attempt to authorize on an appropriations bill. These buffer zones that have been put in place under the expertise of NOAA have been part and parcel to making sure that the salmon in the hatchery system work properly. I think for us to delve into this at this point is difficult, and the wording is challenging.

Rather than deal with it here, I would ask if we could talk about it and see what we could do in conference, and that would be a good thing. I would hate for us, after having invested tens of millions of dollars in the salmon, to be taking a rash action here on the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman, and I would like to work with you on this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I respect that, but let me clarify what is going on here because the gentleman, with due respect, represents an urban area, and I represent a rural area. That is self-evident. That is not criticism. I am just pointing out the obvious.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, it is true that I represent an urban area, yes. I would be glad to continue to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

I just want to make this point. These are suggested guidelines, and we have gone through this before. In fact, the EPA is working on this precisely.

□ 1930

I oppose what the EPA is doing, as a matter of fact, and most people on the ground.

I am just simply saying that through the funding mechanism, NOAA should not be able to impose these guidelines that have a great deal of controversy in the Pacific Northwest.

I know this is the start of this process. I know NOAA had some problems with the initial language. We changed that language now. They can't say they oppose this because this only affects particularly these guidelines that are being proposed.

So I think the amendment is something that needs to be passed, frankly, to send a message.

By the time we go through this process, if they want to have some other adjustments, when they make their adjustments, I would be more than willing to talk. But I think this amendment should be passed so we can send a message to NOAA.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, the United States taxpayers have invested a lot of money for the help of salmon in your neck of the woods. I am all for it. I like to make sure that whatever we are doing is correct. We have got treaty obligations. We have got hatcheries. We have got all kinds of stuff going on with both the Native Americans and the commercial fishermen operations there.

All I am saying is I don't want to come to the end of the night, after we have been debating this bill for 2 days, and rush something forward that may not be the way to go.

It is interestingly worded. I know that you have good intentions. I would like to work with you and the majority staff and see where we are. I just can't support this, given the complexities of the issues and the limitations of me being from an urban area. I want to make sure I have a complete grasp on the issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate that. I simply want to say that these are issues that I know are unique to mainly the Western part of the United States.

But in many respects, the gentleman made a statement that really supports my amendment. Because he said the American taxpayers are spending billions of dollars on salmon recovery. That is true. So are the ratepayers in the Bonneville power system. They are paying billions of dollars for salmon recovery.

The good news is the fish runs in the last 5 years have come back in record numbers.

To be very honest with you, these guidelines haven't been imposed, and the salmon are coming back. So why

would you want to impose these buffer zones when it probably wouldn't add anything, and when a Federal court has said it is questionable science anyway.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, a lot of us would love to go out to dinner tonight and have salmon.

The issue for the science of this is that you can't make a mistake. This is a multiyear process. You have got a lot going on here. And if you blow it, you are going to blow it for a big industry that is important for America.

So I would like to work with you and make sure that we get it right. And the expertise of NOAA, I think, could be helpful in that process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate, again, the ranking member working with me. But I think this is sufficiently important that we should adopt this amendment.

Again, I will point out the American taxpayers, as have the ratepayers, spent billions of dollars recovering salmon.

The good news in the Pacific Northwest, as I mentioned, some of the salmon runs are coming back in record numbers in the last 4 or 5 years.

So if there is something that is before the final part of this bill becomes a law, and there needs to be some adjustment, I would be more than happy to talk about it. But I think it is sufficiently important to send a message right now to NOAA to not impose these guidelines when the evidence is contrary to what they are trying to do.

So I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOYLE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. __. Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, and United States International Trade Commission shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The authorities of the Department of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, and United States International Trade Commission, respectively, to impose sanctions against corporations or other legal entities that benefit from utilizing trade secrets or other information—

(A) obtained by such corporations or entities through cyber intrusions or other illegal methods; or

(B) provided to such corporations or entities by a national government, foreign intelligence service, or other entity using such means.

(2) If the Department of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, or United States International Trade Commission does not have sufficient authorities described in paragraph (1), recommendations to improve or broaden the scope of such authorities to address the matters described in paragraph (1).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to start off by saying to my good friend the chairman that I plan to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague TIM MURPHY and I are offering this bipartisan amendment that directs the Department of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, and the United States International Trade Commission to report to Congress on the sanctions they can bring against companies that benefit from information acquired by hacking into private computers in the United States.

The Justice Department recently indicted five Chinese military officers for stealing commercially valuable information from a number of companies in the United States. These indictments highlight what we have known for a long time: namely, that China and governments around the world are hacking into computers in the United States and using that information they steal for their own economic advantage.

These hackers have targeted the offices of Westinghouse, U.S. Steel, the United Steel Workers Union, Alcoa, Allegheny Technologies, and SolarWorld, five of which are located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The information they stole helped Chinese companies in negotiations or trade disputes with each of the targeted organizations. While these indictments are the first of their kind, businesses in the United States have been facing cyber attacks like this for years.

I would like to think that these cyber spies will be prosecuted and imprisoned for their actions at some point, but that won't do anything to reverse the damage that they have done. Congress needs to focus right now—today—on protecting the American workers and businesses who face these attacks every day.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our amendment and begin taking the necessary measures to counter cyber espionage against American workers and businesses. This amendment would take the first step by determining whether the U.S. government has the tools it needs to do just that.

Let's send a clear message to bad actors around the world that the United States has the power and the will to punish those that engage in criminal trade practices.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank my friend, Mr. DOYLE.

On Monday, May 19, the U.S. attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed an indictment against five members of the Communist Chinese military, affirming what I as chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus and other lawmakers have contended for quite some time. This indictment proves we are losing manufacturing jobs not because the U.S. stopped making great products, but because the Chinese Government is stealing ideas, inventions, and intellectual property straight out of western Pennsylvania.

The Chinese Government has hacked into our computers, stolen business blueprints, erected trade barriers, and manipulated currency markets to give state-owned enterprises an unfair and illegal advantage in the American marketplace.

For example, in 2010, as American factories were shutting down because of dumped and illegally traded Chinese pipe, Chinese agents were trying to cheat in court as well. The Chinese army hacked into computers at U.S. Steel and the United Steelworkers Union in 2010 to obtain privileged legal communications about the crucial unfair trade case then being litigated before the International Trade Commission on the oil country tubular goods from China.

This amendment will help us continue this effort and apply the same crackdown on trade crimes. By dumping sophisticated, high-cost oil country tubular goods onto the U.S. market, countries like China are in clear violation of their obligations under international trade agreements.

Western Pennsylvania—nor the rest of this country—won't be a welcome mat for the Chinese or any foreign competitor to walk over.

Mr. DOYLE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman WOLF for his efforts and support. Hopefully, we can work together to achieve the goals of this amendment with language in the conference report or some other means.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. This is one of the better amendments offered today. Frankly, I will do everything I can to make sure this is in the bill when it comes to the conference report.

If the Members would take the time to go out and look at the place whereby you can see all the companies that are being hit, the Chinese are stealing jobs.

And so I thank Mr. DOYLE and Mr. MURPHY for offering this. I will do everything I can. I think the staff knows how strongly I feel. Mr. FATTAH has been a great help on these issues.

So if the amendment is ruled out of order, we will make sure that we try to put it in the bill, and I thank both of you for offering it.

Mr. DOYLE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I want to thank my colleagues from Pennsylvania.

And yes, the case that was referenced centered in Pennsylvania, and it is a case that is pending before our courts. I won't have much to say about it other than under our system, an indictment is merely a charge. We have to go through the process.

But the one thing that we do know—having nothing to do with the instant case—is Chairman WOLF has worked on this for a number of years. He has exposed all of us to information about this and arranged briefings from our highest levels of law enforcement officials in our country.

And clearly, there is a great deal of cyber snooping going on. It emanates from a number of different places, China included: Ukraine, Nigeria—we can go through the laundry list. But we have to do more to protect ourselves.

I want to thank the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE and Mr. MURPHY, for bringing this amendment forward. As the chairman indicated, we will work with them in a way to make this as concrete as possible as we go forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

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. ____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act, except those amounts made available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following accounts of the Department of Justice:

(1) ''Fees and Expenses of Witnesses''.

(2) ''Public Safety Officer Benefits''.

(3) ''United States Trustee System Fund''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin first by thanking Chairman WOLF for his patience. Every single year, as he has shepherded this appropriations bill, I have come to this floor and offered an amendment that would include a 1 percent across-the-board spending cut. He has been very gracious and very kind, even though he opposes. And even though I appreciate the good work that the committees have done to reduce spending and to get these levels down, I believe that we can do more—and that we should be doing more.

I think it is admirable that the committee is showing us a 0.8 percent reduction. But if we would pass my amendment, we would save another $400 million. And that is a step that we need to take.

I think it is important to realize that this amendment exempts the $8.5 billion budget that is for the FBI. We think it is important that they get that for their vital mission that they conduct every single day in protecting American citizens at home and abroad and in conducting the activities that do help to keep the homeland and our people safe.

My amendment will not affect the efforts that are combating terrorism, cyber crime, human trafficking or violent gangs. It is a targeted spending cut that will result in a savings to the taxpayers of over $400 million.

□ 1945

Given the $51 billion price tag of this bill, I do not feel that it is asking too much to cut a little bit more.

I think it is important to note also that across-the-board spending cuts have worked at the State level. There is no reason not to utilize them here in Washington.

We have heard from so many of our Governors and our mayors that have trumpeted the use of across-the-board spending cuts. We have heard Chris Christie, a 9 percent across-the-board spending cut; Rick Perry in Texas, a 5 percent savings.

We have Governor Cuomo, who was looking at reducing 10 percent across the board; Schweitzer in Montana, 5 percent across the board.

They work, and there is a reason they do—because it is an equitable cut.

Mr. Chairman, we are $17 trillion in debt. This is something we can do for our children and our grandchildren and begin to responsibly roll back the amount that the Federal Government spends.

At this point in time, we are spending the money that our children have not made for programs that they do not want and will never, ever use. What we need to do is be wise stewards of the taxpayer dollar, now and in the future.

I also think this is an idea that the American people are beginning to support. I noted a recent poll—Washington Post-ABC News poll. This was March 6, 2013. Sixty-one percent of the American public actually supports not a 1 percent or a 2 percent, but a 5 percent across-the-board cut in all Federal spending.

It is time for us to do a little more to save a little more, to make a few more spending reductions, and to think about what the addition of debt—piling on more debt does to our children and our grandchildren and to their futures.

It is, indeed, capping and trading our children's futures to the people that hold our publicly-traded debt.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentlelady is saying, and I think she makes a powerful case, but I think, to bring it back to this bill, the allocation for the bill already represents a cut of $398 million below the FY14 level. Thirty-three individual programs have been terminated in the bill.

Moreover, and I will end with this, since the beginning of the 112th Congress, the allocation for Commerce-Justice-Science appropriation has been cut by $13.1 billion, or over 20 percent, so you have had a 20 percent cut since the 112th.

As a result of that, I would ask for a ''no'' vote.

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

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

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase the new light-duty vehicles, except in accord with the President's memorandum.

This amendment has been supported by the majority and minority on appropriations bills eight times over the past few years, and I understand it will receive similar support today.

Our transportation sector is, by far, the biggest reason we send $600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't have to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel.

Alternative technologies exist today and, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, agriculture waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them.

If they can do this in Brazil, then we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide which is best for them.

Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I also want to mention that Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and I have a bill which would mandate that, by a certain amount of time, all cars in America would be flex-fuel cars. We can build these cars for under $100 per car, and I think it is ridiculous that we don't do it.

I want to thank Mr. WOLF and Mr. FATTAH for their courtesies, and I ask that the Engel amendment be supported.

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

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment forward. It is so very important that our country move aggressively in this area.

As you travel around the world, you see other countries doing so much more in terms of renewable energy and utilizing cleaner energy sources.

In Ireland, it is wind energy. In France, it is nuclear. In Israel, you have solar along the Dead Sea. Morocco has got one of the largest solar operations.

One of the things that our government can do to save money, as was mentioned in the last discussion about the need to save money, is that we could be moving to a different type of fuel, and we also could be improving the circumstances under which the air that our grandchildren will breathe will be healthier.

I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this forward. There are vehicles that are coming forward that are going to be solar-powered and powered by other types of alternative fuel. Our military has been investing very significantly in this regard, in terms of aviation fuel.

There is work for us to do. We can actually do it together, Democrats and Republicans; and therefore, I rise in support of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

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 in this Act may be used for operation, renovation, or construction at Thomson Correctional Facility in Illinois.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of my amendment to shut down the Thomson Correctional Center in Illinois. The amendment would prohibit any funds being made available for operations, renovation, or construction at Thomson Correctional.

Section 529 of our CJS bill prohibits funds to construct, acquire, or modify a facility in the U.S. to house detainees. However, my amendment goes further, by not allowing any funds for operations at Thomson.

In addition, I recognize that CJS also prohibits the use of funds to transfer Guantanamo detainees to the U.S. However, the administration has proven resourceful at finding pots of money to achieve their goals.

Thomson Correctional Center is ground zero in this debate. As long as it remains operational, we run the risk of seeing Guantanamo Bay detainees on American soil.

One of the President's first acts in office was signing Executive Order 13492 on January 22, 2009, to close Guantanamo Bay detention center. The administration has attempted to purchase the facility since 2009 to hold these detainees.

We have the letter from December 15 to Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, which was signed by several administration officials, including Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, stating the following:

> As the President has made clear, we need to continue to detain some individuals currently held at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. To securely house these detainees, Federal agencies plan to work with me and other State officials to acquire the nearly vacant maximum security facility in Thomson, Illinois.

It later adds:

> The Defense Department will operate part of the facility to house a limited number of detainees from Guantanamo.

Congress passed language in subsequent bills to prevent the transfer of detainees from Guantanamo prisons to the U.S. However, the administration, once again, went behind the intent of Congress and purchased the Thomson facility in 2012 for $165 million, using money from various DOJ accounts. Supposedly, that was to combat prison overcrowding.

Mr. Chairman, today, the prison is still empty.

President Obama also requested $43.7 million in his fiscal year 2014 budget to begin activating Thomson. I think that we all know that this administration intends to close the Guantanamo Bay detention center. When it is shut down, those detainees are going to go somewhere.

The handwriting is on the wall. President Obama, Hillary Clinton, and other Democrats have clearly stated their intent to bring those detainees to American soil.

I think that it is imperative that we accept this amendment and make certain that there is no money for operational funds for the Thomson facility.

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment and seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the Congresswoman from Tennessee.

The amendment she offers that aims to deny funding for the Thomson Correctional Center in Thomson, Illinois, would not only negatively impact public safety and put our hardworking prison guards in harm's way, but it would also be a big disservice to our Nation's taxpayers.

On a personal level, it would also be another setback for Thomson, Illinois, and the surrounding communities that have been thirsting far too long for the good-paying jobs and the economic opportunity that will come with the long-awaited opening of this dormant facility.

□ 2000

When fully opened, the Thomson prison will create 1,100 jobs and will infuse more than $200 million into our local community. But making sure this facility remains on track to open has very important ramifications for communities across our country as well.

Due to the shortage of prison bed space, high security prisons are today operating at 53 percent over capacity. This is especially alarming when considering that nearly nine out of every 10 high-security inmates have a history of violence. This overcrowding has put our hardworking prison guards and staff at facilities from coast to coast at risk of harm every day while they are on the job.

My husband ran our county jail for more than a decade, and I can tell you, I understand this on a very personal level.

Let me quote the Government Accountability Office, which says that overcrowding has affected Bureau of Prisons' ''institutions, institution staff, and the infrastructure of Bureau of Prisons facilities, and has contributed to inmate misconduct, which affects staff and inmate security and safety.''

Opening the Thomson prison will add critical high-security beds that will help alleviate overcrowding and make our prisons safer for guards, staff, and inmates.

In addition to increasing safety, opening the Thomson Correctional Center would also save taxpayers' hard-earned money. The cost of constructing a new facility comparable to Thomson would exceed $400 million and take 3 to 4 years to complete. That is more than double the funding needed to open the existing Thomson facility. In short, by purchasing Thomson from the State of Illinois, the Federal Government potentially saves the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Finally, the U.S. Attorney General has pledged, most recently at his House appropriations hearing, that no detainees from Guantanamo could or would be transferred to Thomson—zero, none. Additionally, there is language in the underlying bill that prohibits this. It is simply not going to happen. I repeat: it is not going to happen.

The Bureau of Prisons has already designated funding for the activation of Thomson prison, and local job hiring has already begun. We cannot turn the clock back now. To even make that attempt is a display of contempt for the American taxpayer.

The opening of the Thomson prison is good for prison guards. It helps relieve an overcrowded prison system and pays respect to our hardworking taxpayers who are seeking common sense, no more nonsense.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with me in opposing this foolish and misguided amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

There are other priorities within the Bureau of Prisons, including bringing online two other recently constructed facilities and maintaining sufficient staffing levels at existing facilities to ensure safety.

I am also concerned—and I think what the problem is, if I could just maybe speak to the gentlelady from Illinois. I think if the administration were saying that there will never be any Guantanamo detainees transferred, but the problem is we see the veto threat on the DOD bill. No one is trying to hurt your community, and I commend you for fighting for it; but every time you begin to kind of say, okay, we will go that way, you then begin to see the veto threats. The administration has not set a veto threat to this bill but has expressed concern with regard to our Guantanamo Bay language.

And my sense is, if honestly, ethically, morally we were all convinced no Guantanamo Bay transfers—and, quite frankly, I don't think you want Khalid Sheikh Mohammed to come to your local community either. So I think you would probably agree with me as much as anything. But if there was convincing evidence that they were never going to be brought there, then I wouldn't have any problem.

But I think the gentlelady from Tennessee raises a very, very good, good point. And every time you come back to that, it always comes back to, we are going to veto that.

So I think it is a good amendment. I guess the challenge would be: How could we remove this so that this does not become a problem? Eventually, I can understand. I think you make a legitimate case. But the hurdle is Members up here on both sides of the aisle believe that the administration ultimately will take people from Guantanamo to Thomson, and that becomes a problem.

If you could remove that risk whereby nobody will ever come back to it, then I think this problem would go away. Until that time, I think it is going to be a battle constantly, constantly, constantly. And I know that Senator DURBIN has made a strong effort, but there are some of us on this side who believe that it becomes a big political issue, too.

So if you can somehow make it whereby there is some convincing and not run the risk of, in 2 or 3 years from now, say, ''Ah-hah, we have got you; we are going to take them there,'' then I think this problem would probably go away. But until that time, I support the gentlelady's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank my good friend and colleague from Illinois, who has been a real leader on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, like Congresswoman BUSTOS, I rise in opposition to this amendment today. This amendment would harm our economy and would add greater stress to our prison system as well.

Iowans and Illinoisans have waited for years for a solution on the Thomson Correctional Center. For too long, politics in Washington—which I think is on display again tonight, unfortunately—got in the way of creating jobs in our region, and for me, it is in eastern Iowa. It is a type of partisan game that really must end. And I do appreciate the comments from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this.

The Thomson prison will bring more than 1,000 new jobs at a time when families badly need them and will spur economic development in our region. Money for this facility was included in the FY14 omnibus bill that we just passed in January, and it makes no sense to me to prevent progress on a facility that we just voted to enhance 4 months ago.

In addition to those economic benefits, I hope that I don't need to remind my colleagues of the fact that we have a capacity problem in our Nation's prisons. The problem only grows worse when we intentionally prevent more facilities from operating. And, again, while I understand the arguments that have been made tonight against it, those folks will not come here.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind my colleagues of a couple of things. Number one, going back to the letter dated December 15, 2009, it says in the letter: ''The Defense Department will operate part of the facility to house a limited number of detainees from Guantanamo Bay.''

Now, I have to ask my colleagues: Who do you think is going to be there? This is a prison that is empty. It is empty right now. We know what is going to happen. This is going to be used to receive Guantanamo Bay detainees.

The 9/11 families support this amendment. It is supported by these families. They do not want to see Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and other detainees here

on American soil. They do not want them to have access to our civilian court system. And passing this amendment will save us millions of taxpayer dollars that could end up being used not only to house, not only to give access to the courts, but to pay for lawyers to defend enemies who have taken up arms against our brave men and women in uniform.

It was clear from 2009 what the intent was. It said it in the letter: ''The Defense Department will operate part of the facility to house a limited number of detainees.''

I encourage support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Let me say a couple of things. One is I am opposed to this amendment.

Now, generally, I am opposed to us building new prisons. I think we would be much better off building new schools. But there are circumstances in which people have to be incarcerated to protect society from them.

I want to talk about one young man who lost his life, and I think it is important relative to this amendment. His name was Eric Williams. It was February of 2013. He worked for us. He worked for the Federal Government. He worked in a Federal prison in Pennsylvania, and he lost his life because of the overcrowding there.

So one of the things is that, if we are going to imprison more people than any other nation on the face of the Earth, then we have to do it. And we can't do it on the cheap. We have to have facilities that are well staffed so that our guards and the people who work for us are not put in unsafe circumstances.

Now, this political nonsense, this is a new theme of some of my colleagues on the other side. We can't pass immigration reform because the President might not do something or might do something. We can't do this prison that we have already invested money in because the President might do something or not do something. So it is kind of like this hyperconcern about what the President may do.

We should do our job, and our job is that, if we want to take the prison census from 20,000 to 220,000, then we have to have the facilities. We can't stand on the floor and vote for prison sentences that go out years and decades, have people tried through the DOJ that we are funding, and then have no place to incarcerate them. It doesn't work that way.

So this amendment makes no sense, that you would have a facility that the taxpayers have paid for, you have a system that is overcrowded, you have people like Eric Williams who have lost their lives trying to do a job on behalf of the American public, and then we have politics intrude. This is not about criminal justice management. This is about politics. This is about, well, you know, Obama and this and that.

There is no place in America in which we can have a circumstance in which we incarcerate someone and make sure—we don't have any breakouts from Federal maximum security prisons. If you did, the Congress would be excited about it. It hasn't happened. So the idea that we can't incarcerate people safely is defied by the facts. What we can't do is safeguard our prison staff if we put them in a situation where overcrowding exists.

So I would hope that we would reject this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. It boils down to the issue of trust.

I was specifically told by the Justice Department that the Uighurs from Guantanamo Bay would not be released. We had a meeting in my office. The White House was there. They were all there. They said they will not be released.

We got a call from somebody in the administration who called us to say that the helicopters are getting ready and leaving Guantanamo. And, by the way, they have leased an apartment at Seven Corners. These were three people who had been picked up at Tora Bora in a camp.

I understand. I mean, if we could work this thing out, I would be happy.

So when you see the veto message, as the gentlelady from Tennessee said, the concern is that they will just blink and come and go. But they looked me directly in the eye and said: We will not release these inmates.

And then had I not gotten that telephone call—and, quite frankly, I think this person who stopped them from being released was the current mayor of Chicago, to his credit.

And so that is the concern we have. There needs to be a basic trust that if somebody says something, there is absolutely no question that that is the word and it will never happen.

But I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, when I was back in school, I read a paper called ''Metaphysical Madness,'' and the essence of it was that in politics the question was: How do you get ambitious, vindictive people to agree on something? That is how you make progress. Well, I don't know that we want to be vindictive. But the point here is that we still have to, in some way, come to a shared agreement about how this country is going to go forward.

If you think the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, who is from Illinois, is going to have this bill moved forward with this language in it, it is not going to happen. We are just asking for a bottleneck. So we should stop wasting time and find a way to go forward.

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.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARPER). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used to prevent a State from implementing its own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of industrial hemp, as defined in section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment is very simple. It would move our country in line with industrialized countries around the world that long ago recognized the importance of industrial hemp as a natural resource, an agricultural commodity, and a versatile component in thousands of commercial products.

In fact, not only does this amendment bring America in line with much of the rest of the industrialized world, it brings America back in line with its own history. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson grew it. The first drafts of our Constitution and many of our first laws were written on paper made from it. In fact, during World War II, the USDA encouraged patriotic American farmers to raise it for the war effort. They even produced a promotional film entitled ''Hemp for Victory,'' and now at least 16 States have passed laws that will allow their farmers to grow it.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government stands in the way of family farmers who want to be able to grow industrial hemp. The senseless classification of hemp as a Schedule I drug does not further public safety, but it does rob our farm economies of a potentially multibillion dollar crop that can be used to make everything from rope to soap. In fact, it seems like the only thing you can't make out of hemp is dope.

Despite the fact that American farmers can't grow industrial hemp, hemp products here in this country account

for nearly $500 million in annual sales. Now, that is a sizable industry, but nothing compared to the economic impact that full-scale cultivation and commercialization would have if States were permitted to implement their laws and our hemp did not have to get imported from other countries.

This amendment would only allow farmers to grow hemp in accordance with their State's laws. It simply divests the Department of Justice and the DEA of their ability to treat industrial hemp like marijuana because it is not like marijuana. So far, 16 States have seen the value that hemp provides, and have passed laws to allow farmers to grow hemp and to closely regulate it.

Farmers in those States across the country are waiting for the Federal Government to get out of their way. But because the Department of Justice refuses to acknowledge what Washington and Jefferson knew—that hemp is an important agricultural commodity, it is not marijuana—these State laws must take a back seat to Federal overreach.

The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau Federation agree that we should allow our farmers to grow industrial hemp.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. The amendment seeks to fix a problem that does not exist. There is no restriction on use and transfer of domestically produced or traded industrial hemp products or seed. They never sought a license. They have every right to do this had they got a license. And the DEA had a responsibility, as the Customs and Border Patrol does, to ensure that imports are legal and safe, including the imports of agriculture products. The responsibility falls to those who seek to import these products to secure necessary import licenses in a timely way to ensure Federal law enforcement can do its job and confirm that the commodity imported is legal.

There is no reason to restrict the exercise of this important law enforcement mission. So they never sought a license, and that is what the problem was.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, may I please inquire as to the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy as I appreciate her leadership on this.

The matter is that 22 States have moved to reduce the barriers, 17 States now, including our home State of Oregon, have removed barriers to production. But there is uncertainty. As a matter of fact, I think my friend from Kentucky may talk about a problem they had in the State of Kentucky now.

We need to approve this amendment to get the Federal Government out of the way of a revolution that is taking place at the State level. States across the country understand that this is an important commodity, it is part of our heritage, and it is part of our future. The DEA has more important things to do than interfere with legal activities at the State level.

We need to remove the cloud of uncertainty and approve this amendment, and I respectfully request that people approve it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my cosponsor.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, officials in my home State of Kentucky were recently forced to file a lawsuit in Federal Court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds intended for a university research pilot program. What a waste of time, money, and the court system's limited resources.

States can't launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA seizes the seeds before they reach their destination. And although the DEA did recently agree to release the seeds, they still insist that they have the authority to regulate industrial hemp—which was clearly conveyed to the States in the farm bill.

Isn't it ironic that thousands of pounds of cocaine and heroin are somehow passing across our borders every week, yet the DEA thinks that seizing hemp seeds, industrial hemp seeds, is a worthwhile use of its time and resources? I say it is not.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) as a courtesy to my colleague to speak on the question of hemp.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentlewoman from Oregon and the gentleman from Kentucky.

I am very pleased to support both this amendment as well as a very similar one along with Representatives MASSIE, BLUMENAUER, BONAMICI, and BARR, thanking them for their leadership on a very commonsense issue that helps my home State of Colorado.

Last year, I was thrilled to be part of a successful effort to pass an amendment to the farm bill that allows colleges like Colorado State University in my district to grow hemp and cultivate hemp for academic and agricultural research purposes. But in no other instance can I think of urgent emails and texts that I have got from farmers where they are in dire straits and need my help in getting the seed they need to grow their crop approved through our own State Department of Agriculture.

Our current ag commissioner in Colorado is a former colleague of ours in this body, former Congressman John Salazar, as some of you may recall. He is our ag commissioner. They set up a rule process around industrial hemp farming. But farmers are unable to get the seed they need to be able to grow their legal crop.

Industrial hemp is critical for our economy. It is already used in countless products from clothing to a flag that is flown over this very United States Capitol last year to, in fact, some of the very first American flags, which were made of hemp. And yet we are forced to import it from other countries, driving jobs away from American agriculture and farmers to farms overseas.

It is really hard to grow industrial hemp when the DEA, without any clear reason, any argument, or any sense throws itself down as a roadblock to success. The DEA recently seized industrial hemp seeds intended for a university research pilot program. It is essential that our institutions of higher education are not prevented from growing or cultivating hemp seed.

In addition, hemp, as we know, is an important agricultural commodity and a historic one. We can do a lot better as a country. That is why Representative BONAMICI and others are offering this very simple amendment which states that the DOJ and DEA cannot use funds to prevent State agricultural agencies and universities from growing industrial hemp in States where it is always legal.

Let us have access to the seed to ensure that we can continue to grow this crop here doing the research we need to ensure that the next great generation of hemp products that are bought and sold in our country are made in America. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Bonamici amendment as well as the Massie amendment. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania kindly.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, in the hope that perhaps whatever the circumstances that might emerge from these couple of amendments, maybe it might bring greater harmony in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join him in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chair, the purpose of this amendment ostensibly is to make it easier to import seeds for the purpose of research with regard to growing or cultivating industrial hemp, and for that reason the amendment is unnecessary and inappropriate. Current law imposes no impediment to legitimate research on industrial hemp being carried out in accordance with section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014.

Under current law, institutions of higher education and State Departments of Agriculture may import the seeds needed to conduct research authorized by section 7606 of the Agricultural Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. BONAMICI. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I do not. I don't have enough time, I don't believe, to finish my remarks.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Such institutions of higher education or State departments of agriculture simply need to first become registered with the DEA as an importer or as a researcher and, second, obtain an import permit authorizing the shipment of seeds.

The process is not burdensome. Within the last 10 days, the DEA registered two State departments of agriculture in Colorado and Kentucky to import industrial hemp seeds and issued an import permit to the Kentucky department of agriculture.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. BONAMICI. It is a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The Member having the floor would need to yield for a parliamentary inquiry to be entertained.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman does not yield.

The gentleman from Virginia may proceed.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. As the Chair stated, the gentleman from Virginia controls the time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure the record is clear. There are two amendments. It appears that the gentleman is talking about the other amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is not recognized.

The gentleman from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. This amendment would require the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to choose between ignoring existing law or barring all imports of seeds. Removing DEA from the registration and permit process without changing existing law would eliminate the only lawful means of importing Cannabis seeds for industrial hemp cultivation pursuant to section 7606.

To protect our Nation from the importation of potentially dangerous materials, our customs laws have always required the importer to demonstrate before the materials enter this country that the materials may lawfully be imported. In carrying out this function, the CBP consults with the appropriate government agencies, including the Department of Justice and the DEA. By cutting the DOJ and DEA out of this process, the amendment creates uncertainty and could potentially be construed to require CBP to allow any shipment by anyone to enter the U.S. as long as the shipper claims the goods are industrial hemp seeds. Since there is no way to tell just from looking at a bag of seeds whether they will actually yield Cannabis plants that fall within the TAT limits of section 7606, CPB, DOJ, and DEA consultation is important.

Requiring CBP to accept bare representations from anyone claiming to be a legitimate importer exposes the possibility of others importing any item under the guise of industrial hemp. The existing permit and registration process provides some protection against that risk. For that reason, I would join in opposing the amendment.

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

□ 2030

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FATTAH. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FATTAH. There may be some confusion. The entire comments of the gentleman who just spoke, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE). That is not the amendment that was being debated and is being offered by my colleague from Kentucky, and we were trying to clarify that because the House could be confused.

The Acting CHAIR. In response to the inquiry, the Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

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

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

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Investigative and Public Affairs Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation except for the Ten Most Wanted Fugitives, the Most Wanted Terrorists, and missing children programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, taxpayers should not foot the bill for the FBI to be consultants for Hollywood producers. However, this is the case with the FBI Investigative Publicity and Public Affairs Unit.

Although this unit does important work like publicize the Most Wanted Fugitives list, it also provides screenwriters, as well as movie and TV producers, advice on costumes, props, scenery, and weapons, as well as b-roll footage and fact-checking.

Now, I am confident that Hollywood and their hundred-million-dollar production budgets can afford to hire ex-FBI agents to consult on their projects. It just seems to make good common sense.

This unit's activities and most of its $1.5 million annual budget should be highlighted for what it really is, and that is Department of Justice waste.

If Hollywood can make millions from these movies and television shows, such as ''Without a Trace,'' ''CSI,'' and ''The Closer,'' and also movies like ''Shooter,'' featuring—and no relation I might add—Mark Wahlberg, that grossed over $80 million, as well as ''The Kingdom,'' which also grossed over $80 million, it does not need, I believe, the American taxpayer and FBI to help fund its research.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment that simply states that no taxpayer funds can be used by the unit except—and I make this clear—it doesn't zero out the entire budget, but funds can only be used by this unit for the Ten Most Wanted Fugitives, the Most Wanted Terrorists, and missing children programs. I think it is a reasonable amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I ask for support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. It won't take long to make this point. All of us grew up during a time in which part of the ability to attract people to Federal service, particularly to law enforcement, were

shows that highlighted the FBI and its prowess, but think about it today, in order to recruit people, in order to have job fairs and career fairs and to communicate information about the agency.

For instance, it is trying to recruit now people who can help in cyber crimes, and they have had a problem getting people who can get past some of the screening, so they have to do even more public relations in order to attract people who are capable of helping to build the cases like some of the ones which were discussed here earlier on the floor in which American companies were being cyber hacked and they were stealing essentially American jobs and wealth in that process.

I think, in this effort to separate the FBI from Hollywood, we might be separating the agency from its ability to promote itself. There is no Member of Congress that doesn't understand and appreciate the fact that there are times in which you need to be able to communicate with the public, and so it is the case with a Federal agency.

I think that the amendment—and I understand the impulse, and I am sure there is waste, and I can show you waste in the FBI and in any of these other agencies, but I don't believe that communicating with the American public is something that we should consider as wasteful. I, therefore, oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would concur with the need to communicate; but, again, we are talking over 600 Hollywood projects, most of which are grossing millions of dollars, $80 million, as I mentioned, for ''Shooter,'' $80 million for ''The Kingdom.''

It seems like, with that kind of grossing that is taking place, taxpayers shouldn't be on the bill to support the research that goes on. You have retired FBI agents, CIA, and others that can be brought in to do the research, as well as consult on these films.

We want accuracy, and yet we also understand that the taxpayer should only be footing the bill as necessary, and I don't think this is. Nothing against Mark Wahlberg or any others that are being used in these movies, especially with my name attached.

I still think the taxpayer deserves consideration here, and so I ask for this reasonable amendment to be supported. It allows the continued working on Most Wanted Fugitives and Most Wanted Terrorists and missing children programs. I think that is legitimate. Beyond that, I reject it. I ask for support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. 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. 21 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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. Chairman, just for the sake of perfect clarity, may I have the first few words of the amendment read.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill this year and last year that has been considered under an open rule.

This amendment would expand the list of parties the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting with because of misconduct on the part of those contractors. This list would include contractors who have been convicted of fraud; have violated Federal or State antitrust laws; who have been convicted of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, violation of Federal tax laws, and other items outlined in section 52.209–5 of title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

These are all offenses which any contractor doing business with the Federal Government must disclose to the contracting officer, but oddly enough, the contracting officer, absent this amendment, would then be free to ignore these transgressions and award contracts to the offending entities.

I commend the authors of this bill for their inclusion of sections 536 and 537. I still believe, however, that we can improve on the bill by prohibiting agencies from contracting with those entities who have engaged in the activities described above.

It is my hope that this amendment will remain noncontroversial, as it has been, and, again, will be passed unanimously by the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. I accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin, to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of medical marijuana.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment, which would prohibit the Department of Justice from using any of

the funds appropriated in this bill to prevent States from implementing their own medical marijuana laws. Twenty-nine States have enacted laws that allow patients access to medical marijuana and its derivatives, such as CBD oils.

It is no surprise then that public opinion is shifting, too. A recent Pew Research Center survey found that 61 percent of Republicans and a whooping 76 percent of Independents favor making medical marijuana legal and available to their patients who need it.

As I have said, 29 States have already enacted laws that will permit patients access to medical marijuana and their derivatives. By the way, 80 percent of Democrats feel the same way.

Despite this overwhelming shift in public opinion, the Federal Government continues its hard-line oppression against medical marijuana. For those of us who routinely talk about the 10th Amendment, which we do in conservative ranks, and respect for State laws, this amendment should be a no-brainer.

Our amendment gives all of us an opportunity to show our constituents that we are truly constitutionalists and that we mean what we say when we talk about the importance of the 10th Amendment.

In addition, this also gives us the opportunity to prove that we really do believe in respecting the doctor-patient relationship.

I proudly offer this amendment that has the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I am joined by Republican cosponsors DON YOUNG, TOM MCCLINTOCK, Dr. PAUL BROUN, STEVE STOCKMAN, and JUSTIN AMASH, as well as Democrat cosponsors SAM FARR, EARL BLUMENAUER, STEVE COHEN, JARED POLIS, BARBARA LEE, and DINA TITUS.

I urge my colleagues to support our commonsense, states' rights, compassionate, fiscally responsible amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield myself 1 minute.

The following national medical organizations are currently opposed to medical marijuana: American Medical Association, American Cancer Society, American Glaucoma Society, Glaucoma Research Foundation, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and American Psychiatric Association.

Also, recent research has demonstrated that marijuana use during teen years decreases IQ rates by an average of eight points.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

□ 2045

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment. My State is named in the amendment.

Look, everyone supports compassionate, effective medical care for patients with cancer, epilepsy, chronic pain. You will probably hear anecdotal reports, maybe even during the testimony this evening, about how medical marijuana can solve some of these problems.

There are two problems with medical marijuana. First, it is the camel's nose under the tent; and second, the amendment as written would tie the DEA's hands beyond medical marijuana.

With regard to the camel's nose under the tent, let me just quote from the DEA report just published this month: Organizers behind the medical marijuana movement did not really concern themselves with marijuana as a medicine. They just saw it as a means to an end, which is the legalization of marijuana for recreational purposes. They did not deal with ensuring that the product meets the standards of modern medicine: quality, safety, and efficacy.

Because, Mr. Chairman, the term ''medical marijuana'' is generally used to refer—and this is from the NIH. We respect the NIH. This is the National Institute on Drug Abuse: The term ''medical marijuana'' is generally used to refer to the whole, unprocessed marijuana plant or its crude extracts.

Mr. Chairman, that is not what medicine is about. Medicine is about refining the components THC and CBD, actually making sure they are efficacious, giving the exact dose, not two joints a day, not a brownie here, a biscuit there. That is not modern medicine. In fact, the DEA supports those studies, looking at the safety and efficacy and dosing regimens for these, THC, CBD. They have licensed some of the drugs.

Mr. Chairman, according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, medical and street marijuana are not different. Most marijuana sold in dispensaries as medicine, again reading from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, is the same quality and carries the same health risks as marijuana sold on the street.

Mr. Chairman, we know there are health problems. The problem is that the way the amendment is drafted, in a State like Maryland which has medical marijuana, if we ever legalized it, the amendment would stop the DEA from going after more than medical marijuana.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We have 2½ minutes each.

I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I am not here to talk about brownies and biscuits. I am here to talk about a serious medical issue, cannabidiol, the CBD oil that comes from the cannabis plant. It is very low in THC and is nonpsychoactive. Research has shown very promising results in children with epilepsy, autism, and other neurological disorders. CBD oil is also showing promising results in adults with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and PTSD.

We need to remove the roadblocks to these potential medical breakthroughs. This amendment would do that. The Federal Government should not countermand State law. In this case, the absurd result of that is that medical discoveries are being blocked.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, let me say that in this discussion you may have heard reference to the 10th Amendment and the Commerce Clause. Let me address that. I want to get that out of the way, because I have talked tremendously over the past few days and weeks about the dangers of marijuana.

This controversy came before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2005 in Gonzales v. Raich. The Supreme Court reviewed the Federal Government's authority to enforce the Controlled Substances Act. In a 6–3 decision, Justice Scalia, a strong states' rights advocate, concurred with the majority ruling that the CSA does not violate the Commerce Clause or the principles of State sovereignty.

Just to read what he said:

> Not only is it impossible to distinguish controlled substances manufactured and distributed intrastate from controlled substances manufactured and distributed interstate, but it hardly makes sense to speak in such terms.

Drugs like marijuana are fungible commodities, as the Court explains marijuana that is grown at home and possessed for personal use is never more than an instant from the interstate market, and this is so whether or not the possession is for medicinal use or lawful use under the laws of a particular State.

Again, if we want to make a statement principle on the Tenth Amendment, fine, but don't do it on the backs of our kids and our grandkids. This is dangerous for them. How do we know this? The health risks: brain development, schizophrenia, increased risk of stroke. A study at Northwestern University recently showed profound changes in the brain just in casual marijuana users. Heart complications, three times normal in such use. Recent studies shows, as I said, not only damage in certain structures in the brain, but the same structures that attend to motivation, which again underlines the amotivational syndrome that we have all heard about.

So again, it is settled law. The Supreme Court has already spoken on the constitutionality of this. It is settled when it comes to medicine. We hear anecdotal stories, but there is no widespread accepted use of marijuana, medicinal marijuana and so forth. There is no acceptance of this by the medical community. It is not evidence-based. Fine, if you want to do research on it, but this will take away the ability of the Department of Justice to protect our young people.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN), our doctor in the House. We do believe in the doctor-patient relationship and that the government shouldn't interfere.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am a family physician and an addictionologist. Marijuana is addicting if it is used improperly. But used medically, and there are very valid medical reasons to utilize extracts or products from marijuana in medical procedures, it is a very valid medical use under the direction of a doctor. It is actually less dangerous than some narcotics that doctors prescribe all over this country.

Also, this is a states' rights, states' power issue, because many States across the country—in fact, my own State of Georgia is considering allowing the medical use under the direction of a physician. This is a states' rights, Tenth Amendment issue. We need to reserve the states' powers under the Constitution.

Please support this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I am listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle in opposition here and the notion about camel's nose, this train has already left the station. Eighteen years ago, the State of California voters approved medical marijuana. We now have 22 States that are doing so.

My good friend from Georgia is right. I mean, there are a million Americans now with the legal right to medical marijuana as prescribed by a physician. The problem is that the Federal Government is getting in the way. The Federal Government makes it harder for doctors and researchers to be able to do what I think my friend from Louisiana wants than it is for parents to self-medicate with buying marijuana for a child with violent epilepsy.

This amendment is important to get the Federal Government out of the way. Let this process work going forward where we can have respect for states' rights and something that makes a huge difference to hundreds of thousands of people around the country now and more in the future.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment as a coauthor of it and to point out this is six Democrats and six Republicans that are authoring this. There are 33 States, three of which have just passed laws and the Governors have indicated they will sign them.

This is essentially saying, look, if you are following State law, you are a legal resident doing your business under State law, the Feds just can't come in and bust you and bust the doctors and bust the patient. It is more than half the States. So you don't have to have any opinion about the value of marijuana. This doesn't change any laws. This doesn't affect one law, just lists the States that have already legalized it only for medical purposes, only medical purposes, and says, Federal Government, in those States, in those places, you can't bust people. It seems to me a practical, reasonable amendment in this time and age.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, for the District of Columbia and 22 States, including Nevada, with laws in place allowing the legal use of some form of marijuana for medical purposes, this commonsense amendment simply ensures that patients do not have to live in fear when following the laws of their States and the recommendations of their doctors. Physicians in those States will not be prosecuted for prescribing the substance, and local businesses will not be shut down for dispensing the same.

I urge you vote in favor.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oakland, California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor along with my colleagues. This amendment will provide much-needed clarity to patients and businesses in my home State of California and 31 other jurisdictions that provide safe and legal access to medicine. We should allow for the implementation of the will of the voters to comply with State laws rather than undermining our democracy.

In States with medical marijuana laws, patients face uncertainty regarding their treatment, and small business owners who have invested millions creating jobs and revenue have no assurances for the future. It is past time for the Justice Department to stop its unwarranted persecution of medical marijuana and put its resources where they are needed.

In States with medical marijuana laws, people with multiple sclerosis, glaucoma, cancer, HIV, and AIDS and other medical issues continue to face uncertainty when it comes to accessing the medicine that they need to provide some relief. So it is time to pass this. It is time to give these patients the relief that they need.

This is the humanitarian thing to do, it is the democratic thing to do, and I hope this body will vote for it and pass it on a bipartisan basis. It is long overdue. Enough is enough.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, marijuana is neither safe nor legal. Let's get it straight. The Controlled Substances Act makes marijuana in the United States illegal because it is not safe.

□ 2100

Mr. Chairman, there is more and more evidence every day that it is not safe. The effect on the brains, developing brains of teenagers and young adults, is becoming more and more clear, as the doctor from Louisiana has talked about, the effect on affect, the effect on mood; it is not safe.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a medicine. This would be like me as a physician saying: You know, I think you need penicillin, go chew on some mold. Of course I wouldn't do that. I write: for 250 milligrams of penicillin q.6 hours times 10 days. I don't write: chew on a mold a couple of times a day.

Mr. Chairman, why don't we have therapeutic tobacco? Nicotine, one of the substances in tobacco, purified is actually useful as a drug to treat autosomal dominant nocturnal frontal lobe epilepsy. Nobody writes a prescription: smoke a couple of cigarettes and cure your epilepsy. But that is what we are being asked to do.

Mr. Chairman, worse than that, this blurs the line in those States that have gone beyond medical marijuana. For instance, in Colorado, under Amendment 64, a person can grow six plants under the new law for general use, but if it is medical marijuana you can grow as many plants as you want as long you can prove you have a medicinal use.

So how is the DEA going to enforce anything when, under this amendment, they are prohibited from going into that person's house growing as many plants as they want, because that is legal under the medical marijuana part of the law, not under the new law?

Mr. Chairman, this is not the right place for this. The Ogden memorandum from this administration clearly states that the Department of Justice does not prioritize prosecution for medical marijuana—clearly states it. They don't do it. This is a solution in search of a problem that opens many other doors to the dangers of marijuana.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Dr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. WOLF.

Look, first of all, let's be clear, marijuana is an addicting substance. It is

schedule I, it is against Federal law, it was passed that way into the CSA in 1970.

What this amendment would do is, it wouldn't change the law, it would just make it difficult, if not impossible, for the DEA and the Department of Justice to enforce the law.

Members on my side have been criticizing President Obama for selective enforcement of ObamaCare and for immigration and other laws like that. So now we are going to start going down the road of selective enforcement for our drug policy.

Medicinal marijuana, what is it exactly? Folks, I can tell you it is nothing more than the end run around the laws against the legalization of marijuana. There is nothing medical or medicinal about it. It is not accepted by physicians. Oh, somebody claims it may do something for glaucoma, perhaps. Well, maybe it will, maybe it won't. But there are a lot more drugs that do a much better job than that and they are much safer.

But the most important thing I want everybody to know, Mr. Chairman, today is the fact that marijuana is highly addicting. It is the most common diagnosis for addiction in admissions to rehab centers for young people. Why in the world do we want to take away drug enforcement and leave our young people out there vulnerable? Yes, you say it can only be used by adults. Well, if it is sitting around on shelves at home the kids are going to get into it. We are already hearing about Colorado fourth-graders dealing with it. We hear about more poisonings in the emergency room.

If you look at other places that have gone down this road like Alaska, they retracted from their legalization. So I don't think we should accept at all that this is history in the making and that we are never going to go back. You look at Amsterdam, they put a lot more restrictions back in the control even in that very, very liberal nation.

So for that and many reasons I would just say tonight from a legal standpoint this amendment would not be constitutional. Our laws are currently constitutional, as found so in 2005 by the Supreme Court. And this is an extremely dangerous drug for our children and future adults and future generations.

Mr. WOLF. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is this the close of the debate?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is correct.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this is the most incredible debate we have had. Over half the States have already gone through every argument that was presented and decided against what you just heard. There are doctors at every one of those States that participated in a long debate over this and found exactly the opposite of what we have heard today.

Some people are suffering and if a doctor feels that he needs to prescribe something to alleviate that suffering, it is immoral for this government to get in the way, and that is what is happening. The State governments have recognized that a doctor has a right to treat his patient any way he sees fit, and so did our Founding Fathers.

I ask for support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 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. 20 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC.__. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to solicit, offer, or award a contract in which the federal government is required to provide a minimum number of inmates to a private correctional institution or a private detention center.

Mr. GRAYSON. For avoidance of data, I would like to have the first few words of the amendment read, please.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It prohibits the Federal Bureau of Prisons from soliciting, offering, or awarding a contract—and by the way, I am talking about a new contract, not an existing contract—to a for-profit prison that guarantees the number of prisoners that will be housed there.

I believe it is not only bad policy but fundamentally immoral to guarantee that our government will incarcerate a specific number of people so that a for-profit entity can guarantee its profit margin. Whether or not we agree on the main impetus for incarceration—punishment, rehabilitation, or some combination of both—I would hope that we can all agree that a perverse conflict of interest, such as the one that this amendment addresses, should not be allowed to exist to be able to guarantee a profit on human bodies.

This amendment seeks to eliminate any potential for a repeat of the ''kids for cash'' scandal that unfolded in 2008. In that instance, two judges from Pennsylvania accepted money from the builder of two private for-profit juvenile facilities in return for imposing harsh sentences on juveniles brought before their courts. All told, those two individuals received $2.6 million in payments from the managers at that company.

American citizens' freedom and the length of a convicted person's prison sentence should never be a line item on a business sheet. I would hate to imagine a world in which certain segments of our society could honestly question whether or not they are being targeted purely for filling an incarceration quota guaranteed to a for-profit prison.

Let me be clear. I may not like for-profit prisons, but this amendment would not ban them nor would it have any effect on existing contracts that the Federal Government has already entered into. What it does do is it bans a practice of guaranteeing under new contracts a specific number of human beings that will be jailed or imprisoned in a given year. I think that is wrong. I hope that you do too.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned what this means for the Bureau of Prisons. I am inclined to maybe take the amendment. I think that is one of the concerns, somebody comes in without knowing.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. GRAYSON. The author of this amendment, namely me, is open to whatever ameliorating second order amendments the gentleman may care to offer. I think we may be on the same wavelength here, and I would not oppose a second order amendment if the gentleman so sought one.

Mr. WOLF. Well, we may be, and I think that is probably not a bad idea.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have reservations about this that are very significant. I would oppose this amendment very strongly in its current form.

All private prison contracts provide for a guaranteed population. Without this, the contractors would operate at a significant risk which could only be addressed by significantly raising their annual operating cost, and also such language would adversely impact competition. Would contractors be willing to propose a 1,000 bed facility without

guaranteed minimums for private prison services? Lack of competition would likely result in higher costs.

But here is the thing. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has both prisons operated by the government and prisons that they privately contract for. So there is never an instance where they are going to house somebody just for the purpose of meeting the obligations here. If the prison population declines and they have a contractual obligation to house them in the private prison, they will reduce the population in the government-operated facility.

The Bureau of Prisons certainly wants to retain the ability to strategically prepare and issue solicitations which allow for guaranteed population minimums.

Also, with regard to children, there are so few children in the Federal prison population because we don't want to put them in a Federal-operated prison with adults, we usually contract out for the incarceration of juveniles. To pass this amendment would make that increasingly more difficult.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question again?

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Would the gentleman agree that the gentleman's principles of guaranteeing a contract to the prison companies can be achieved by simply giving them a certain dollar amount in the contract, which I will concede my amendment does not prohibit? All my amendment prohibits is guaranteeing a certain number of bodies. Would the gentleman concede that allowing them to get their guaranteed contract through dollar amounts would achieve the same purpose, and would the gentleman concede that this amendment allows that?

Mr. GOODLATTE. First of all, let me say that it would not achieve the purpose of having a competitive bid process for the operation of prisons. Because if you would accept that premise you would have the Federal Government offering contracts; then if they are not utilizing those contracts the taxpayers are going to suffer the loss as a result of that.

As long as the Federal Government, which operates a very large prison system, has both publicly-run facilities and privately contracts you are not going to have the problem that the gentleman's amendment is concerned about addressing, and that is somehow people being incarcerated simply for the purpose of meeting the contractual obligations.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am going to rise in opposition to the amendment. There are just so many questions. I think Chairman GOODLATTE raises them.

We are open to work with you as we go through it. It is quarter after 9. Nobody is there at the Bureau of Prisons. We are not going to get a constructive answer, and we don't want to do something that causes damage.

One, I am going to oppose the amendment. Mr. GOODLATTE was so convincing.

And secondly, we will be willing to work with you though to see. Because I understand what you are trying to do, and I am sort of sympathetic to it. But for now with the way it is drafted I will oppose the amendment and ask for a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I hate to be the bearer of bad news, but the prison system that the Federal Government is operating, which has been growing exponentially over the last decade, will have gobbled up—by the time we pass this bill—about a fourth of the DOJ's budget. This is like the Pac-Man arcade game that keeps eating money.

Now, there are very interesting things going on in the land. There are Democrats and Republicans. There are the most conservative people in our country and the most liberal who are saying things that are fascinating, like we need to stop incarcerating so many people, that America really should not be the leading nation in the world in the percentage of people that we put in jail and that maybe we need to rethink part of what we are doing.

We have the problem of having very violent criminals we don't seem to have enough prison space for because we are locking up nonviolent people for things that we should probably find some way to have diversions for.

We have had multiple amendments today for diversion programs. You might not want to call them that, but that is what they are—drug courts, veterans courts. These are vehicles by which to divert people from the prison system because we know something about the prison system.

We know that, if you put people in there, the most likely circumstance is that they are going to go back again and again and again and that they are going to go back for increasingly more serious and more violent activities because the one thing that is happening in the prisons is that they are becoming involved in a vocation that is essentially antisocial.

I am not dealing with the amendment itself because the chairman is right, in that we need to know what it says, and we need to act in a responsible way, but we should not be, in any way, under some illusion that we are going to continue, as a country, to just put more and more people away.

It doesn't make sense, and as politicians who are supposed to be leading the most powerful nation in the world, we need to start to make some sense on this point.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. That is why, last year, we launched an overcriminalization of Federal law task force. We are looking at prison overpopulation and who is getting sentenced and what kind of alternative sentencing should be looked at and what kind of attention should be given to prisoners when they are in prison, so that we reduce the recidivism rate, which also can reduce the prison population.

As to one of the things I think we should do, there are a number of States that are seeing declining populations in their prisons, and they are not getting high recidivism rates. We should be looking at those States and finding out what they are doing.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, I can tell you that those are States that the chairman and the former ranking member, Mollohan—and now myself—have been investing in, in the Justice reinvestment programs, that help States think through how to do just that and operate a more safe environment for their people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment and work with the chairman and me, and we will see to what degree we might be able to meet his concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, based upon the kind representations of the Chair and based upon the kind representations of the ranking member, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer or temporarily assign employees to the Office of the Pardon Attorney for the purpose of screening clemency applications.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds from this bill from being used to transfer or to detail employees to the Office of the Pardon Attorney.

The President possesses the constitutional authority to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States. However, in the first 5 years of this President's administration, President Obama granted fewer pardons and

commutations than any of his recent predecessors.

Earlier this year, the Deputy Attorney General took the unprecedented step of asking the defense bar for assistance in recruiting candidates for executive clemency, specifically Federal drug offenders.

The Justice Department intends to beef up its pardon attorney's office to process applications for commutations of sentence for Federal drug offenders. This is clear, and this amendment would prohibit that.

The Constitution gives the President the pardon power, but the fact that the President has finally chosen to use that power and to use it solely on behalf of drug offenders shows that this is little more than a political ploy by the administration to bypass Congress yet again.

This is not as the Founders intended, an exercise of the power to provide for exceptions in favor of unfortunate guilt, but the use of the pardon power to benefit an entire class of offenders who were duly convicted in a court of law and is serving a sentence. It is also just the latest example of executive overreach by this administration.

I am urging the support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, this is impractical. If there were a resignation in the office and if you needed to have a temporary detailee, it would be prohibited from this amendment. The last thing we would want is the President using such extraordinary power without the benefit of proper staff and due diligence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, no one denies the constitutional power of the President to grant clemency. The question here is whether this power is being used by the President of the United States as a way around the enforcement of the law as passed by the Congress when you invite mass representations of defense attorneys that thousands of their clients are entitled to have clemency granted to them. That is not a proper use of this power, and the Congress should not fund that office for that purpose.

I think the gentleman's amendment is well-advised, and I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Holding amendment.

Mr. HOLDING. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 Executive Order 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer a simple amendment to address an overreach by the executive branch of our government.

My amendment bans the use of Federal funds for the implementation of Executive Order No. 13547. Executive Order No. 13547, signed in 2010, requires that 63-plus bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof.

This amendment addresses a critical executive branch encroachment into the powers of Congress as set forth in our Constitution. The activities being conducted under E.O. 13547 have not been authorized by Congress, nor have appropriations been made by Congress to fund these activities.

Mr. Chair, since 2010, this body has voted several times in support of this amendment in a bipartisan manner. Today, I am offering this amendment, again, because concerns have been raised that the effects of the recently created National Ocean Policy may extend well beyond restricting the ocean and inland activities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this harmful amendment. This amendment would cripple the important ocean planning efforts supported by the National Ocean Policy.

Our oceans are not just important to coastal regions, like the one I represent on the central coast of California, but they are important to our Nation as a whole, and the many uses of the ocean, such as tourism, shipping, fishing, and construction, are increasingly complex and require a cohesive decisionmaking process.

That is why I support funding for the National Ocean Policy, which simply aims to coordinate marine activities in harmony with existing laws. By reducing redundancies and conflicting government actions, we can remove burdens on ocean stakeholders and better focus our efforts on the more serious issues jeopardizing ocean health, and we can give our local communities the ability to make informed choices about how they use their marine environments.

A vote against the National Ocean Policy is a vote against government efficiency through smart ocean planning.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this.

I was around when this National Ocean Policy was before Congress and was heard in the committee. In fact, the commission that created it was created by Congress, and the members were appointed by President George Bush, and those members included members of the oil and gas industry.

They came up with recommendations that we need to do the conflicts of sea resolution, and that is what the National Ocean Policy does. It gets all of the Federal agencies together, and because they are together and can talk about what they each do when they are in conflict, the priorities it supports are consistent with the Gulf of Mexico Alliance, which is supported by Governor Perry and the Gulf State Governors.

It supports activities at Texas A&M, as they have signed a letter opposing any legislation that would undermine the National Ocean Policy. It affects the Texas coastal programs based in Houston, and they have also signed a letter in opposition to this amendment.

A local example of National Ocean Policy work is with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Navy, NOAA, the U.S. Geological Survey, and NASA. They have all worked on sensitive shorelines just north and south of Houston, which are key destinations for birders and beachgoers. They were able to resolve the critical conflicts between these agencies. Also, it would have an impact on the Port of Houston.

So there are reasons you want to avoid a conflict of interest. This is a great one with which to do it. We do it in law enforcement, we do it in firefighting, and we ought to do it with our conflicts in the oceans. Oppose this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from the great State of Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you for yielding me the time and for recognizing that it is the great State of Maine.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, which would block funding for the implementation of the National Ocean Policy.

This important policy seeks to improve the coordinated management of our oceans and coasts to address the most pressing issues facing our oceans, our resources, and our coastal communities. I happen to live on an island 12 miles off the coast of Maine, so I am well aware of the need for the improved coordination between Federal agencies and the inclusion of stakeholders in the policymaking process.

The National Ocean Policy brings together a variety of agencies at a single table, and it improves government efficiency and decision outcomes.

The work and research conducted under the National Ocean Policy supports tens of millions of jobs, which, in turn, generate billions of dollars for our coastal communities.

□ 2130

For example, in Maine, working waterfronts are critically important to Maine's coastal economy. These working waterfronts are critical for a variety of water-dependent activities, like ports and fishing docks, that are at the heart of our coastal culture and economy.

These water-dependent businesses, many of which are icons in Maine, are struggling to maintain their access to water in the face of increasing development pressure.

The National Ocean Policy will provide a framework to preserve waterfront access to traditional groups like fishermen. It is an extremely important issue for fishermen and the residents of Maine.

One of the constituents in my district, Richard Nelson, a lobsterman, says: ''The ocean is our workplace, our cultural heritage, and it economically sustains us and our extended communities.''

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting wise stewardship of our Nation's oceans and our ocean economy by opposing this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming the balance of my time, without oceans that are alive and healthy, we are going to be challenged ourselves to live.

Our Nation has the responsibility for the greatest amount of oceans anywhere in the world. It is tough being the United States of America. We have some responsibility.

We now, for the first time ever, have an ocean policy, and the gentleman offers a proposal to prohibit the implementation of a policy to create better health for our coastal communities and for our oceans.

I reject the amendment, and hope that the House would do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think now that you have heard the arguments against my amendment, it is important to set the record straight as far as what the real history was.

Congress did pass an act to establish a National Ocean Commission. That Commission was appointed by President Bush. And it made recommendations, but it did nothing else.

Those recommendations were considered by the 108th, 109th, 110th, and 111th Congresses, and Congress elected to take no action on those recommendations. Therefore, it is the intent of Congress that no further activity take place.

The President has wired around Congress by signing this executive order to establish a commission to empower 63 agencies to go spend money for which no funds have been appropriated and under which it has no statutory authority.

I have got 93 interests that include fishing, agricultural, farming, energy, and other industries that are concerned about the impact of this Federal overreach.

Again, this is a simple amendment that just stands up for the constitutional rights of this Congress to create the statutes under which this activity can be conducted.

We may not be against ocean planning. What we are for, though, is for the Constitution and to stand up for our congressional rights to enact the statutes related to this activity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section 221 of title 13, United States Code, with respect to the American Community Survey.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the American Community Survey, first of all, is not the Census. What it is is a survey conducted by the Census Bureau of a portion of the American population every year. It has 48 questions, and those questions are intrusive.

There is, in my opinion, intimidation by the Community Survey workers to get this information from citizens.

A single mother in my district told me one of the workers came by her house and started peeping in the window, knocking on the door, and sat in the street waiting for her to come home from work to get this information from her.

The information is intrusive. It violates the right of privacy, in my opinion. It asks questions like: How many times have you been married? Does anyone in your household have a mental problem? What time do you go to work? And: How many toilets do you have?

It is 48 very intrusive questions.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the Federal Government from enforcing a potential fine against a person for failure to fill out this information. Right now, if a person doesn't fill out this information, Community Survey workers tell the citizen that they can be fined $5,000.

Do we really want to fine Americans $5,000 for not telling the government how many toilets they have in their home?

There are other ways this information can be gathered by the government without being intrusive and without violating the right of privacy.

I would ask Members to support my amendment to prohibit a fine being imposed on the American Community Survey, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I will not take more than 50 seconds.

Simply put, the notion that we as a country are better off having less information defies most logic that I can think of at this hour of the night.

I think more information is probably good, and I would ask that we vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would make this simple comment. This information can be gathered by other means without violating the right of privacy of citizens, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for the ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS'' may be used in contravention of sections 509 and 510 of title 28, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple amendment, as well, that I can imagine nothing more than bipartisan support for.

First of all, I want to again thank the chairman, Mr. WOLF, and the ranking member, for their steadfastness and leadership on this appropriations bill, and to again acknowledge Mr. WOLF in his service and tenure not only to his district, but to the Nation.

I believe that we all have come for the common understanding that this Nation is founded on principles of due process and justice, and as well the recognition that we have a system of criminal justice laws that there are people who will be incarcerated.

I am very glad that I serve on the Judiciary Committee, where my chairman, Chairman GOODLATTE, along with Ranking Member CONYERS, established an overcriminalization task force.

With that in mind, it is to discuss how you look at laws and be fair to the individual that may be the victim, but also the person that was the perpetrator, or to look at the different charges and various offenses and determine whether or not today, in 2014, they are still appropriate.

My amendment is an amendment that addresses the question of the existing authority of the Attorney General to manage executive responsibilities under 28 U.S.C. 509 and 28 U.S.C. 510 as relates to authorizing the performance by any other officer and as it relates to all functions of agencies and employees.

It speaks to the question of prison overcrowding. It is straightforward, as I indicated. It makes a positive contribution to the problem.

The United States incarcerates nearly 25 percent of the world's inmates, even though it only has 5 percent of the world's population. Thirty years ago, there were less than 30,000 inmates in the Federal system. Today, there are nearly 216,000—an increase of 800 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked on this issue for almost two decades. In the early 1990s, I offered an amendment for good time, early release legislation, to look at providing relief to inmates who had been in the Federal system and reached the age of 45, had in fact not been engaged in any violent crime with a weapon, and had no violent incidents while they were incarcerated. We made the recommendation that we would have the opportunity to release those older inmates.

I am very glad to say that Senator Kennedy had the same kind of legislation. Over the years, we managed to get it into the authorization bill.

But, as I indicated, no other country imprisons a larger percentage of its population. The prison system costs $6.5 billion. That is part of the appropriations today.

My amendment will alleviate this overcrowding by clarifying that nothing in this bill prohibits the Attorney General from exercising his statutory authorities to expand the use of executive clemency to address prison overcrowding and redress sentencing injustices, so long as he does so in a manner consistent with the law and the Constitution.

Much of the overcrowding of our Federal prison system is a direct and proximate result of a proliferation of offenses carrying mandatory minimums. That is the basis of the Over-Criminalization Task Force. Again, I applaud the Judiciary Committee for that.

Heretofore, we had the 100 to 1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine. We in the Judiciary Committee changed that, along with the Senate. The President signed that legislation.

We now know the cost of imprisoning so many nonviolent offenders is fiscally unsustainable and morally unjustifiable. Remember, my emphasis has been that which is within the context of the law. And the legislation that I offered for the good time, early release was for nonviolent offenders.

It will take the combined efforts of policymakers, reform advocates, legal professionals, and private citizens to solve the problem. I can assure you there is a bar of lawyers that are interested in making sure that their clients come under the law and are treated fairly under the law.

My amendment gives life to this question by allowing the Attorney General, whoever it might be, to act within the law.

Just quickly, I give an example of Clarence Aaron of Mobile, Alabama, who was arrested in 1992 with 20 kilograms of power cocaine and distributed it as crack cocaine. It was in 1992. He received an enormous sentence. He was a first-time offender, and received a life sentence.

These are the kinds of issues that can be addressed if we are acting within the law.

My amendment simply says to act within the law using the authority that is given and to be able to address these questions of the overincarceration of persons and to give people a second chance.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Thank you for this opportunity to briefly explain my amendment.

Let me offer my appreciation and thanks to Ranking Member FATTAH and to Chairman WOLF for their work on this legislation and decades long commitment to the administration of justice and to developing sensible reforms to make our criminal justice system better.

Thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple, straightforward, and makes a positive contribution to the problem of overcrowding in our federal prisons.

The United States incarcerates nearly 25 percent of the world's inmates, even though it only has 5 percent of the world's population.

Thirty years ago, there were less than 30,000 inmates in the federal system; today, there are nearly 216,000, an increase of 800 percent!

No other country imprisons a larger percentage of its population than the United States or spends anywhere near the $6.5 billion that we spend annually on prison administration.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help alleviate this overcrowding by clarifying that nothing in the bill prohibits the Attorney General from exercising his statutory authorities to expand the use of executive clemency to address prison overcrowding and redress sentencing injustices so long as he does so in a manner consistent with law and the Constitution.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for the ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS'' may be used in contravention of sections 509 and 510 of title 28, United States Code.

Much of the overcrowding of our federal prison system is the direct and proximate result of proliferation of offenses carrying mandatory minimums and the prior unjust and discriminatory 100 to 1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine sentences in federal law.

We now know the cost of imprisoning so many non-violent offenders is fiscally unsustainable and morally unjustifiable and it will take the combined efforts of policy makers, reform advocates, legal professionals, and private citizens to solve the problem.

There is no shortage of stories about the damage done to the lives of thousands of individuals and their families by the draconian sentencing laws passed by Congress and state legislatures beginning in the late 1980s in the ''War on Drugs.''

An example is Clarence Aaron, of Mobile, Alabama who was arrested in 1992 by federal law enforcement officers and charged with conspiring to process 20 kilograms of powder cocaine and distribute it as crack cocaine.

Even though this was his first offense, Clarence was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole because the judge was powerless to adjust the punishment to fit the crime because he was required by law to impose the sentence called for by the then-mandatory federal sentencing guidelines.

The case of Clarence Aaron case is not an aberration. The sad fact is that half of all inmates in the federal system (52%) were incarcerated for drug offenses, a rate more than three times as great (17%) as found in the state penal system.

And the racial and ethnic composition of federal inmates incarcerated for drug offenses is equally troubling because while whites and African Americans use drugs at similar rates, African Americans are much more likely to be arrested and sentenced for drug offenses.

Indeed, African Americans and Hispanics comprise more than 6 in 10 federal inmates incarcerated for drug offenses.

And African American offenders receive sentences that are 10 percent longer than white offenders for the same crimes and are 21 percent more likely to receive mandatory-minimum sentences than white defendants according to the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

In 2010, after years of working to reform our drug sentencing laws, our efforts finally bore fruit when the Congress passed and President

Obama signed into law the "Fair Sentencing Act of 2010" (P.L. 111–220), which finally ended the discriminatory 100:1 sentencing ratio.

But since the provisions of the "Fair Sentencing Act" are not retroactive there is still much work left to be done.

We need to keep working for reform until all federal inmates sentenced under the old regime are afforded the opportunity to have their sentences reconsidered under the provisions of current law.

Fortunately, Clarence Aaron will not be one of those who still must wait because after serving more than 20 years in federal prison, he was freed on April 17 because he was one of eight persons granted executive clemency, or a reduction in sentence, by President Obama on December 19, 2013.

The power to grant a reduction in sentence is among the powers vested exclusively to, and committed to the sound discretion of, the President by the Pardon Clause (Art. II, §2, Clause 1) of the U.S. Constitution.

In exercising clemency powers under the Constitution, the President typically relies upon the counsel and recommendations of the Attorney General.

President Obama's grant of executive clemency to Clarence Aaron and seven others was an act of simple justice and a welcome development.

So too is the announcement by the Department of Justice that it intends to be more aggressive in identifying and recommending to the President additional candidates for executive clemency consideration.

Let me emphasize that executive clemency is not amnesty. These inmates have been incarcerated for many years.

Applications for executive clemency that are most likely to receive favorable consideration are those submitted by non-violent, low-level drug offenders who were not leaders of, or had any significant ties to, large-scale organizations, gangs, or cartels.

Mr. Chair, until and unless the provisions of the "Fair Sentencing Act of 2010" (P.L. 111–220), are made retroactive, the need for innovative and effective measures to reduce prison overcrowding and bring greater fairness to federal sentencing policy will remain great.

The Jackson Lee Amendment ensures that Attorney General retains the latitude to develop and implement policies relating to requests for executive clemency for deserving petitioners, which will help reduce prison overcrowding and save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

[From Justice News]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS—ANNOUNCING NEW CLEMENCY INITIATIVE, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL JAMES M. COLE DETAILS BROAD NEW CRITERIA FOR APPLICANTS

As part of the Justice Department's new clemency initiative, Deputy Attorney General James M. Cole announced six criteria the department will consider when reviewing and expediting clemency applications from federal inmates.

Under the new initiative, the department will prioritize clemency applications from inmates who meet all of the following factors:

1. They are currently serving a federal sentence in prison and, by operation of law, likely would have received a substantially lower sentence if convicted of the same offense(s) today;

2. They are non-violent, low-level offenders without significant ties to large scale criminal organizations, gangs or cartels;

3. They have served at least 10 years of their prison sentence;

4. They do not have a significant criminal history;

5. They have demonstrated good conduct in prison; and

6. They have no history of violence prior to or during their current term of imprisonment.

"For our criminal justice system to be effective, it needs to not only be fair; but it also must be perceived as being fair," said Deputy Attorney General Cole. "Older, stringent punishments that are out of line with sentences imposed under today's laws erode people's confidence in our criminal justice system, and I am confident that this initiative will go far to promote the most fundamental of American ideals—equal justice under law."

In December 2013, President Obama commuted the sentences of eight individuals who were sentenced under an outdated regime—many of whom would have already paid their debt to society if they had been sentenced under current law. Since that time, President Obama has said he wants to consider more applications for clemency from inmates similarly situated.

28 U.S.C. §509: The Attorney General may from time to time make such provisions as he considers appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, employee, or agency of the Department of Justice of any function of the Attorney General.

28 U.S.C. §509: All functions of other officers of the Department of Justice and all functions of agencies and employees of the Department of Justice are vested in the Attorney General except the functions—

1. vested by subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 in administrative law judges employed by the Department of Justice;

2. of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.; and

3. of the Board of Directors and officers of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. I understand it says you must follow the law.

I accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7606 ("Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research") of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Pub. L. No. 113–79) by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with four of my colleagues to offer a bipartisan amendment that simply requires the DEA to comply with Federal law.

Despite clear language in the recently passed farm bill that specifically allows State agricultural agencies and universities to grow industrial hemp for research, the DEA decided to ignore the plain text of a Federal statute.

Officials in my home State of Kentucky were recently forced to file a lawsuit in Federal court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds intended for a university research pilot program. What a waste of time, money, and the court system's limited resources.

□ 2145

States cannot launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA seizes the seeds before they reach their destination, and although the DEA did recently agree to release the seeds, my amendment ensures that this type of DEA action won't happen again.

If this were simply about seeds, I wouldn't be here. We have got that resolved, but there are further issues. There are more issues.

For instance, the DEA has been very ambiguous on whether they are going to assert authority to say that hemp can't be grown on private property. Listen, where else are you going to grow it? It is not like the government has farms.

The farm bill is clear on this language. The farm bill says that the State authorities shall register these sites, not the DEA; yet the DEA refuses to acknowledge that.

Furthermore, with regard to the seeds, the DEA requires—and this I find ridiculous—that the seeds—and these are industrial hemp seeds with no active THC—must be kept under lock and key, with only three keys available.

The way we have got these stored in Kentucky now is you put your handprint on the door and you can get into these hemp seeds. You want to know how ridiculous that is?

By the end of this growing season, we are going to have thousands of pounds of hemp seeds, not 250 pounds of hemp seeds. The question is: What is the DEA going to do going forward?

We just want them to simply obey the law. The fact is that growing hemp for research purposes has always been legal. So why hasn't it been done? Because it required interfacing with the DEA, and the DEA purposely used regulations to stop any of this research.

The farm bill that I cosponsored was to clear the way for hemp industrial research, not to perpetuate a broken

process where the DEA obfuscates and delays, but to give that freedom to State and local governments.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this is where I came in a little while ago. The gentlewoman was correct, that I was speaking earlier about this amendment and not hers. However, I oppose both these amendments. The principle is the same.

With regard to this amendment, I would say to the gentleman that the gentleman's amendment in the farm bill is new law, and it is being implemented, but it does not exclude the role of the DEA.

Your amendment here today would strip funds from the ability of the DEA to be involved, and the involvement is as described in your amendment with regard to the confiscation, seizure, and otherwise impeding the importation, transfer, and movement in interstate or interstate commerce of seeds intended for the purpose of growing or cultivating industrial hemp.

Mr. MASSIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. That is not my amendment that you just read.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Okay. What is your amendment then?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASSIE. The Clerk read it, but if you may, it says:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7606 (''Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research'') of the Agricultural Act of 2014 by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

My amendment at the desk says nothing about seeds.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Okay. Well, seeds or hemp, you have to still have the involvement of the DEA because seeds and hemp can be used to grow marijuana, as well as to grow hemp.

So if you don't have the ability to determine, just by looking at it, whether or not it is something that is going to be used for research purposes for hemp or whether it is going to be used to grow illegal marijuana to be sold to whoever, you need to have the DEA involved in that process.

If you take the DEA out of the process, which your amendment in the farm bill did not do and which I would strongly oppose having occur now, you are going to have a situation where this law will be honored in name only and will not be used for the purpose for which I presume you intended it, which is to do research with regard to the growing of hemp.

That is not what you are going to have here because you cannot determine, for example, the THC limits of cannabis plants simply by looking at them. You have got to have this examined, you have got to have it licensed, and that is a proper thing to do since the law requires it to be done.

The DEA needs to fulfill the role that the law requires them to do for that very purpose. As a result, I must strongly oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman be willing to share a minute of that with our side?

Mr. MASSIE. Yes. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment I am proud to cosponsor with Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

This amendment simply says that none of the funds in the CJS bill can be used by the Department of Justice or the DEA in contravention of the section of the farm bill—the duly-enacted farm bill, which I supported for many reasons, one of which was that it had an industrial hemp research program, that authorizes industrial hemp research.

This is very simple. We passed a bipartisan farm bill. Its provisions are law. In Kentucky, one of the States conducting research, the DEA intervened. Only when Kentucky sued did the DEA get out of the way.

The amendment restates a law that is already on the books, but maybe the DEA needs to hear it twice. Remember, it is rope, not dope.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. MASSIE. I hope the chairman will vote for my amendment. Basically, it just says that we are going to enforce the farm bill, the language of the farm bill, and the farm bill is very clear in its language. It says no other Federal law withstanding.

Isn't it ironic that thousands of pounds of cocaine and heroin are somehow passing our borders every week? Yet the DEA thinks that seizing industrial hemp seeds in Kentucky is worthwhile use of its time and resources.

Furthermore, what are they going to do this fall when we harvest the hemp seeds?

There is no import-export there. These are Kentucky hemp seeds once they are grown in Kentucky. There is no Federal nexus this fall, so I hope that the farm bill and the language in the farm bill will be honored. We voted for it. It was signed by the President.

Our amendment is simple. It states that no funds may be used by the Department of Justice or Drug Enforcement Administration to violate the clear language of the farm bill, which says: States are allowed to grow and cultivate industrial hemp if the industrial hemp is grown or cultivated for the purposes of research conducted under an agricultural pilot program or other agricultural or academic research.

The DEA is not above Congress. It is not above the law. Executive branch agencies like the DEA must follow the laws passed by the legislative branch.

Please join us in support of this commonsense, reasonable 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 Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 assess or collect the fee established by section 660.115 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking two of my colleagues, Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, for their hard work. I have been collaborating with them on this and related efforts to bring relief to our west coast fishermen.

This is a simple amendment. It would defer for 1 year the collection of a cost recovery fee in the west coast trawl program and provide some relief to groundfish fishermen who are facing mounting costs at a time when they can ill afford it.

The west coast groundfish industry has been rebuilding its stocks for several years. They have made hard decisions and taken hard cuts to ensure the long-term sustainability of that fishery, and they should be commended for that.

One aspect of that rebuilding plan was the adoption of a catch share program which, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, required the collection of a fee to cover costs of managing the program, and that was implemented this year.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. We accept the amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. 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 develop, approve, or implement a new limited access privilege program (as that term is used in section 303A of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a)) that are not already developed, approved, or implemented for any fishery under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, New England, or Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the Southerland-Tierney-Jones amendment, a bipartisan provision that reaffirms, for the third time, the House's intent that no funding under the underlying bill should be allocated for new limited access privilege programs, also known as catch shares in the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico fisheries.

Catch shares is a fishery management tool that allocates a portion of a once-open public fishery to a select group of fishermen, forcing the others off the water and out of business. Put more simply, it is cap-and-trade for the oceans.

Our bipartisan amendment takes a big step towards halting the perpetuation of economic harm on our coastal communities, one of which my family has lived in for 200 years.

Let me be clear, our amendment has zero impact on catch shares already in place. If you have catch shares now, you will have them tomorrow, but we owe our fishermen a voice in addressing these issues through the House and Senate reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management Act before we consider funding for the development, implementation, or approval of new catch share programs. That is proper process. It is common sense.

I encourage all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan Southerland-Tierney-Jones amendment and preventing the funding of development, implementation, and approval of new catch share programs going forward.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. We accept the amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. If the chairman would yield, we have a member of the committee who wanted to say a few words on this and had some concerns. She is only going to take a minute.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment offered here tonight because I think we shouldn't be prohibiting any new catch share programs because it is such an important tool to manage our Nation's fisheries. This effectively supersedes the Regional Fisheries Management Council process that was already set up by Congress.

We have a lot of families in Maine who have very deep ties to the ocean, generations of Mainers who have worked in the fishing industry, but fisheries are facing a crisis.

Every year, our fishermen struggle to make a living on fewer fish and fewer trips going out fishing. The New England Fisheries Management Council is working very hard to develop solutions for these challenges by implementing catch share programs as an effective way to manage the fisheries.

This results in success stories, many that we have seen in Maine. Take a look at Port Clyde, one of our largest inshore fisheries communities. The fishermen in this sector have developed a fishermen's cooperative, Port Clyde Fresh Catch, as a way to market their fish using environmentally conscious fishing methods.

The result is sustainable fish, better quality fish, better prices for the fishermen. Membership in the sector has led to a profitable and sustainable on and offshore fishing industry.

I just want to say that fishermen in New England are not being forced into enrolling in the catch share programs. They can choose to stay in the common pool fishery or join a sector, but if we remove catch share as a management option, we would only be hindering fisheries management efforts around our Nation, stifling the creativity and innovation within the fishing industry, and preventing fishermen from working in an industry that is safer and more profitable.

□ 2200

Catch shares work. I have seen the benefits firsthand in Maine. I don't think we should be denying fishing communities the chance to improve their industry by removing a management option.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I respect Chairman WOLF's ability to accept the amendment. I just wanted to register my opposition to it.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOLF. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I also want to remind my colleagues that no one was a greater champion of my amendment than former Massachusetts Congressman Barney Frank. He is definitely a stalwart in New England fisheries. So though he is not here, his spirit in favor of this amendment rings true.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for his work on this issue and his leadership on it, and I would like to thank the Democrats for allowing us to have this.

I want to just tell you, as a father who spends time in the Gulf of Mexico, in 2007, we were allowed to fish, as a family, 194 days out of the year. For 194 days, I could go out with my son and we could catch snapper, and we could catch up to four fish apiece. Today, we have now been reduced to 9 days. We have lost 95 percent. Mr. Chairman, 95 percent of the time that a family could spend on the water fishing together has been taken from us as sportsmen in the Gulf of Mexico with regard to red snapper.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for his work on this. I want to thank the other Members of the House for understanding us and how important this issue is to those of us who are the recreational anglers.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I want every father and son to be able to fish year-round in our Federal waters. Nine days is a problem—it absolutely is a problem—and I look forward to working with both the gentlemen from Florida and Georgia to ensure open access to our Federal waters.

I am also upset with NOAA and their continuously low stock assessment and flawed assessment methods.

My opposition to this amendment comes from the negative impacts that it will have on head boat captains in the EFP. This is a pilot program.

The Texas gulf coast, the area that I proudly represent, has a strong fishing heritage. Recreational and commercial fishing supports nearly 40,000 jobs in my State and generates $4.2 billion in sales.

I have talked to fishermen in my district, Mr. Chairman, and they are

against this amendment. They don't believe that the bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., should be telling—I agree with the gentlelady from Maine—regional fishing councils and local fishermen how to manage their fishery.

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is comprised of local fishermen and folks that have lived on the gulf their whole life. This council is developing and testing a very successful pilot program, where head boat captains have access to the water year-round—not just 9 days, year-round.

Under this program, they catch the same amount of fish but have the flexibility and freedom to go out when it is most convenient for their customers. I have heard from my constituents, and they want this program to grow, like the gentlelady said. This amendment would gut that pilot program and kick people out of the water.

Mr. Chairman, as a proud conservative, I believe that fishery management decisions should be made at the local level. Given the challenges our fishermen face, Congress should ensure local councils have all the tools in the fishery management toolbox available to them.

I will vote against this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of any of the following:

(1) The fifth and 14th amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs).

(3) Section 809(c)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (relating to prohibition of discrimination).

(4) Section 210401(a) of the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (relating to unlawful police pattern or practice).

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have read that amendment. It says that you are to follow the law. I agree with that, so I accept the amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. I will take ''yes'' for an answer, Mr. Chairman.

So with that, 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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Advanced Food Technology Project.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman WOLF for offering me this opportunity.

This amendment prohibits the funding for NASA's Advanced Food Technology project, the AFT. The AFT project is responsible for providing spaceflight crews with a food system that is safe, nutritious, and acceptable to the crew while efficiently balancing appropriate vehicle mass, volume, waste, and food preparation time for exploration missions to Mars. The problem is we are not going to Mars anytime soon.

Since we have accepted as a fact that other nations such as Russia will be taking the lead on space exploration and we have no plans to go back into space over the next fiscal year—at least to Mars—there is no reason to waste taxpayer money on food research for a mission to Mars.

This project has been highlighted as a source of waste for years by my colleagues in the United States Senate, starting with NASA's use of taxpayer money to develop pizza and hundreds of other recipes for, again, a mission to Mars, which NASA has no plans to undertake. I want to ensure that taxpayer funding is not wasted on projects that are not going to happen.

I urge passage of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. I accept the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, with brevity, I reject the entire predicate of the amendment, that we are not going to Mars or that Russia is leading space exploration or any of the other things.

However, I understand the gentleman would not like to not waste the taxpayers' money, and, therefore, he has offered this amendment. The chairman has accepted it. But the idea that our country is not the leading premier nation in the world in space exploration, I do not accept.

And with that point, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition outlined in 48 CFR 52.209–7(c)(1)(i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act.''

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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, no hardworking American should ever have to worry about whether her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or take money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. This practice is known as wage theft.

Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are still allowed to apply for Federal contracts. My amendment would deny Federal contracts to those who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act to deny workers the pay they have earned. The

amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support. We should only reward good actors.

Taxpayer money must be spent wisely, and as the largest purchaser of goods and services, the Federal Government must find a way to make sure that funds are going to companies that treat their workers fairly and according to the law and that give every American family a chance to succeed. More importantly, it signals to working Americans around the country that wage theft will not be tolerated.

Low-wage workers are fighting back. They are demanding that they be treated fairly. And now it is time for Congress to stand with these low-wage workers and say clearly that wage theft is not anything that we are willing to tolerate.

So we may not agree on the minimum wage or we may not agree on a lot of other things, but I believe Americans on both sides of the aisle believe that a penny earned is a penny that must be paid. Any time a Federal contractor is found to have violated a worker's rights and is found to have been guilty of that, according to the law, that Federal contractor should not benefit from the money in this particular bill.

So with the remainder of my time, I would like to just add that this is a very serious problem. A recent report by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee in the United States Senate reveals that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors. There should be a consequence. Similarly, the National Employment Law Project study found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime, and 11 percent have been forced to work off the clock.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that we can get cooperation from all Members on this.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and will add the point that many of these Federal workers are women who are the head of their household, and, therefore, the undermining of their compensation based upon overtime and the theft of wages because they are not paid fully for their work and hours really undermines the family.

□ 2215

So I believe that this is a very important amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. No one knows what the amendment does. If you know what this amendment does, you should vote for it because nobody else seems to know. And that is one of the problems of these things coming rolling in at 10:15. I don't know what it does, and I wouldn't want to vote for it since I don't know what it does. So if you know what it does and you are for it, you can vote for it. But no one knows what it does.

So I strongly urge, in the interest of making sure that this place does not mess up, 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 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 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for a loan guarantee for Innovative Technologies in Manufacturing under the heading ''Economic Development Administration, Economic Development Assistance Programs.''

Mr. BROUN of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds from being used for the loan guarantee program created by the America COMPETES Act of 2010, a program which is essentially an $84 billion science experiment in stimulus spending.

The America COMPETES Act directed the Commerce Department to establish loan guarantees within the Innovative Technologies in Manufacturing program of the Economic Development Administration, or EDA.

These government-backed loans are meant to provide small or medium-sized manufacturers with new opportunities to use, manufacture, or commercialize any innovative technology. However, authorization for America COMPETES ran out in 2013 with little passing interest from industry. In fact, not one loan has been issued under this program to date—not one, not the first one.

In July of 2013, the Government Accountability Office found that the EDA had done nothing with its appropriated funds outside of establishing a staffing budget and a timeline for executing the program. At the same time, GAO noted that EDA officials had reached out to the Small Business Administration for technical assistance on how to run a loan guarantee program.

Mr. Chairman, think about this for a moment. If one government agency needs to consult another government agency about how to run a program which is similar to a program that is already established elsewhere, is the new program really necessary?

There are similar programs sprinkled throughout the Federal Government, yet we keep authorizing more and more. Congress needs to seriously reevaluate this approach and instead focus on real innovation in manufacturing. I would submit that if the Federal Government simply stopped taxing small and medium-sized businesses out of the country—or out of business—we would see an immediate increase in growth and new jobs, no new programs needed.

The America COMPETES loan guarantee program is a wasteful, duplicative attempt to spur innovation in manufacturing by creating more bureaucracy, and we should not allow it to go any further. Not one loan has been put out by this program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. So we have had about 30,000 small and medium manufacturers close their shop in our country over last 20 years. We have 11 million Americans who go to work every day making things with their hands. We still lead the world as the number one manufacturer, but what used to be an absolute lead is now relative. Part of the challenge is technology.

This Congress has provided writeoffs for new machinery and other types of write-downs on capital equipment. We need to fortify our manufacturing base, and we also need to provide technical support. We provide billions of dollars to our National Laboratories. I went out to visit Oak Ridge in Tennessee. They have a manufacturing center there that helps small manufacturers think through their challenges. And the last thing we need to do is to retreat on this battlefield on manufacturing.

So the gentleman from Georgia is headed in the wrong direction. I hope

that the Congress does not follow him. I will be voting against this amendment, and I support this technology loan guarantee program. In fact, I authored it in this bill, and, yes, it has been built up over the last couple years to make sure that before they do anything that they do it correctly because we want to get it right.

But the one thing we should be certain about is that small and medium manufacturers, which are at the heart of our manufacturing industry in our country, they need our support, and this is a way to help them. It is not a handout, it is a loan, and it is actually a loan guarantee.

It is a way to go to help manufacturers across our land, and I hope that even at this late hour that we not fall victim to the suggestion that we can't do what we should do to make sure that this country can continue to lead in this critical area.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, during the public comment period, there was absolutely zero interest in this program—zero. The SBA already does this. I am all for manufacturing. I am all for small and medium businesses. But we do not need this program. It is an $84 billion program with no interest in it within small or medium businesses. Not one loan has been given out. All it has done is fund the bureaucrats that are established to do this program, and no loans have been made since 2010. In 4 years, zero loans, zero interest. We need to eliminate it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate an agreement that includes a waiver of the 'Buy American Act'.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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. Chairman, this concerns the Buy American Act and how it interacts with the work of the Trade Representative under this bill.

The Buy American Act dates back to every Republican's favorite President, President Hoover, who signed it into office on his last day in office in 1933. It requires the U.S. Government to prefer U.S.-made products in its purchases, and there already is precedent for this in the trade organization agreement called the WTO 1996 Agreement on Government Procurement. The Buy American Act was specifically excluded from the government procurement agreements program.

We are coming up upon a time when, according to news reports, the President may be presenting us with trade agreements. He may be presenting us with a fast track procedure for those trade agreements. The fast track procedure would basically give us a take-it-or-leave-it situation on these principles. Obviously, these trade agreements that have been negotiated are complex, but I think that we shouldn't be throwing out the baby with the bath water.

This is an 80-year-old law. It requires that the American Government give preference to American-made products when making procurement decisions. This is a commonsense principle that guides purchasing throughout the Federal Government, as it should.

Hard-earned American taxpayer dollars should be reused here at home. They should be going back into our economy and putting Americans back to work. I would hate to see this fundamental principle of government procurement slurred or undermined in any way by any agreement that is now being negotiated by the Trade Representative or anybody else in this administration or any future administration.

Therefore, I submit this amendment to make certain that the agreements now being negotiated, the ones being negotiated in the future, respect this basic, fundamental principle that American dollars and American jobs are what the American Government is all about.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition on the amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available to the National Science Foundation by this Act may be used to examine climate effects on tea quality and socioeconomic responses under award number 1313775–CNH.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to cut all funding for the National Science Foundation's program to study the climate effects on tea quality and socioeconomic responses in China and other locations. In fact, I find it deeply troubling that while our country is facing fiscal challenges of gigantic proportions, staring down over $17.5 trillion in debt, that I can quickly find programs such as this that are being funded on the back of the American taxpayer.

To date, this program has already received about $1 million in funding. Regardless of whether or not you believe that we must get our national debt under control, I believe we can all agree that these are difficult times for American families. With this in mind, how can we seriously look our constituents in the face and assure them we are looking out for their best interest when we allow their money to be spent like this?

While I certainly understand the value of predicting agricultural trends for tea, I believe that that is a task that ought to be left to the private sector, the ones that benefit from this kind of information.

Now, amendments like this are a high watermark. If we can't make the easy choices to eliminate these kinds of programs, how are we going to do the tough cuts? In a time where things are tough enough for the average American family, we certainly don't need to add another burden such as programs like this. And I might just say, finally, that our history has shown us that government getting involved in tea policy, as Great Britain did, can lead to a very, very slippery slope. I think government needs to stay out of tea policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REED). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I will take about 50 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. I think intruding on the National Science Foundation and the work that is based on merit and peer-reviewed science, we should not be using politics in the political process as a substitute for it.

I hope that Congress would in its wisdom vote against the amendment offered by my friend, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for bringing this amendment forward. I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about appropriations bills, and, of course, people across the country are concerned, as we are, about the fact that our country is spending money we don't have. Washington spends almost 40 cents of every dollar with borrowed money. This is money we are borrowing from countries like China, ironically, and then here you have an

amendment that highlights the fact that we are spending money through the National Science Foundation on grants to study the effects of global warming on tea grown in China.

I mean, is this part of the deal that we cut with China when they loan us money to continue deficit spending? This is ludicrous. This is a classic example of wasteful Washington spending. And I commend, again, the gentleman for bringing this amendment because there are opportunities we have to highlight areas of wasteful Washington spending where we should at least be able to agree, as Republicans and Democrats, that every single dollar we are looking at we ought to ask the first question: Is this program—is this program worth borrowing money not only from countries like China, but borrowing money from our children? Our children are going to have to pay for these bills. And does this really rise to that level that it is worth borrowing money from our children, who are going to be getting that credit card bill, $931,000 of tax payer money, to study the effects of climate change on tea grown in China?

□ 2230

This is ludicrous. This is ludicrous spending. We ought not be doing it. We ought to at least be able to set priorities and agree, as Republicans and Democrats, that we are going to get serious about fiscal responsibility, and it starts with the little things.

This is not billions and trillions that we are talking about, but this is how you get to billions and trillions of dollars of debt. So while China holds maybe over a trillion dollars of our debt, I don't think it is going to cause any kind of international relations problem, that fact that we are going to say we should not spend $931,000 of money we don't have that is being borrowed from countries like China to study the effects of global warming on tea grown in China.

This is ludicrous. This doesn't pass the laugh test. When they say it is not all of the tea in China, this is a place where we should agree to stop spending taxpayer money on something that is incredibly wasteful.

Again, this is money borrowed from our children and borrowed from countries like China. We ought not be doing it.

Again, I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment. It is a great example where we should be able to agree and say enough is enough.

Mr. SALMON. I will just say in summation, I think the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) said it very well, and that is: How in the world are we going to get to the serious cuts to try to get our budget balanced if we can't even cut a million dollars to give to China to see how China's tea is going to grow with climate change?

This is ridiculous. If we can't do an easy thing like this, I fear for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC.__. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compel a journalist or reporter to testify about information or sources that the journalist or reporter states in a motion to quash the subpeona that he has obtained as a journalist or reporter and that he regards as confidential.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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, I regret bringing this up at 10:30 at night. I apologize for that because this is a weighty matter, and I think it deserves fair consideration. I hope we are not all too tired to deny this question the attention that it deserves.

The purpose of this amendment is to raise the possibility of a Federal shield law that corresponds to shield law already in place in 49 States, but not at the level of the Federal Government.

A shield law is legislation designed to protect a reporter's privilege or the right of news reporters to refuse to testify as to information and sources of information obtained during a news gather and dissemination process. In short, a reporter should not be forced to reveal his or her source, and that is in fact the law in 49 States, the only exception being Wyoming.

This has come up in court cases at the Federal level and at the Supreme Court level, beginning with the 1972 case Branzburg v. Hayes, which I think poses this question in the microcosm.

In that case, a reporter wanted to inform his readers about the nature of the drug hashish, and he realized the only way to go about that was to find and interview people who had actually used the drug hashish, and so he did that.

After he published his article, relying upon these two confidential sources, at that point, he was subpoenaed to provide those sources, compromising their identity and compromising the principle of protecting your sources.

This is an issue that comes up from time to time, often at the State level, occasionally at the Federal level.

Some of us may remember the case of the Plame affair, the CIA leak scandal. A reporter was asked to release the name of the person to whom he had been perceived to leak regarding Valerie Plame. Reporters were asked, in general: Who are your sources with regards to this leak?

One reporter, Judith Miller of The New York Times, was jailed for 85 days in 2005 for refusing to disclose her source in the government probe.

At this point, under current law, journalists are in a quandary. They realize the need to protect their sources. That right is recognized in 49 States, but it is not codified at the Federal level, so what I seek to do at this late hour today is to do just that.

I think this is a very important principle, as Branzburg pointed out, that springs from the foundation of our law. The Constitution and the First Amendment provide for freedom of speech and of the press. It is completely incongruous to say we have freedom of the press, but the Federal Government can subpoena your sources and put them and you in prison—you, if you don't comply.

This is something that should have been handled perhaps years, if not decades ago. It falls upon us tonight, at this late hour, to try to handle it ourselves. I respectfully submit this amendment as being a much-needed and long-delayed clarification that the Federal Government treats this matter no differently than 49 States now do, and therefore, I ask for support on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is significant change. The authorizers should be looking at this. This is not something to put on an appropriation bill at 10:35 at night.

I listened to the gentleman, and a lot of what he said, I seem to agree with, but you have to really look at this and have hearings, and for those reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I share the gentleman from Florida's interest and support for shield laws as well, but I don't believe this has been carefully vetted. There are implications here about exactly who has the right to make the determination about whether or not funds could or could not be used. The way the language reads suggests that maybe the reporter would have that right, rather than a court.

To me, this is not the best way to go about doing this. We will continue to work on shield law legislation in the House Judiciary Committee, which has passed out forms of shield law in the past, and we will continue to work on it.

I must oppose this amendment in these circumstances. I don't think this is the right place to legislate something as complicated as this issue.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and think he is exactly right.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Without claiming my own time, I just want to support the thrust of this proposed amendment, which is that we should provide a shield law. The idea that, in 2005, a reporter was jailed for over 85 days is wrong, and we do want to have the freedom.

We have a constitutional responsibility to protect the freedom of press, but I agree with the chairman, we don't want to do it on an appropriations bill at 10:30 at night. We want to make sure it is clear what we are doing, so I oppose the amendment under those circumstances.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Supreme Court decision that we are talking about here was decided in 1972. There have already been hearings. There has been plenty of draft legislation. It is hard enough to get anything voted on around here. It is time to vote on this.

After 42 years since the Supreme Court first addressed this, we don't have this body on record saying whether or not there should be a Federal shield law. I understand the reservations that have been expressed, but the time is now.

The reporters in this country have waited long enough. It is time to be fair and show fealty to the First Amendment and to pass this amendment tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 create or maintain a national firearm registry.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study the social effects of online interactive games.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how humans react to popular baby names.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how humans react to trends in popular culture.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study any facet of professional or collegiate sports, their games, or their playoff systems.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study whether or not humans are more or less racially-focused when seeking love online.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study the effects of romance novels on human activities.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study whether or not any social media application is able to predict trends in the stock market or any global trading market.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how rumors are started.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how much housework a member of one household creates for the rest of such household.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study the relationship between online virtual world users and their avatars.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how long animals can run on treadmills.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how humans ride bikes.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study robot rodeo hoedowns (defined as assemblies of robotic devices brought to central locations for the purposes of being programmed to move in unison for no other purpose than entertainment, record-setting, or to generally recreate or attempt to recreate any form of dance) or what they look like.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how dog became man's best friend.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to continue to withhold from the Treasury undisbursed grant balances for grants which were initiated before January 1, 2013.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to instruct any financial institution to designate a firearms dealer as a ''high-risk'' merchant customer for the purposes of restricting or regulating commerce.

Mr. GOSAR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a multifaceted amendment to limit funds within the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act to programs that are constitutional, appropriate, and sane.

For the sake of time, I will just highlight some of the provisions within my amendment.

My amendment protects Second Amendment rights and individual liberties. It does so by prohibiting a Federal firearm registry from being created with funds in this bill. Similar language has previously passed the House.

I also want to bring the House's attention to some of the ludicrous studies that taxpayers have funded via the National Science Foundation.

First, I appreciate the National Science Foundation's mission and its work. The National Science Foundation grantees and funds have been instrumental in advances in the Internet, astronomy, energy, chemistry, and many other important aspects of scientific scholarship; but, like our well-funded government operations, the bureaucracy begins to grow and proper oversight of the grant process begins to wane.

In 2011, Senator TOM COBURN released a publication titled ''The National Science Foundation: Under the Microscope.'' In that document, he outlined a litany of wasteful, superfluous, and seemingly idiotic studies, some of which I will outline here.

There was a study on human reaction to popular baby names. There was a $580,000 grant to study racial preferences in online dating. There was nearly $1 million in multiple grants to study how rumors are started.

There have been nearly two decades of grants awarded to a certain panel in which the National Science Foundation has granted about $60 million. One of the panel's studies covered how much housework a man creates for a wife in his household. There was a $90,000 grant to study the relationship between a researcher and their online avatar in virtual worlds and differences in their behaviors.

Since 2000, grants provided by the National Science Foundation have been used to study crustaceans running on tiny treadmills after being exposed to different microbes.

These little shrimp were also given tiny backpacks to weigh them down, so researchers could study test variables such as weight and resistance. In 2011, the lab said it planned to build treadmills and create studies for lobsters and blue crabs as well. This amendment would prevent these types of abuses.

There was a 2009 grant disbursed to the tune of $300,000, to study how humans ride bicycles. There was another $300,000, which actually came from the stimulus funds, that was disbursed to a married couple to travel to seven countries around the world to study stray dogs in an effort to discover how dogs became man's best friend. Sounds like a heck of a honeymoon to me.

Possibly the most ridiculous grant highlighted by Senator COBURN's report was a National Science Foundation grant to support a robot rodeo hoedown. Let me repeat that: a robot rodeo hoedown. I would like to point out how laughable it was to my staff to work with legislative counsel to define what a hoedown is for the purpose of this amendment.

The project involved programming small robots to dance to ''Chicken

Coop Shuffle,'' but I suppose the event wasn't a total loss. It produced hundreds of YouTube views.

I want to, again, thank Senator COBURN and his staff for producing these reports that shed light on these issues. My amendment will not prohibit all future ridiculous taxpayer-funded studies, but hopefully, I can take part in shedding a little bit of light of those that are the most egregious.

The hope is that those people awarding these moneys wake up and use a little more discretion with hard-earned taxpayer money, but I have a feeling I will be back here next year offering a similar amendment. I urge passage of this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires new determinations.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

□ 2245

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to obtain the contents of wire or electronic communications in a remote computing service as described in section 2703(b)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to correct a serious injustice against U.S. citizens and the United States Constitution.

As many of us learned from the intelligence disclosures last year, the Federal Government is engaged in a wide variety of surveillance practices. These practices, though mostly focused internationally, also encompass domestic communications on a regular basis.

I hear many in the executive branch—and the legislative branch, no doubt—making excuses as to why this happens or how that is not all that bad, but I say that it is. It is an absolute violation of our basic civil liberties and the Fourth Amendment.

I could go on and on about the different practices that violate our Constitution and the trust of the people, but my amendment focuses on one simple statute, one simple statute I believe almost everyone will agree needs to be changed. Section 2703 of title 18, U.S.C., United States Code, allows the Federal Government to obtain your personal emails in your email account if they are 180 days or older. It is essentially a carte blanche authority to do so.

What is it about a piece of email being 180 days old that suddenly makes it the business of the government? What is it about a piece of email being 180 days old that suddenly makes it no longer your property? After 6 months, are those emails suddenly a threat to national security? Moreover, if these personal emails do discuss plots against the Nation, in many cases it is a little too little, a little too late to do anything since the government is 6 months behind the ball.

I do not know anyone who can make a legitimate argument to keep this provision of law. I know of no real justification.

To put support for this amendment in perspective, I will point out that there are a handful of bills in the House that abolish or significantly alter this provision of law.

One of these bills is H.R. 1847, introduced by my friend and colleague Congressman MATT SALMON of Arizona. The other is H.R. 1852, introduced by my friend Congressman KEVIN YODER of Kansas. If you add up all the Republicans and Democrats cosponsoring these two bills alone, the number is 217, just about enough to pass this amendment. I can tell you that our constituencies certainly do not accept this gross violation of privacy and abuse of power.

We saw a good bill in the U.S. Freedom Act get watered down and mutilated last week, which was a disgrace. I supported the original act because it made real reforms. I voted against the version that came to the floor because it extended section 215 of the PATRIOT Act for another 2 years.

But can we not agree on this one simple change?

Must the NSA or the FBI or the Department of Homeland Security have access to our emails that are several years old with no other justification than an arbitrary date? I think not.

I urge passage of my commonsense amendment.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for raising this important issue.

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act was written long before the Internet was in common use. It is out of date. It needs to be modernized. It needs to have some of the requirements that not only the gentleman has noted, but also some of the courts of appeals have noted.

However, the particular way this amendment works on the particular section of the Stored Communications Act, which is a part of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, has implications beyond what I think the gentleman intends would have a significant impact on not only Federal, but also State and local law enforcement ability to carry out their job.

If the gentleman would agree to work with me, as have the two individuals that you referred to have introduced bills and many others in this Congress who know that this needs to be modified—I have had conversations with Senator LEAHY, chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, and we have agreed that this is a priority for both of us to significantly reform this law and address some of the very concerns that the gentleman raises. If he would agree to withdraw the amendment, I would look forward to working with him and others to accomplish that goal in what I think would be a better setting. We have already held two hearings on this issue, and we will be continuing to work on this in an expeditious manner in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, with the understanding that the chairman has given, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to design, implement, administer, or carry out the U.S. Global Climate Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866.

Mr. PERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, it is my understanding the chairman accepts the amendment. If that is the case, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. WOLF. I accept the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 relinquish the responsibility of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration with respect to Internet domain name system functions, including responsibility with respect to the authoritative root zone file and the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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. Chair, I think most Americans are aware that the President has recently stated that he intends to transfer the core functions of the Internet to an international or foreign body. What my amendment does today will prohibit the President from using any of these funds to relinquish control of those core functions to the Internet.

I think this is an incredibly important amendment because America and our zest for freedom of speech has made sure that the Internet is an open forum for dialogue, an open forum for ideas. By relinquishing these rights or core functions to a foreign body, I don't think we will retain the current system of the Internet and the current rights of freedom of speech that the Internet currently enjoys.

If you look at stakeholders, you have a say in how the Internet is run. I think when we use the term ''stakeholders,'' what we are really referring to are foreign governments and corporations. I think we have to ask the question: Do we think that China, that Russia, that Iran, who have a say in the core functions of the Internet, have the same concern for the freedom of speech that we Americans do?

I think it is important that this institution use its control of the purse strings to limit the President's authority to transfer those core functions to this foreign body.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and I appreciate him offering it.

Have you seen how difficult it is to get sanctions in Syria from Putin? sanctions against the Sudanese with regard to the genocide from China?

The gentleman is right. I accept the amendment and urge all Members to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Mr. DUFFY's amendment.

The current way the Internet is governed is soon set to change, as we all know, and the question remains: Who will take over? The answer will have consequences for human rights, for the global economy, as well as Internet security and stability.

We must get it right. It is important to the future of our economy. It is important to the type of world we want to live in. We need to ensure the continuation of an open and accessible Internet which can serve to fulfill people's aspirations for freedom and for democracy. And when it comes to Internet policy, the administration has botched consultations over the transition of the duties at the NTIA.

We cannot allow countries to use their influence to stifle speech and commerce on the Internet. This amendment will give us more time to ensure we get this right.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, the process that the gentleman seeks to intervene in with this amendment started some 16 years ago. And I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect this, that apparently if a Presidential election doesn't go in the right direction, the other team's notion is to yank all of the authority away from the person who did win.

Unfortunately in our democracy, it doesn't work like that. When they are not calling for some Member of the Cabinet to resign or doing something else to intervene in the President's authority, they have these theories. Well, this new theory is that Obama has concocted some strategy to turn over the Internet to our enemies.

This is a process that started 16 years ago, and through the Bush administration and the Clinton administration. It is a process having to do with what we might want to call the yellow pages for the Internet, the domain names and how people can create their addresses on the Internet.

The theory of the Internet was to have no government in control. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America has been one of the major proponents of this. I don't believe that anyone on the other team would suggest that somehow they have concocted this scheme with the President to have us empower the Syrians or someone with control of the Internet.

So it is hard for me to focus on this as a substantive matter, because the truth is so far from what has been stated it is hard to reconcile the two things. But the point here is that one of the things that we have tried to say to the rest of the world is that the Internet is not controlled by government, that it is an opportunity for people to enjoy an American ideal, which is freedom of speech, freedom of association.

There were those on the other team who were happy when, during the Arab Spring, people were using social media and Twitter to interact against oppressive regimes around the world. So we have this kind of selective amnesia on these issues. It seems to come into play having anything to do with the Obama administration. There is nothing I can do about it this evening. Maybe it is covered under the Affordable Care Act. But I oppose this amendment, and I oppose the knee-jerk, irresponsible actions that would suggest to countries like China and others that we want to control the Internet versus we want it to be an opportunity for people to gather information, speak freely, and associate freely.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to enforce the Fair Housing Act in a manner that relies upon an allegation of liability under 24 C.F.R. 100.500.

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 2300

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that stops the Justice Department from using one of the most dangerous and illogical legal theories of all times: the theory of disparate impact.

In short, disparate impact liability allows the government to allege discrimination on the basis of race or other factors based solely on the statistical analysis that finds disproportionate results among different groups of people.

In recent years, the Justice Department has increasingly used this dubious theory in lawsuits against mortgage lenders, insurers, and landlords, and forced these companies to pay multimillion dollar settlements.

What is wrong with this, one might ask? Well, under disparate impact, one could never intentionally discriminate in any way, and even then have strong antidiscriminatory policies in place, and still be found to have discriminated.

If, for example, a mortgage lender uses a completely objective standard to assess the credit risk, such as the debt-to-income ratio, they can still be found to have discriminated if the data show different loan approval rates for different groups of consumers.

Some of these statistical differences and outcomes may actually be due to discrimination, but others may not be. It is impossible to tell which is which from the statistics alone. Under disparate impact it doesn't matter though. All statistical differences are considered by themselves discrimination.

To be clear, none of us have a tolerance for intentional discrimination. If there is intentional discrimination, we must prosecute it to the fullest extent of the law. The Justice Department's use of disparate impact, however, tries to fight one injustice with another.

On a more practical level, disparate impact will make it difficult, if not impossible, for lenders to make rational economic decisions about risk. Lenders will feel the pressure to weaken their current standards to keep their lending statistics in line with whatever the Justice Department bureaucrats consider nondiscriminatory.

We have seen what this discriminatory and damaging risky lending can do to our economy. It is truly reckless for our government to be encouraging those dangerous and short-sighted practices to continue.

Ironically, disparate impact forces lenders, insurers, and landlords to constantly take race, ethnicity, gender, and other factors into account or risk running afoul of the Justice Department.

You and I both know, Mr. Chairman, that even an accusation of discrimination could have a devastating impact on a small business.

I quote Roger Clegg, who is the president and general counsel for the Center for Equal Opportunity. He said:

> The disparate impact standard for antidiscrimination law pushes people to do one of two things: Get rid of legitimate selection criteria, or use a racial double standard to ensure that the numbers come out right.

On balance, Mr. Chairman, disparate impact will make it more difficult and expensive for families to buy a home, and will result in more discrimination not less.

For these reasons, both philosophical and practical, I ask my colleagues to reject this misguided theory by supporting my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether I can raise a point of order against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is already pending.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I won't waste the Congress' time going through a great deal of debate. But as brief as I can, what the gentleman's amendment says is no matter what the result, if whole classifications of people are discriminated against based on a set of policies, the DOJ can do nothing about it. That is the America he wants, and I hope the Congress would register our opinion on it when we get a chance to vote. We will be seeking a roll call vote on this matter.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GARRETT. You just said something. You said that the Justice Department will not go after them if a whole set of policies result in discriminations.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, what I said is what the gentleman offers to the House is an opportunity where no matter what the result, if whole classifications of people are left out, i.e., there is a disparate impact, that DOJ can't go after it. That is what you offered to the House.

I appreciate your offering, and we will see what kind of America we would like to have when we cast a vote on this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think what America wants is to only be able to bring lawsuits against discrimination when there was, in fact, intentional discrimination, not just because, at the end result from some statistics, some may believe that there was discrimination. If there was intentional discrimination, this amendment does not do anything that would prevent the Justice Department from proceeding.

I would like to enter into the RECORD support for legislation from a number of organizations, including the Consumer Mortgage Coalition, Credit Union National Association, National Association of Federal Credit Unions, and also NAMIC, PCI, and American Insurance Association, which in part states:

> All 50 States have a strong and comprehensive antidiscrimination regulatory regime, including definitions of unacceptable conduct and full panoply of enforcement tools that includes rate approval, license revocation, and fines. There is no evidence that these regimes are insufficient.

Furthermore, they state:

> Under the disparate impact theory, even when a lender takes every step to prevent discrimination and treats all consumers fairly and equally, a neutral policy can serve as a basis for very serious and harmful results.

And ''could increase the cost and undermine the availability of credit throughout the economy.''

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES ASSOCIATION, CONSUMER MORTGAGE COALITION, CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY BANKERS OF AMERICA, MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

May 29, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned organizations support Representative Garrett's amendment to H.R. 4660, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The amendment would prohibit any funds made available by the Act from being used for litigation in which the Department of Justice (DOJ) seeks to prove illegal discrimination based on the ''disparate impact'' theory.

All of our organizations and their member companies view illegal discrimination in housing and lending as morally, ethically, and legally abhorrent and do not tolerate it in any size, shape or form. They are committed to providing financial services to American consumers in full compliance with all lending laws.

Recently, the Department of Justice, along with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), entered into a $98 million settlement with Ally Financial and Ally Bank over allegations that it discriminated against minority borrowers in its indirect auto lending program. The order represents the federal government's largest auto loan discrimination settlement in history. The CFPB and DOJ based their allegations solely on a disparate impact theory of discrimination. They do not allege that Ally intentionally discriminated against any consumers. This settlement was only a part of a larger joint effort between the CFPB and DOJ to address disparate impact in the auto lending market.

Disparate impact claims also have been brought under the Fair Housing Act pursuant to rules issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is notwithstanding that the basis for such claims under the Act is in considerable dispute.

Under the disparate impact theory, even when a lender takes every step to prevent

discrimination and treats all consumers fairly and equally, a neutral policy can serve as a basis for very serious and harmful claims in the absence of intentional discrimination. Smaller lenders, in particular, will find it difficult to manage this type of litigation risk. Left unchecked, disparate impact enforcement could increase the cost and undermine the availability of credit throughout the economy.

We ask the Members of the House of Representatives to vote in favor of Representative Garrett's amendment.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES, PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSOCIATION

May 29, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned insurance trade organizations strongly support Rep. Scott Garrett's amendment to H.R. 4660 to prevent the Department of Justice (DOJ) from using funds to litigate in order to prove illegal discrimination based on the ''disparate impact'' theory. In particular, we are concerned about the use of the ''disparate impact'' theory in relation to a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rule (24 C.F.R. 100.500) issued on February 15, 2013. The new rule would allow HUD and DOJ to hold insurers liable for discrimination when a housing-related practice has a discriminatory effect based on ''disparate impact'' theory.

We individually and collectively abhor any unfair discrimination in any aspect of insurance. However, application of the rule to the provision and pricing of homeowners insurance as HUD intends is impractical and contrary to existing State and Federal law. All 50 States have a strong and comprehensive anti-discrimination regulatory regime, including definitions of unacceptable conduct and a full panoply of enforcement tools that includes rate approval, license revocation, and fines. There is no evidence that these regimes have been insufficient.

The rule could be used to challenge common and regulator-approved factors used for risk-based pricing—including an applicant's claims history, construction materials, the presence or absence of a security system, and distance from a firehouse—if they were found to result in a statistical disparity for a class defined by race, ethnicity, or gender. However, accurate risk classification is essential to the business of insurance and treating similar risk profiles in a similar manner is a form of reasonable and fair underwriting that is at the very heart of the business of insurance. The rule ignores this and under it, an insurance company acting in full compliance with a State rating law standard could see itself challenged under the ''disparate impact'' theory.

Accordingly, the rule is impractical and contrary to existing law. Therefore, we support passage of Mr. Garrett's amendment to H.R. 4660 to prevent DOJ from funding litigation to prove illegal discrimination based on the ''disparate impact'' theory.

Sincerely,

American Insurance Association, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America.

Mr. GARRETT. In the end, Mr. Speaker, what we are intending to do here is to allow for the Justice Department to proceed when there is evidence of intentional discrimination. But when there is no evidence whatsoever, when it is purely on statistics, then it should not proceed under that theory of law.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one other point here.

Every single Federal appellate court has upheld a way to proceed in terms of looking at the impact of policies.

What the gentleman offers is that if American baseball looks like it looked prior to Jackie Robinson, that that is just perfectly fine. I happen to think that American baseball is a little bit as a pastime more enjoyable for all of us after the Jackie Robinson decision, which was to take into account those who have been left out and to take an affirmative action to include them in. That is the America I want my children to grow up in.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out Operation Choke Point.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Mr. Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, how does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it simply doesn't like? Easy. It cuts that industry off from the financial services it needs to operate.

Sound impossible? Sure, it does. However, that is exactly what the Department of Justice is doing in conjunction with the FDIC. This program even has a name: Operation Choke Point. It is designed to force legally operating and licensed entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need.

What started with nondepository lenders is spreading to other industries. Media reports indicate that DOJ is now pressuring financial institutions that service the gun and ammunition industries. As a former bank examiner and banker, I know how they are using the power of their position to intimidate the banks and undermine the banks' ability to serve their customers who are doing a legal business. It is just plain wrong, Mr. Chairman.

However, I want to be very clear. I strongly support DOJ's authority to go after the bad actors. Those actions should be commended and should not be inhibited. But what cannot be tolerated is the Federal Government using its authority to broadly target entire industries, including those that obey the law and are living within the rules.

The staff report just released in the Oversight Committee summarizes 853 pages of internal DOJ documents. Many of these internal documents show that even DOJ officials question the legality of their actions, and yet they continue.

This isn't a Republican or Democrat issue. This isn't a conservative or liberal issue. This is an issue of DOJ stepping outside the law.

We have worked on a bipartisan basis to inform DOJ and other regulators of the unintended consequences of Operation Choke Point, but those concerns have fallen on deaf ears.

As a result, this bipartisan amendment is an important step to ensuring that DOJ can continue to do its job, but makes clear the Department must not abuse its authorities.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my good friend.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

I supported the original intent of Operation Choke Point, which sought to restrict online payday lenders, usually operating from overseas, from lending in States that prohibit payday lending, but the program expanded and is now being pushed well beyond its stated objective.

Eliminating fraud and illegal transactions from our Nation's payment system should continue to be a priority for the Department of Justice and other Federal regulators, but employing a ''dragnet'' on companies engaged in legitimate business activities is wrong.

State banking commissioners have also expressed concerns the Federal agencies are attempting to deny essential banking services to lawful State-licensed firms.

Operation Choke Point pressures banks to close accounts and stop processing payments for those businesses that pose a reputational risk.

What is happening here is this approach, this dragnet approach, causes a chilling effect on legitimate businesses and legitimate banking services. As a consequence, going after bad guys, the Department of Justice needs to do that, but not in such a broad, all-inclusive way to chill legitimate business.

That is why I support this amendment, and ask for an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. With that, Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by saying I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's support.

This is an agency that has gone well beyond the scope of its authority. It even questions its own authority in its internal memos. The original intent is questionable, but at this point it has gone well beyond even the original intent. There is now even a list of other industries to go after.

I think that this is a situation where we need to stop what is going on, and I think my amendment clearly sets out what needs to be done.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Consumer and financial fraud are major crimes in the country, and fraud investigations are a matter of high priority for the FBI.

I just think this issue ought to be addressed by the committee of jurisdiction. In this case, the Judiciary Committee, also the Financial Services Committee.

We do hear stories of, outside of military bases, veterans being exploited.

I am just concerned about what it actually means, and I think it ought to be looked at by the committee of jurisdiction and not by the Appropriations Committee at 11:15 at night. So for that reason I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. I concur with the chairman. Maybe it will get approved, but not in our bill and not at this time because we don't completely understand it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 under the heading ''Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 2315

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits any of the funds used within this portion of the bill from going to cities that have passed and enacted what we call sanctuary cities or sanctuary political subdivisions. The section of the code that we refer to, 8 U.S.C. 1373, reads this way:

Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which would now be ICE, information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

This is current law. We have multiple cities in the country that are violating current law, and they are doing so with impunity, and when we send funds out of this appropriations bill to those cities, it simply ignores an opportunity that we have to restrain these cities, which is for them to come back and comply with Federal law.

I was brought up in a law enforcement family. I had the Constitution waved at me on a regular basis. It was expressed to me clearly that it is the supreme law of the land, and the enumerator powers in it, which this Congress does assert and defend, are included within 8 U.S.C. 1373.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if these cities and if these political subdivisions disagree with Federal law, they can come here and ask Congress to change the law, but to defy it and to do so with the level of impunity that they have cannot be accepted by the United States Congress. We have a responsibility to assert our constitutional and statutory authority.

That is what my amendment does. It says any cities that have sanctuary policies and that implement those sanctuary policies are not going to receive funds out of this section of the bill, and the dollar figure we are dealing with here is from a fund of $1.235 billion.

I would point out that, today, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, testified before the Judiciary Committee. He was speaking specifically of Secure Communities, the act that allows for fingerprints to be transferred back and forth between the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, or the NCIC.

He said:

Even with the Secure Communities issue, we have mayors and Governors pursuing laws that limit the effectiveness of Secure Communities.

This addresses Secure Communities in this way, and it addresses sanctuary city policies, of which the Secure Communities policy, according to Secretary Jeh Johnson, is a very worthy one.

So this supports at least the tone of the message delivered today in the Judiciary Committee, and it supports what this Congress has done multiple times in the past. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, obviously, between the Garrett amendment on disparate impact and this, this is, I guess, not actually part of their effort to reach out for a greater fan base—the idea that local communities can't make decisions in their own interests and that we need the heavy hand of the Federal Government to herd them into some particular set of responsibilities that are actually our responsibilities.

Immigration law is our responsibility. It is not a local community's responsibility. When the fire department shows up, it is supposed to put the fire out, not worry about where someone's papers are. I just think that it is somewhat contradictory of what we hear from the other team about where they are headed, but this might be representative thereof, rather than doing comprehensive immigration reform.

We must do our job as the United States Congress. Now, the Senate has done its job. The President has said that he wants to sign a comprehensive bill. The Chamber of Commerce and all of the various religious and faith-based groups in our country have come forward, but rather than the Congress taking up a bill—any bill—on immigration reform, what we have is this constant effort to get at local communities that are just trying to make the best of a very tough situation that the Federal Government is creating.

Now, we will burden them because we don't want to take our responsibility and enact a comprehensive immigration program.

I am opposed to this amendment, but I am pleased that the gentleman has reminded us that this is, in essence, the immigration program that has some currency from the majority party. We should do something different than this, and we can.

There are 218 votes on this floor that would do comprehensive immigration reform if we would bring it, then we wouldn't have to deal with these kinds of amendments year in and year out, bill in and bill out, because we would have dealt with the problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that these political subdivisions, particularly in the cities, are contravening and ordering their officers not to cooperate with Federal immigration officers, refusing to allow them to collaborate with or to transport or to otherwise cooperate with our Federal immigration officers.

We simply cannot have a law enforcement structure in the United States

where you don't have local and State and Federal officers cooperating with each other. It is not good for our communities' security, and it is not good for our national security.

This is in defiance with and in contravention of Federal law that directs that they cannot do this. They write these ordinances anyway in defiance of the law, and this Congress must assert its primary authority over the funding that flows to those communities.

If we fail to do that, we shouldn't be surprised if there are many other Federal laws that are contravened or defied, so I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read 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 negotiate or enter into a trade agreement that establishes a limit on greenhouse gas emissions. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

Mr. MEADOWS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I have a very simple amendment. Currently, there are negotiations going on with the USTR. This amendment would prohibit funding to have any of the negotiations to enter into a trade agreement that would establish a limit on greenhouse gas emissions.

The 110th Congress—Democratically-controlled Congress—rejected the cap-and-trade in 2009. It would be very clear in supporting this amendment that we would carry on the will of the House in terms of making sure that we wouldn't use any funds to circumvent the will of Congress.

Additionally, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce came out recently with proposed rules from the EPA, which are set to come out next week, that would indicate that these types of rules could cost anywhere in the neighborhood of 3.5 million jobs over the next 15 years.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to seek time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

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

Mr. FATTAH. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the amounts made available by this Act may be used for any program not authorized by law as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to offer an amendment to the CJS appropriations bill that would prohibit the funding for any program that is not authorized by law.

For far too long, Congress has continued to appropriate spending on government programs with little or no oversight. Our country has essentially been on autopilot towards a cliff of fiscal and economic disaster.

This has resulted in a massive and out-of-control, bloated bureaucracy. In this bill alone, there are 141 unauthorized programs. Some of these programs were last authorized in 1993, and there are others that have never been authorized.

In total, these unauthorized and unchecked programs in this legislation receive $57 billion. With over $17 trillion in debt, it is time for us to say: enough is enough.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSON. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania when I get a second.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funding in the bill for unauthorized programs. It parallels my Sunset Act of 2014, H.R. 3847, which would force Congress to actually do oversight and evaluate each individual program.

This type of sweeping reform would dramatically overhaul the way Washington budgets and spends hard-earned taxpayer dollars, and it would allow Congress to finally take back control, scale back our bloated bureaucracy, and provide accountability for the Federal Government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman would yield for a second.

My question was that a large swath of our bill has not been authorized, including NASA, so we have to deal with transport back and forth to the International Space Station.

Even though it has not been reauthorized, your amendment, as written, would seem to prohibit NASA from being able to conduct life-sustaining activities relative to the space station.

That was my question. The gentleman neglected to yield, but I will have it stand as a rhetorical question for the moment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 provide assistance to a State, or political subdivision of a State, that has in effect any law, policy, or procedure in contravention of immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the opportunity, and it looks like I am probably bringing up the boots. I think I am on a boat, as they say. I am the last one coming in.

I just want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the time.

I have been watching all night, and I just want to thank you all for the work you have done on this bill, and I look forward to offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to ensure that no funds appropriated under H.R. 4660 are used to assist States and localities whose laws and policies are in direct contradiction to Federal immigration law and enforcement efforts.

State and local jurisdictions are implementing policies that directly contradict U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's statutorily-mandated mission to identify and ultimately remove illegal aliens who are currently incarcerated.

Not only do these policies go against the spirit and the letter of the laws enacted by this body, but they ultimately do a disservice to the very communities that they are designed to protect.

Local jurisdictions are increasingly implementing policies that bar State and local officials, including law enforcement officials, from asking people about their immigration statuses, from reporting them to Federal immigration authorities, or otherwise cooperating with or assisting Federal immigration authorities.

Some jurisdictions are even going farther to defy Federal law by implementing antidetainer policies that restrict local and State police from cooperating with Federal authorities that are seeking to remove aliens who have been arrested and charged with other crimes, and when local sheriffs choose to follow the Federal law and honor ICE detainers, some have been slapped with a lawsuit for cooperating with these detainers.

In response to a number of local jurisdictions for their refusing to honor ICE detainers in all or in many cases, former ICE Director John Morton warned of what would occur.

He said that:

> The approach of one particular county is ultimately going to lead to additional crimes that would have been prevented had we been able to enforce the law as the law is presently written.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment and send a clear message that, if localities and jurisdictions refuse to honor ICE detainers and implement policies in contradiction to Federal immigration law, they should not be eligible to receive funds under this act, specifically Federal reimbursement grants under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

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

□ 2330

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in direct opposition to the amendment, and I rise with mixed emotions. I am very pleased this is the last amendment. But, nonetheless, I am opposed to it—not in the main. That is to say, of course, none of the funds in this bill should be used to operate contrary to our laws, but some of the vagueness of the language as it intersects with State and local communities and decisions they may make.

So, for instance, a local community may say that in an emergency situation public safety officers should not engage in questions about whether you have papers or not. Or, when you are seeking information about a child that has been kidnapped, and you go to a certain home or family, you shouldn't be questioning them about their immigration status when you are trying to save a child who could be in imminent danger.

There could be circumstances in which this apparent language would create a real problem.

I reluctantly oppose the amendment. I thank the gentleman for joining the party and closing us out tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the ranking member's opinion on that. As the son of a Georgia State trooper, I think the descriptions that you have just made are basically a little bit of hyperbole in the sense that when an officer or others go in an emergency and have this situation in which they would not act in the best interest of the situation which they are in.

All we are simply saying is we are not going to give Federal funds to cities and localities and States who want to directly contradict immigration local law in the normal course of business. That is exactly what this amendment does, and will continue to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me briefly say I rise to speak on this bill which directly impacts our economy, our competitiveness, and our ability to create jobs that pay well and open doors of opportunity.

While there are many positives to this bill—not limited to the strong support of NASA and the Goddard Space Flight Center, which is in my district, as well as robust funding for the National Science Foundation—this bill nonetheless makes two deep cuts to vital programs that protect against crime, promote innovation, and facilitate exports.

But the reason I wanted to come to the floor is because I wanted to take a moment to congratulate my friend, Representative FRANK WOLF of Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee who is managing this bill on the Republican side.

FRANK was elected in 1980. I was elected a few months later in a special election in 1981. We served together for 23 years on the Appropriations Committee. We served all that time until I left when I was elected majority leader.

We served on the Helsinki Commission together, which fought for human rights while the Soviet Union existed and so many were enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

FRANK WOLF has chaired this subcommittee for many, many years. He has done so with honor, with honesty, and with fairness.

He and I have served together in this House for 33 years. We sat together on the Appropriations Committee, as I said, for 23. When he retires at the end of this Congress, it will be a significant loss to the people of his district and to this House, which he has served so well.

We may sit, FRANK, on opposite sides of the aisle, but that has done nothing to diminish the friendship and alliance we have forged over the course of our service together, and the level of respect I have for him as a legislator and as a human being.

He has been indefatigable, Mr. Chairman, in his work on behalf of his constituents, on behalf of our Federal employees, and on behalf of the interests of the Washington metropolitan area.

This is his final Commerce, Justice, and Science appropriations bill, at least as being initiated on this House floor.

I know his passion and professionalism when it comes to these issues will be greatly missed, not only by the many outside groups that provide input to him and the subcommittee each year, but to his Democratic colleagues on the subcommittee, including Ranking Member CHAKA FATTAH, with whom he has worked so well, and previous ranking members who have worked well with him. I applaud them for their work.

FRANK WOLF is a principled, courageous, tenacious advocate for human rights in every corner of the Earth. I have traveled with him frequently behind the Iron Curtain to argue for those who were discriminated against, whose human rights were undermined, and whose civil rights did not exist.

FRANK WOLF is always prepared to go anywhere, anytime, in the toughest of circumstances, by himself and yes, with others, to advocate on behalf of those who had no advocate.

I have had the privilege of working with Congressman WOLF on many issues over the years. I have always found him focused on the merits of issues and not on their politics.

Mr. Chairman, I join all my colleagues in thanking him for his service to this House, to the subcommittee, to the Nation he served in the uniform of the United States Army, and to the people of his district.

I look forward, FRANK, to working with you the balance of this year as you continue your focus and advocacy on behalf of the issues which you so ably support.

The 113th Congress will come to an end, and FRANK WOLF will leave us. He will still have many things to accomplish. He will still make many significant and important contributions to his country and to his community.

I know that all the Members join me, FRANK, in thanking you for your service, your dedication, and your friendship.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I think we all owe thanks to FRANK WOLF and Mr. FATTAH for all of the work that they have done today.

This has been a long, hard slog. There has been dozens of amendments and almost endless debate, but they have stayed at the chore and they have guided us through this maze that we have been coming through—and, I think, done really well.

So I want to thank both of them for the hard work they have done on this bill yesterday, last night, and today and tonight.

In addition to what the minority leader has said about FRANK WOLF, I want to say that he and I came here together in the same class. There are only three of us left out of 54 now; two after he leaves.

FRANK WOLF, as the leader has said, never fails in compassion and honesty and transparency. He is above board. What you see is what you get. They say that character is when you do the right thing when no one is watching. Certainly, that is true of FRANK WOLF.

He is a patriot. He served his State, his district, his Nation, and the people of the world, for that matter, in an exemplary way. I can think of no one in this body that I have served with in these years together who better exemplifies honesty, integrity, and devotion to his country and family as has FRANK WOLF.

So, FRANK, we are going to miss you dearly. This is the last time that you will chair this bill on the House floor. You have been a great chairman of this subcommittee which I had the pleasure and honor of serving as chairman of for several years, and as a member of that subcommittee for many, many years. No one has done it better.

Our hearts are open when it comes to our love of FRANK WOLF. We wish him the very best in the next chapter of his life.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my request for a recorded vote on my amendment be withdrawn to the end that the amendment stand adopted by the earlier voice vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn, and the amendment stands adopted in accordance with the earlier voice vote thereon.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 14 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 15 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

Amendment by Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. SOUTHERLAND of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) 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 169, noes 230, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—169

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—230

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie

Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—32

Benishek
Bilirakis
Campbell
Capito
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Duckworth
Flores
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hurt
Lankford
Lewis
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woodall

□ 0008

Ms. JENKINS, Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri and MCKINLEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JONES, STOCKMAN, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 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 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 148, noes 253, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—148

Amash
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Capps
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—253

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Cantor
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—30

Benishek
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Duckworth
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Kaptur
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lewis
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Woodall

□ 0011

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 255, I was unexpectedly detained and therefore missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AMENDMENT NO. 15 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 is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 208, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—198

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess

Byrne
Calvert
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—208

Amash
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rokita
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Duckworth
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Woodall

□ 0015

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) 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 237, noes 170, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—237

Amash
Amodei
Barber
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—170

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry

McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Woodall

□ 0018

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CONAWAY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) 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 219, noes 189, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—219

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Welch
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Aderholt
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0022

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 189, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Amash
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0025

Mr. CONAWAY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 162, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—246

Amash
Barber
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—162

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Wagner
Walberg

Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0029

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) 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 185, noes 223, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—185

Amash
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Fleischmann
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grimm
Guthrie
Harris
Heck (NV)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—223

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Goodlatte
Granger
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0033

Messrs. PALLONE and AMASH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT 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 196, noes 211, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—196

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan

Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—211

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0036

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 262, I intended to vote "no" rather than the recorded vote of "yes." I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT 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 225, noes 183, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—225

Amash
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—183

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0039

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT 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 ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 178, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—178

Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Paulsen
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0042

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 264, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 190, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—216

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Neal
Palazzo
Rangel
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0045

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 265 on H.R. 4660, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "aye" when I should have voted "nay".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 194, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—214

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0048

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) 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 226, noes 179, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Fattah
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Kaptur
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nolan
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0051

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, 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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 585, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, sir, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

M__. ___ moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4660 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 38, line 2 (relating to amounts made available for Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 8 (relating to amounts made available for grants to combat violence against women), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6 (relating to amounts made available for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 21 (relating to amounts made available for grants to address backlogs of sexual assault kits at law enforcement agencies), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 52, line 18 (relating to amounts made available for Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Programs), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 53, line 6 (relating to amounts made available for grants for the hiring and rehiring of additional career law enforcement officers under the COPS Program), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 70, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Ms. MOORE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment of this bill. This amendment will not kill the bill nor will it merely send it back to committee, but rather, if adopted, the bill

will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is straightforward and simple. It would increase funding for three critical priorities: first, our chronically underfunded Violence Against Women Act programs; second, for grants to process the backlog on rape kits; and, third, for our Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, grants program, which was slashed deeply in the appropriations bill before us tonight.

Now, given the limited time that I have and the late hour that I have to discuss all these issues, I just want to focus my remarks on one of the Nation's staggering backlogs that we haven't talked about. We have talked, and importantly, about the backlog at the Veterans Administration, but we have been silent about the backlog of the sexual assault kits that have not been analyzed. We have not seen a similar amount of attention paid to the crisis in these rape kits that have been backlogged.

We have all heard these harrowing tales from our communities from young women and men who have waited so long for justice—and waited, and waited, and waited, and waited some more. These victims have not only endured the initial assault, but they have also endured an invasive exam to collect DNA shortly after the attack.

Mr. Speaker, these exams last for over 4 hours in some cases. It is unimaginable how difficult this is to bear. It takes so much courage for a victim to come forward and endure in hopes that the perpetrator will be caught. You know, it is the very least we owe to these victims to process all of the evidence, yet thousands of victims across the country never hear anything ever again.

Police already possess the evidence that is needed to identify and convict the perpetrators of these crimes, yet criminals remain at large primarily because these unprocessed kits remain in back rooms, warehouses, and labs. And given the sad reality that most sex offenders are recidivists, it is imperative that we close the loop on these old cases so offenders don't seek out new victims.

Part of the terror of being raped is knowing that the perpetrator is still out there, he can come back to get you, someone else, you don't know who he is, and it puts not only that individual in terror, but puts the whole community in terror.

On the aggregate level, the Department of Justice has tallied about 400,000 rape kits that remain sitting in evidence lockers, largely because local authorities can't afford the $500 to $1,500 it costs to test these kits. Some of these kits go back to the 1980s. And even though this evidence is old, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't assume that they are meaningless.

In Detroit, law enforcement personnel, as an example, are currently analyzing 11,000 abandoned kits they found in a warehouse. Six years, these kits have been sitting there for 6 years. After processing only 10 percent of these rape kits, they have identified 46 serial rapists that they have identified.

□ 0100

In New York City, they showed that after they processed their backlog of 17,000 kits, the arrest rate for rape kits increased from 40 percent to 70 percent.

The overwhelmingly scourge of backlogged kits require nothing less than a national commitment, Mr. Speaker, including a dedicated response from the United States Congress.

I am pleased that the bill before us tonight fulfills the request from the Obama administration to provide funding for a new grant program to inventory and test rape kits, develop units to pursue new investigative leads, and offer support to victims during the process.

The new investment through this bipartisan bill is an important first step.

However, through simple addition, we can tally the pending cost of clearing the backlog.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, we have now spent more than 15 hours debating and amending this bipartisan bill—and I appreciate Mr. FATTAH's help in it—that sufficiently and responsibly funds Federal programs that provide for our safety and economic well-being.

This legislation ensures that our laws are enforced, that our businesses have the tools needed to succeed, and that uncertainty doesn't hinder progress.

This bill already provides targeted increases for counterterrorism and cybersecurity, fights the scourge of drug abuse, and bolsters American scientific innovation and manufacturing.

This is also a landmark bill for reducing violence against women. It strengthens services for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking by funding above the current level and above the President's request for these programs.

In addition, it increases funding for victim assistance and programs that will address human trafficking.

After amendments, the bill includes $41 million for the Community Response Teams to address the sexual assault kit backlog program.

This is $6 million—17 percent—above the President's request.

The bill also includes $125 million for core DNA programs, including the Debbie Smith program.

This is $25 million above the President's request.

Moreover, we do all this while staying within our allocation for this bill—$400 million less than last year. Making commonsense reductions and eliminating waste wherever possible helps make a more efficient government that won't create undue doubt about the fiscal future of the Nation.

The bill has had bipartisan support throughout the process, and I believe it deserves bipartisan support today.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to recommit and pass H.R. 4660 tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 220, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—185

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—220

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Johnson, E. B.
Lofgren

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Gardner
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0108

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 87, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—321

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—87

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gingrey (GA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Holt
Huffman
Jeffries
Jones
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Massie
Matheson
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Payne
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tierney
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Welch

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0114

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUILD SITES RESERVOIR

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, at a time in the West—especially in California—of severe drought, we need to take immediate action to address the issues of water storage and of building