



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 2016

No. 92

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 10, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

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

We thank You once again that we, Your creatures, can come before You and ask guidance for the men and women of this assembly.

Bless the people of this great Nation with wisdom, knowledge, and understanding, that they might responsibly participate in our American democracy as both political parties anticipate their conventions.

Help us all to be good citizens, respectful in our disagreements, and generous in our behavior toward one another.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELBENE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

STATE EFFORTS TO CRACK DOWN ON OPIOID EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently I was proud to vote for a package of bills here on the floor of the United States House intended to help crack down on the terrible epidemic of prescription opioid abuse and heroin abuse across our Nation.

Today, I want to recognize the efforts in the Pennsylvania General Assembly to assist in the goal of fighting back against all drug use. Specifically, a new law authored by State Representative Matt Baker, who represents a portion of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, would go after designer drugs in which different chemicals are combined to create new drugs.

This new law will speed up the process in adding these drugs to the State's list of banned drugs, enabling law enforcement to arrest and prosecute the individuals responsible. Giving members of our law enforcement commu-

nity the tools that they need to thwart illegal drug manufacturers will save lives.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to successfully fight back against a problem, you surround it. I am proud to see great lifesaving solutions coming from both the Federal and the State levels, with additional community action in the form of local roundtables and townhall meetings.

LGBT EQUALITY DAY

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this is Pride Month, and we have much to celebrate.

In the last two decades, our Nation has seen the Defense of Marriage Act overturned, an end to the criminalization of same-sex conduct, and nationwide marriage equality, all through Supreme Court decisions that were handed down on June 26. But even with these incredible strides, we cannot forget that LGBT Americans continue to face inequality and discrimination simply for who they are and who they love.

That is why I have introduced legislation to designate June 26 as LGBT Equality Day, not only to celebrate how far we have come, but also to acknowledge how much work remains to be done.

I urge my colleagues and all Americans to join me in celebrating the first LGBT Equality Day on June 26.

As opponents of equality double down in their attempts to legalize discrimination, we must keep fighting until all Americans have equal rights and protections under the law.

HONORING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE AUBURN CITIZEN

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

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3667

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important milestone in my congressional district: the bicentennial of the Auburn Citizen.

Two hundred years ago today, this daily publication began serving the people of Cayuga County by providing news and community announcements. Born in 1816 as the Auburn Gazette, this community newspaper has been known by many names over the years.

In an editorial placed this past weekend, publisher Rob Forcey noted that the Auburn Citizen began publishing just 40 years after the birth of our country.

The history of accomplished journalists at this publication includes William Dapping, a community hero who was awarded the very first special Pulitzer in 1930 for his esteemed work in covering the bloody 1929 Auburn State Prison riots.

Today, the Citizen has evolved to cover a wide area of central New York, with web-based access to local and national news, weather, and community events. What is more, the publication has expanded into western Onondaga County, with the Skaneateles Journal and West Onondaga County Journal.

Congratulations again to this community-based publication on two centuries of being the voice of the Auburn community.

REMEMBERING DAVID GILKEY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, David Gilkey, an NPR photojournalist from Portland, Oregon, was killed with his Afghani translator in a Taliban ambush in Afghanistan.

I cannot fully express my gratitude for David's tireless commitment to his profession. His evocative, beautiful work, and many contributions to NPR will be remembered for generations.

He covered conflict areas around the globe. Since 2001, he extensively covered the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

He was one of the most decorated of photo journalists, including an Emmy, and the first multimedia journalist to be awarded the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's prestigious Edward R. Murrow Award for Journalism.

David played an essential role in helping us understand the global events. He was one of those who put themselves in harm's way to open the world's window for the rest of us. They are true heroes.

Our hearts go out to the Gilkey family and to his NPR family for their loss.

APPRECIATING PRIME MINISTER NARENDRA MODI

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I was grateful to serve on the escort committee for Prime Minister Narendra Modi of India, due to my former co-chairmanship of the Caucus on India and Indian Americans, with my father having served in India during World War II.

The Prime Minister was warmly received with his positive presentation:

As a representative of the world's largest democracy, it is indeed a privilege to speak with the leaders of its oldest.

Connecting our two nations is also a unique and dynamic bridge of 3 million Indian Americans. Threats of terror are expanding, and new challenges are emerging in cyber and outer space. India is undergoing a profound social and economic change.

A commitment to rebuild a peaceful and stable and prosperous Afghanistan is our shared objective. In every sector of India's forward march, I see the U.S. as an indispensable partner.

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

South Carolina especially recognizes the success of Indian Americans, with their Governor, Nikki Haley, the second Indian American Governor elected in history.

CONGRATULATING TWIN SCHOLARS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you a really cool story about two smart sisters, Estrella and Perla Ortiz, identical twins who earned the valedictorian and salutatorian status at their high school in Fort Worth.

Estrella and Perla are the two youngest of seven siblings in the Ortiz family. The sisters worked hard and excelled academically at North Side High School, the home of the Steers.

In their spare time, the Ortiz sisters participated in the National Honor Society, Health Occupations Students of America, tutored their peers, and even helped adults obtain their GED.

Their hard work paid off in academia when they were awarded scholarships at Texas Christian University, where the sisters will receive a full ride to TCU to continue their studies in biology and premed.

The Ortiz sisters demonstrate that anything is possible with dedication and perseverance. And, oh, I want to also mention that their sister, Maria, was also valedictorian in 2014 at the same school.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Estrella and Perla on their extraordinary academic achievement.

CHEROKEE TRAIL BOYS BASEBALL TEAM

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the boys baseball team of Cherokee Trail High School on winning the 2016 Colorado 5A State championship game on May 29, 2016.

The students and staff who were a part of the title-winning Cougars team deserve to be honored for winning the State championship for the first time since they won the 4A State championship in 2007. The Cougars beat Rocky Mountain High School 5-1 in the series, and ended the season with a winning 22-5 record.

Throughout the season, the boys of the Cherokee Trail baseball team were dedicated, worked hard, and persevered. These traits were a key factor in their endeavor to win the championship, but winning could not have been possible without the tireless leadership of their head coach, Allan Dyer, and his commendable staff.

It is with great pride that I join all of the residents of Aurora, Colorado, in congratulating the Cherokee Trail Cougars on their State championship.

EXPAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the families who are still struggling to make ends meet.

Our economy has made great strides since the end of the recession. Like my colleagues, I have watched the unemployment rate tick down each month from 10 percent in 2009 to 5 percent today.

According to the story that these numbers tell, our economy has recovered. But for nearly 8 million Americans still looking for work, our economy is still in a state of crisis.

In my home district, more than 16 percent live in poverty, and the unemployment rate is three times the national rate, at 15 percent. I have met hundreds of these unemployed constituents at my annual job fair. They aren't looking for a handout; they are looking for a hand up, an opportunity to work, a chance to live a better life, a shot at the American Dream.

As we enter the second half of 2016, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and take action to expand economic opportunities and to ensure that all Americans who want to work have the chance to do so.

RECOGNIZING COACH LORI BLADE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has a lot of heart, who carries herself with class and humility, and who pushes her players to be better on and off the court.

Coach Lori Blade's incredible success has produced 624 wins, dozens of conference titles, and two State championships.

On April 30, Coach Blade was enshrined into the Illinois Basketball Coaches Association Hall of Fame. Her 22 seasons of accomplishments have vaulted both Edwardsville and Carrollton High Schools' programs to statewide dominance.

Beyond the victories, Coach Blade has made a profound impact on countless lives, teaching players to take pride not just in the game, but in everything they do. Pushing her players never to be satisfied or content, Coach Blade has had a phenomenal career on the court and on the softball diamond, being the only coach in IHSA history to have over 600 wins in two sports.

Congratulations, Coach Blade, on all of your accomplishments. Thank you for your commitment to our students, and I wish you all the best in your future seasons, unless you play my hometown Taylorville Tornados.

□ 0915

LYNN WOOLSEY'S VISIT

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, 444. That is the number of times Lynn Woolsey came to this floor, stood at that podium right over there, and addressed this House during Special Orders, speaking against war and in support of peace.

Lynn Woolsey, for 20 years, represented much of my congressional district. My colleagues here in Congress will remember her as a passionate and outspoken advocate—a leader—in the effort to strengthen our national security without war. One of the ways that she did that was through her hundreds of Special Order hour speeches. In the final one of these, No. 444, she said the following:

“Sometimes I've been accused of wanting a 'perfect world.' But I consider that a compliment. Our Founders strove to form a 'more perfect Union.' Why shouldn't we aim for a perfect world? You see, I'm absolutely certain that if we don't work toward a perfect world, we won't ever come close to providing a safe, healthy, and secure world for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.”

She is with her grandchildren Carlo and Luca here today.

Let us thank Lynn Woolsey for her service, and let's urge all Members of Congress to approach our work with the same tenacity and resolve to work together toward peace, health, and security for all.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 89

Whereas a carbon tax is a Federal tax on carbon released from fossil fuels;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase energy prices, including the price of gasoline, electricity, natural gas, and home heating oil;

Whereas a carbon tax will mean that families and consumers will pay more for essentials like food, gasoline, and electricity;

Whereas a carbon tax will fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those on fixed incomes;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to more jobs and businesses moving overseas;

Whereas a carbon tax will lead to less economic growth;

Whereas American families will be harmed the most from a carbon tax;

Whereas, according to the Energy Information Administration, in 2011, fossil fuels share of energy consumption was 82 percent;

Whereas a carbon tax will increase the cost of every good manufactured in the United States;

Whereas a carbon tax will impose disproportionate burdens on certain industries, jobs, States, and geographic regions and would further restrict the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas American ingenuity has led to innovations in energy exploration and development and has increased production of domestic energy resources on private and State-owned land which has created significant job growth and private capital investment;

Whereas United States energy policy should encourage continued private sector innovation and development and not increase the existing tax burden on manufacturers;

Whereas the production of American energy resources increases the United States ability to maintain a competitive advantage in today's global economy;

Whereas a carbon tax would reduce America's global competitiveness and would encourage development abroad in countries that do not impose this exorbitant tax burden; and

Whereas the Congress and the President should focus on pro-growth solutions that encourage increased development of domestic resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 89, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 89, which takes a strong stand against the carbon tax that would hurt American families, workers, and job creators.

As the President closes out his time in office, he would like nothing more than to ram through more of his harmful energy agenda. Just look at the President's budget this year. Among the \$3.4 trillion in tax hikes he proposed, the President included a \$10 per barrel tax on oil. This tax alone would cause gas prices to increase by an estimated 25 cents per gallon. With a carbon tax, there would be a tax hike on production, distribution, and the use of not only oil but also of natural gas and any other form of energy that emits carbon. Such a tax would have many serious impacts on our economy by making day-to-day life more expensive for families throughout this country.

First, a carbon tax could drive up the cost of energy for both the producers and the consumers. This translates to larger energy bills that eat up even more of Americans' take-home pay, especially during the hottest and coldest months of the year.

Second, a carbon tax would destroy well-paying jobs throughout the American energy sector—a sector that has fueled significant job growth throughout the country.

Third, a carbon tax would deliver a direct hit to working families and have compound effects that would reach all corners of the economy. In fact, a carbon tax would increase the cost of, virtually, every good manufactured or service performed in the United States, including everyday necessities. If a good requires energy to make or transport, which most do, taxes on that energy are, essentially, a tax on that good. As a result, Americans would have to pay more for everything—from milk to clothing to school supplies.

Finally, to make this bad idea even worse, we know that a carbon tax would hurt those who are living in poverty and those who are on fixed incomes more than anyone else.

Put simply, a carbon tax would make it harder for us to grow our economy and help working families and small businesses succeed.

We all want an all-of-the-above energy approach that supports new innovations, not a targeted tax hike on specific industries. Thanks to the leadership of Whip SCALISE, Congress will pass this bill today and send it to the Senate, and we will send a clear message to the people in our districts, as well as to the Obama White House, that we do not support this extreme tax.

Instead, we will continue to pass legislation that grows our economy and that helps more Americans get back to work. After all, last week, we received the worst jobs report in almost 6 years. It is more important than ever that we move forward with a bold, pro-growth agenda, not another expensive Washington tax.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What is happening today is further evidence that the Republicans are simply not doing their job. There is real work to be done. It is simply inexcusable that action has not yet happened to prepare for the Zika virus. That would be real action. Helping the people of Flint get clean drinking water, in my home State, would be something real. There is no budget resolution that has been considered here on the House floor. Raising the minimum wage would also be real, and it would help lift many families out of poverty. Closing tax loopholes and making the Tax Code fairer would be real.

Instead, today, we are voting on two senses of Congress resolutions. Doing so provides further evidence that the Republicans not only are not acting on those real problems mentioned earlier but are in denial on another real issue that needs action—climate change. The scientific evidence of climate change is overwhelming, and the consensus is clear, and we have seen the impacts of climate change, virtually, every day in our country and around the world.

This week, the CBO, led by a Director appointed by the majority here, released a report that identified the effects of climate change as a potential risk to the Federal budget. According to that report, the cost of hurricane damage is projected to be \$35 billion more than it is today because of climate change.

The report stated:

“Human activities around the world, primarily the burning of fossil fuels and widespread changes in land use, are producing growing emissions of greenhouse gases.”

Climate change requires all of us, including the Republicans here who are in total denial, to come to our senses and to act on the challenge of climate change.

This sense of Congress resolution, like the second one, completely fails to meet that challenge. I urge its rejection.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentleman

from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague and friend on the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. BLACK, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 89, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

At a time when 80 percent of domestic energy consumption comes from natural gas, from oil, from coal, it is, clearly, counterproductive to make these necessary resources more expensive by imposing an indirect tax on these fuels. A carbon tax means higher utility bills for families, more expensive goods and services for consumers, decreased economic activity, and it would really hurt job creation. We already heard about the dismal numbers last week that were released—38,000 non-farm-related jobs.

Let me just be clear. When we were in the recession, one of the prime drivers economically that took us out of the recession was the shale revolution—a real energy renaissance in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this type of tax is not just a tax on carbon—it is a tax on working families; it is a tax on the American economy; it is a tax on American competitiveness; it is a tax on our energy security. It strikes right at the foundation of our national security. It is the wrong thing to do. It is a regressive tax. It hurts the people who are most dependent on fixed incomes—seniors. It hurts them most.

Why would we even consider doing this?

There are better ways to set up taxation for this country that meet our needs. I just don't understand why one would propose this type of tax, other than the fact that there is a radical environmental agenda, which would hurt manufacturing and American competitiveness. We can't do this. We need to grow this economy. We need growth around 3 to 4 percent minimum to create jobs, to let American business create value, to assert American leadership globally. We are not going to do this with a carbon tax. We won't do it. We need pro-growth policies.

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand this. A recent study by the Institute for Energy Policy found that over 60 percent of Americans oppose this type of idea.

I applaud Whip SCALISE for offering this sensible resolution because it then puts forth a very strong, affirmative statement that we are not going to dis-

arm the American economy, that we are not going to strike a blow at American competitiveness when we are struggling already as it is.

I am sick and tired of the fact that American leadership is eroding around the world. I am sick and tired of the fact that we are walking around with timidity. We ought to be embracing the concept of American leadership. This gives us an opportunity, based on American innovation and energy—the clearest example of which I know of American exceptionalism—to rewrite the rules of energy security based on open markets, transparent pricing, and diversity of supply source.

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

I am pleased to hear my friend from Louisiana with his impassioned presentation today; but his presentation, coming on the heels of what we all heard from the Prime Minister of India—calling for a low carbon, sustainable, innovative future—makes me sad.

If we would have had our economy take these issues seriously—maybe have a week of hearings—we would have been able to demonstrate to the gentleman with an impartial panel of independent experts all across the political spectrum—Conservative, Liberal, Republican, and Democrat—that a carbon tax, revenue neutral, is, actually, the key to the innovative future they want.

There are all sorts of ways to design a carbon tax, to, actually, enhance the role—the economic status—of low- and moderate-income people, but we never had a hearing on that. It is just simply dismissed as something that we can't do, but they have done it elsewhere in the world. If the committee had done its job, we would be dealing with facts, not hyperbole.

□ 0930

If the committee had done its job, we would have heard that we have very real challenges today to American security, which our Department of Defense has pointed out.

Climate change, despite denial from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, is a threat today to the American military posture. Climate change is disrupting industries like fishing. It is producing unprecedented flooding, forest fires, and a wildly unpredictable weather future. The reduction of arctic ice at unprecedented levels ought to be of concern to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Maybe if we had some open, honest hearings that were balanced and independent, that case would have been made and they may support it.

But whether or not they care about climate change and global warming, a carbon tax makes sense for American innovation, the economy, and our competitiveness. It is the areas of low-carbon energy that have seen the job growth. There are now more people

working in wind and solar than the coal industry by far. That is where the job growth has been undertaken.

A carbon tax would enhance America's global competitiveness. And if we had hearings, listening to independent experts across the board, that case would be made, and I don't think we would have this foolish resolution on the floor.

These are elements that would inject into our energy policy an even, balanced approach using market forces, which are much easier than some of the incentives that we have, which are important, which people on both sides of the aisle have supported in the past. But a carbon tax is a more effective way of achieving those objectives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sad that we didn't have that debate in committee. I am sad that we didn't hear from independent experts. I think of our friend Bob Inglis, former Congressperson, who is on a personal crusade working with the evangelical community about the merits of a carbon tax. It would have been great to have heard from Bob and others like him to be able to present a balanced picture and be able to deal with meaningful policy.

I still hope that someday, that time will come that our Ways and Means Committee actually takes the time to dive into one of the most important issues of the day and to examine one of the tools that independent experts all across the spectrum agree would be a solid addition and actually simplify the Tax Code while we can help people in low income and small business and provide incentives for America's global competitiveness, like we heard from the Prime Minister of India from that very rostrum just 2 days ago.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a colleague of mine and a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK). We see eye to eye on almost everything in our lives, and it is really good to be able to stand here today and speak so strongly in favor of H. Con. Res. 89. I really do appreciate the passion and sincerity of my colleagues across the aisle.

What we are talking today is about policy. What we are talking about today is the all-important, unintended consequences that so often are put to blame for bad things that happen to American people. They are well intended, yes, at their conception, but very harmful.

We are talking about a carbon tax, \$10 a barrel on oil. And we are saying: Well, don't worry about that because that is going to be charged upstream. That is going to be charged when it is taken out of the ground.

But we all know that every single tax, every single cost is paid downstream.

What do I mean by that?

Every day hardworking Americans get up in the morning and want to put a roof over the heads of their families, food on the table, clothes on their back, and a little bit of money put away for their future. But every day we continue to come up with policies that somehow, although well intended, make it harder for them to make a living, make it harder for them to live the American Dream, make it harder for them to get ready for the future.

Now, I know there are always going to be existential threats. I get that. My grandson is afraid to get out of bed at night because he thinks there is a monster under it. He thinks that if you get up in the middle of the night, maybe there is somebody in the closet or maybe there is something else.

Now, I am not a climate change denier. Of course, the climate changes. I have seen it happen in my life. I have seen it where people say it is getting too cold and now it is getting too warm.

Well, you know what?

It just changes. I get that.

What doesn't change is the assault on the American people to pick up the tab on all of these costs. There is nothing that makes less sense to me than what we are doing. And back home where I come from, there is an old saying that goes something like this: Measure twice and cut once.

Why?

Because once you do that cut, it is permanent. That is why you want to measure twice to make sure that the cut you make is the right cut. That is why you need to take the policies that affect everyday American people and make sure that you are not hurting them.

Well intended, I get it. I know it is well intended. I just don't think the American people have to pay the brunt of this.

I am very aware of the Prime Minister of India being here Wednesday. And I also know that between India and China, that is where the greatest pollution comes from. I get it. I get it.

Putting \$10 a barrel on oil coming out of the ground just doesn't make sense. I would just like my friends on both sides of the aisle to think about somebody named Steven Jobs. Steven Jobs did not invent the PC because we taxed typewriters too high and caused the cost of that. Innovation, of course, is the answer. And we have seen great innovation.

I know where I am from in western Pennsylvania, that clean coal is real. But the President promised, when he was running as a candidate, that he would put those who chose to make electricity by burning coal out of business. So we regulate them to the point where it is no longer cost efficient to do that, but we keep moving that way.

The fact that 40,000 Pennsylvanians make a living that way, well, don't worry about that, they will have to find something else to do. You can go down to West Virginia and you can

hear where candidates told them: Listen, you are going to be out of business, but we will find something else for you to do and we will just get to that later.

Look, we have an opportunity today. This is a sense of Congress to tell the American people what it is that we think goes on with this policy. For far too long we have turned a deaf ear and a blind eye to the people who sent us here to represent them. We talk very loftily about what it is that we would like to see, how it is that we would like it to go, our dream for the future. But we forget that every day, hardworking American taxpayers get up, throw their feet out over the side of the bed, and go to work for a very particular reason: their families, their churches, their schools, their communities and, more importantly, all of America.

Well intended, yes. But the results would be devastating.

And who would pay this carbon tax? Who would pay this \$10 a barrel?

It would be any man or woman who has to go out and buy anything for his or her family. It would be reflected in the cost of everything we put on our backs and everything we put in our mouths. It would affect everything we do when we travel from one point to another, but we say it is necessary. It is necessary because we have to tax this so high that we drive people away from it.

I would hope that we could come together in America's House and do what is right for America's people, to do what is right for the people who sent us here to represent them because they are working so hard to make sure that there is a future for their children.

In the last month when we created one job for every 8,000 Americans—one job for every 8,000 Americans, are you kidding me?—in the greatest country the world has ever known, in a Nation that leads the world in defending freedom and liberty, in a Nation that knows that the best way to help others is through American participation—

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I do want to make sure that this final point comes across: We can work together for solutions. We can work together to do the same things for the same people that we all came here to represent. I do not think that there are ill-intended ideas on the other side. I think they are well-intended. I just think they are wrong. I think they are wrong for the times, and I think they are wrong for the American people.

As I said earlier, where I am from, there are a lot of old adages. And one of them is: don't worry about the mule, just load the wagon.

I will tell you right now that the mule is trying to find a way to unhook

itself from the wagon because that load has gotten too heavy to pay. I know that the people who are loading the wagon think it is okay because at some point, that is going to have to be delivered somewhere. The truth of the matter is it is not.

We have put too heavy a burden on American taxpayers, hardworking American taxpayers, hardworking Americans. 1.4 million American lives have been sacrificed for the freedom and liberty not just of this country—our country and our Nation—but for the whole world. So I say let's be careful before we do these well-intended but careless things. Let's be careful before we turn our backs on the people who we actually represent here, and that is hardworking American people.

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

I couldn't agree more with my good friend from Butler, Pennsylvania, that we can actually come together and fashion solutions. That is why it is such a tragedy that this resolution comes to the floor without ever having our committee work on it, because we could have had hearings that could have narrowed those gaps.

I include in the RECORD a letter from six conservative advocates for climate change action.

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Later this week Congress will take up a resolution sponsored by Congressman Scalise (R-LA1) that expresses the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the economy of the United States. We are concerned that this resolution offers a limited perspective on carbon taxes and is blind to the potential benefits of market-based climate policy. Legislation that incorporates a carbon tax could include regulatory and tax reforms to make the United States economy more competitive, innovative, and robust, benefiting both present and future generations.

We recognize that a carbon tax, like any tax, will impose economic costs. But climate change is also imposing economic costs. This resolution falls short by recognizing the cost of action without considering the cost of staying on our present policy course. There are, of course, uncertainties about the future cost of climate change and, likewise, the cost associated with a carbon tax (much would depend on program design and the pace and nature of technological progress). The need for action, however, is clear. A recent survey of economists who publish in leading peer-reviewed journals on these matters found that 93% believe that a meaningful policy response to climate change is warranted.

The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market-friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax. This would harness price signals, rather than regulations, to guide market response. That is why carbon pricing has the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private oil and gas companies in the world (the corporate entities among the most directly affected by climate policy).

In reaching a conclusion, this resolution neglects the fact that the United States already has a multiplicity of carbon taxes.

They are imposed, however, via dozens of federal and state regulations, are invisible to consumers, unevenly imposed across industrial sectors, unnecessarily costly, and growing in size and scope. The policy choice is not if we should price carbon emissions, but how.

Unfortunately, this resolution also fails to differentiate between proposals that would impose carbon taxes on top of existing regulations (chiefly the Obama Administration's Clean Power Plan), and proposals that would impose carbon taxes in place of those existing regulations. Conservatives and free market advocates should embrace the latter, regardless of how they view climate risks.

An economy-wide carbon tax that replaces existing regulatory interventions could reduce the cost of climate policy and deregulate the economy. It could also provide revenue to support pro-growth tax reform, including corporate income or payroll tax cuts, which could dramatically reduce overall costs on the economy. Revenues could be applied to compensate those who suffer the most from higher energy costs; the poor, the elderly, and individuals and families living on fixed incomes.

Unfortunately, none of those options are presently available because Members of Congress have neglected opportunities to design and debate market-friendly climate policies in legislation. Instead, they have yielded authority in climate policy design to the Executive Branch. By discouraging a long-overdue discussion about sensible carbon pricing, this resolution frustrates the development of better policy.

Sincerely,

JERRY TAYLOR,
President, Niskanen Center.

BOB INGLIS,
Executive Director, RepublicEn.

APARNA MATHUR,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

ELI LEHRER,
President, R Street Institute.

THE REV. MITCHELL C. HESCOX,
President, Evangelical Environmental Network.

ALAN VIARD,
Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Pennsylvania could have heard them talk about the need for action and how you can design a carbon tax that meets the objectives he is talking about, but we never did that. We didn't listen to experts across the spectrum—Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, economists, and scientists—to be able to examine the facts.

Instead, we have a cartoon proposal that they are arguing against as opposed to something that we could have worked on together that is promoted by most of the independent experts in the field. And someday within our lifetime this Congress will consider and, I think, probably approve.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Seattle, Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who has looked at some of these challenges around the globe.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I come to speak on the floor, I think I

am in the House of the deniers. Now, in 2007, that liberal journal, National Geographic, had an article called "The Big Thaw." And it says:

"It's no surprise that a warming climate is melting the world's glaciers and polar ice. But no one expected it to happen this fast."

That was in 2007. That was 9 years ago.

I was taken, along with GERRY CONNOLLY, up to the Arctic with the Norwegian Government. They are worried about what is happening.

This resolution is just burying your head in the sand. I think you are thinking that if you put your head in the sand long enough, it will go away and, when you pull your head out, it won't be there.

The CBO just put a report out: Texas, Louisiana, and Florida are going to have hurricane damage that is unbelievable. FEMA already accounts for 45 percent of money spent on hurricane damage, \$95 billion since 2000.

Now, if you think the insurance companies are going to keep insuring against hurricanes, you have another thing coming. At some point, they are going to say: We are not doing hurricane insurance in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and a whole bunch of other places. That is the economics.

You say: Let's not pay anything right now, let's not change anything, let's not work on it.

But if we don't work on it, we are going to pay later. I am old enough to remember a FRAM commercial on the television. It was an air cleaner on your car, and it said: Pay me now or pay me later. And this is what this is about today.

Now, there are things going on in this country which just absolutely boggle my mind. In North Carolina, the assembly got together and they said: You know what? We are not going to spend any money to measure the sea levels.

Now, you have hundreds of miles of coastline in North Carolina where the sea is rising and property values are going to be lost. We are talking money here. We are not talking soft, liberal stuff. This is real, and people don't want to even look at it.

In Florida and Wisconsin, they took a novel approach and they said: We are not even going to use the words "climate change" in anything.

Now, here in Congress, the climate deniers take many forms, from blocking the words "social cost of carbon" to directing the Department of Defense to ignore climate change. All the while, the DOD itself highlights the threat of climate change to national security. Republicans like to talk about national security.

□ 0945

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. If you are serious about talking about national security,

you better start talking about the climate change that is going on in the world. Sea lanes across the North Pole are coming, boats are already coming, we are building the Panama Canal wider, and it is opening up on the north end of the globe.

Now, this absurdity cannot last, and we have got to begin to do what Mr. BLUMENAUER suggested. There have to be hearings. Bob Inglis, I knew him when he was here. God, he was a wild-eyed liberal. I couldn't believe what a wild-eyed liberal he was. He came down here talking about a carbon tax. I had a carbon tax. Mr. LARSON had a carbon tax.

This is not a partisan issue, Democrat versus Republican; it is whether or not you are going to look at the science of what is happening on the globe. I urge people to vote "no" on this. You will come back and do it in a couple of years.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding. I am proud to bring forward this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that expresses the strong sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy.

If you look at what this administration has done through radical rules and regulations, through all of its agencies, starting with the EPA, with the IRS, with the NLRB, the whole alphabet soup of Federal agencies that every morning wake up trying to figure out how to make it harder for our economy to get moving again, how to make it harder for people to create jobs in America, frankly, the results of these radical regulations are shifting and running jobs away, out of our country to foreign countries like China, like India, and they want to keep it going.

This is not a new concept, Mr. Speaker. They tried this years ago when they brought through the cap-and-trade bill. Passed out of the House, it couldn't even pass in the Senate when they had a supermajority in the Senate with 60 votes because it was such a detrimental idea that would devastate our economy. Yet even with that defeat, President Obama still tries to come back with a carbon tax through other means, whether it is regulations or whether it is superimposed carbon taxes through the EPA and some of the other things they are doing.

We have had hearings on this, Mr. Speaker. There is data all around that confirms how devastating a carbon tax would be to the United States economy. You can just look at what some of the outside groups that look at this said. The National Association of Manufacturers, the people that make things in America, have confirmed we would lose more than a million jobs in America if a carbon tax was imposed.

Where would those jobs go? They would go to countries, ironically, that

don't have the good environmental standards we already have. So they would go to countries like China and India where, if you are concerned about carbon going into the atmosphere, the things that they do to produce the same things we produce here in America, it creates more than five times the amount of carbon in those countries. So you are shifting jobs out of America to send it to countries where you would actually create more carbon.

They talk about somehow being able to create policy that will stop hurricanes and change the sea level rising, for goodness sake, as if some policy is going to do that.

By the way, the result of their policies will increase carbon in the Earth's atmosphere. But let's not even talk about that. Let's actually talk about the track record of this administration that now wants to control the Earth's temperature.

They spent over \$500 million and couldn't even create a Web site to take your health insurance requests, healthcare.gov. Remember that? Well, this same group now thinks they can control the Earth's temperature through radical policies.

Again, let's look at the devastating impact these policies would have. They wouldn't work, first of all, but they would have a devastating impact on the middle class of this country. The Congressional Budget Office, our own Congressional Budget Office that looked at this, said a carbon tax would actually hit low-income people the hardest, even harder than high-income people.

It would have a devastating impact on those people who are least able to afford it because it would increase the cost of everything they do. It would increase your food costs at the grocery store. It would increase, of course, what you pay at the pump. It would increase your electricity prices.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. The Heritage Foundation looked at this and said that this kind of carbon tax would actually increase the cost of everything that families buy by over \$1,400 per family. Families are going to pay \$1,400 more every year for the cost of a carbon tax that the other side wants to defend. And to yield what? To just yield an opportunity for countries like China and India to grow their economies at the expense of ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, if you look at what they are trying to do—and, again, if you want to do this, bring it forward as an idea in legislation. They tried it with cap-and-trade, and it got defeated when Democrats controlled everything. There is bipartisanship on this issue, and the bipartisanship is in opposition to a carbon tax.

So why don't we go on record and be very clear about it, not just that it is bad policy, but also to reaffirm how

devastating it would be for the United States economy.

It shouldn't move forward. The President needs to stop this radical agenda and instead focus on reversing the depressing economic activity that we have seen in this country since he has been President because of these kinds of policies.

Let's get real economic growth. Let's bring those jobs back to the United States. Let's reject a carbon tax.

I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed my friend from Louisiana's impassioned presentation. It is too bad that the Committee on Ways and Means didn't actually sit down and go through the elements that would be in a balanced carbon tax. He is debating a cartoon version, not one that we worked on.

I am going to yield, in a moment, to one of the gentlemen who, earlier in this carbon debate several Congresses ago, has been involved with crafting a realistic carbon tax.

We had the reference to the inability to move the cap-and-trade, which I don't think is as good as a carbon tax. It failed because there were a minority of the Senate who were opposed to allowing it to go forward. It wasn't that we didn't have a majority that were interested. In the Senate, you can have a veto with 41 people who are decided that they are not going to allow things to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). He has been a student of a carbon tax, who has listened to those people across the political spectrum and has been a champion of a reasonable, thoughtful approach to promote American innovation.

I would just point out the areas where we have had the greatest job growth in the energy sector have not been petroleum or coal. It has been solar and wind. A carbon tax would help accelerate that by leveling the playing field and allowing the forces of economics to dictate the next steps.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be on the floor and join in this debate.

I must, along with my colleague from Oregon, express frustration. This body should be about the vitality of ideas. Whatever those ideas are, in a democracy, there ought to be the willingness to express them.

Mr. BLUMENAUER has detailed, at length, the lack of public hearings. Listen, I get it. This is a messaging opportunity. This has no force of law. All this does is say what the sensibilities are of the Congress.

Now, what does the public think of the sensibilities of the Congress? What the public thinks is that we are all bluster and no solution and that we never take the time to sit down and measure twice and then cut. We just simply don't do that in our committees.

And so the vitality of ideas, a very noble idea expressed by a Republican, Mr. Inglis, many sessions ago and embraced by many conservative economists in the Reagan, in the Nixon, and in the Bush administrations about providing certainty in terms of what we need to do and a revenue stream that has this at its core: tax pollution—tax pollution—at its source, and pass the savings on to the consumers.

We know the volumes that are produced. We know the science behind this. There should be an open and clear-eyed debate on this; but not only a debate about the pros and cons, but how about something refreshing for the American people—a solution. It may not be the bill that I proposed or that Bob Inglis proposed or that any number of people have embraced, but you have major companies, including major oil companies that will be taxed, say, no, this is a sensible way for us to embrace this, and we are enjoined by the very people who this would tax and by conservative economists who say, yeah, we ought to take a look at this not only from the standpoint of the certainty that it will provide, but the known certainty of what pollution does. And it is not just about climate change. It is about the health of the air that we breathe, what we are poisoning in the atmosphere for our children, what happens with respect to the effects of asthma and what happens in terms of the people in coal mines from black lung disease.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. These debilitating diseases scream out for the Congress not to have a message opportunity that may or may not advantage one side or the other in the realm of politics, but how about a solution?

How about us doing what MIKE KELLY suggested, to work together in the committee to come up with a positive solution as to how to address this? Pass the savings along to the consumer. Develop a revenue system that will, in fact, allow us to rebuild our country that is crumbling around us.

Let's take those steps and the responsibility that we all have to the citizens to provide them with solutions, not bluster.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BOUSTANY on these two concurrent resolutions that are being offered today. I appreciate the time.

I recall in this debate here that there was a whole movie back in the 1960s called "If It's Tuesday, This Must Be Belgium." Well, if it is tax-raising time, this must be Washington, D.C., because there are more schemes all the

time to come hit not just big, evil corporations and big energy producers; this always ends up hitting the bottom line of American working families and the economy.

The President's plan to raise a tax on each and every barrel of oil produced by \$10 translates out to 25 cents at the pump. We heard earlier some of my colleagues talk about what the carbon tax would mean to working families—much more than they can afford in this bad economy and a time where the jobless rate is higher than is even measurable by this administration.

This continues the antidomestically produced energy narrative of this administration. It only hurts U.S. energy jobs and takes productive U.S. fields, such as what we have in California, out of production that are on the margins of being profitable. Instead of having domestically produced energy, we are going to shift more of that burden to other sources: foreign energy or the need for exploring more here or offshore.

Why don't we allow the profitable energy and oilfields we have in California and this country to continue to be productive and not hamper them with another additional tax that will take them out of production and rely more on foreign oil?

Now, how popular is this amongst regular people? In my own district, we conducted a survey recently where people actually took time to send post-cards back into my office that came in at approximately a 90 percent rate in opposition to this \$10-per-barrel oil tax, which they understand means 25 cents, again, per gallon at the gas pump.

This really, really hurts all Americans. It hurts working families, people on the lower end of the income scale, but even more so, districts like mine that are very rural and all the other rural districts around this country where people have to travel farther to get to their work, to take their kids to school or to healthcare appointments, their ball games, maybe even save up occasionally in this economy for a travel vacation they might like to take and visit the beauty of America.

□ 1000

So the rural economy is even more devastated by this—the rural economy that also would be productive with energy—with these schemes that are being pondered.

Additionally, there are other ideas, like a tax on every mile driven, which is being contemplated at some level here federally as well as in my own State. Tax people for every mile they drive, tax them at the gas pump, tax them for carbon. Again, this hits real people in America, not just some idea of a big, evil corporation.

The answer in Washington always seems to be more government and taxation that hurts working families. Perhaps first, these dollars should be channeled into projects that people can use. Not more environmental projects, but

more highways, more bridges, more water storage. Not boondoggles like we have in California, such as the high-speed rail money pit, or the cost of frivolous environmental measures that drive up the costs of construction projects and sometimes even completely eliminate them.

We talk about a green economy a lot, especially on that side of the floor over there. Why don't we focus on a green economy that is not based on importing solar panels from China or wind machines from Europe? How about we get out and do the forestry that is needed to be done to thin the forests?

We are talking about the air we breathe. Each summer, for months, the air is brown in northern California—lots of California—and lots of the Western States from forests that are burning because they are not managed, because they are not thinned. Instead, they are overgrown.

That would be a green economy. We could turn this into biomass if you want to have real energy that works for the equation of renewable energy. Channel that effort into that instead of chasing these wind machines and solar panels.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I support H. Con. Res. 112 and H. Con. Res. 89, to send a message that this is more job-killing taxes and schemes that will fix our economy.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LAMALFA. It is the freedom to explore for and produce low-cost domestic energy that will help Americans and our economy to recover once again.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), a gentleman who brings his private sector business success to commonsense solutions in policy.

Mr. DELANEY. I want to thank my friend from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, my friends on the other side of the aisle are making four points.

The first point they are making is that they don't believe in science, because the science around climate change is unassailable.

The second point they are making is that they don't worry about American prosperity, because from an economic perspective and national security, the military, we should be reminded, has called climate change a threat multiplier. This is a very significant risk to long-term American prosperity.

The third point they are making is that they don't believe in the power of markets to change behavior at its core. They are not acknowledging the power of a capitalistic economic model to change people's behavior.

And the fourth thing they are saying is that they don't trust U.S. businesses to innovate into opportunities and around challenges.

These are extraordinary statements. And contrast that with our approach. I have a piece of legislation called the Tax Pollution, Not Profits Act, which puts in place a carbon pricing mechanism, which has been proven to be the most effective way—more effective than a regulatory approach—to change behavior and reverse some of the trends and bend the curve on climate change.

We take the revenues that are generated by that bill and we use it to offset all of the costs that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say exist through tax credits to individuals. We set aside money to take care of the retirement of all the coal workers in the United States of America for the rest of their lives, and then we take the remaining revenues and we pay for a significant and substantial cut to business taxes.

So this piece of legislation, unlike what my colleagues are proposing, has a double bottom line. It will reverse the negative effects of climate change and the threat to our prosperity, and it is a pro-growth policy because it puts money back in the economy and it makes a bet on U.S. businesses that they can innovate and grow into opportunities and around challenges. It is reflective of the view of businesses in 2016, not the view of businesses from the 1950s.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my friend, who has spent a lot of time thinking about these environmental issues and acting on them.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to these two resolutions.

The first one, H. Con. Res. 89, says that a carbon tax would necessarily be detrimental to the United States economy. This is false. Plain and simple.

The truth is that we can and we must design carbon pollution reduction strategies to spur advancements in clean energy technology, reduce carbon pollution, and fight climate change.

These strategies, including a carbon tax or a fee, can easily be designed to be revenue-neutral, and we know from long experience at the State and Federal level that fighting pollution is good for jobs and good for the economy. California is a perfect example. If anyone has questions about this, come to California, where you will see that climate leadership is actually also good economics.

It doesn't seem to matter to my colleagues who have offered these resolutions. In the year 2016, they continue to deny the reality of climate change. Literally, our friends across the aisle

are the last policymakers on the planet Earth to hold this view. Even in other oil-producing companies, the conservative parties in those countries acknowledge climate change, and they have positions in their party platforms that acknowledge we need to do something about it.

Now, the other resolution, H. Con. Res. 112, similarly demonstrates a lack of leadership by opposing President Obama's proposal to finance infrastructure investments. Those who don't support the President's infrastructure financing mechanism, I think, have a responsibility to offer their own solutions for our infrastructure crisis. This bill doesn't do that. Instead, it simply describes a desire to support Big Oil.

So here we have it: climate denial; the party that doesn't want to fill vacancies on the Supreme Court; a party that doesn't want to do its job to respond to public health crises, like Zika; a party that prefers not to offer any solutions on our critical infrastructure funding needs.

Is this how we are going to make America great again?

I don't think so. Let's move forward in the 21st century and not let our energy and infrastructure policies be driven by 18th century thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose both of these bills.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we are here debating H. Con. Res. 89, which purports to express the sense of Congress. But really, nothing could be further from the truth, because what it does is express the nonsense of Congress.

We are here witnessing the latest example of climate denial brought to the floor by the majority. The entire world agrees that climate change is a pressing problem, except this extreme wing of the Republican Party.

Climate change is already affecting people across the globe. As Dr. MCDERMOTT from Washington pointed out already, the nonpartisan CBO recently noted the increasing and enormous budgetary impact future storms will have on our Nation, and attributed the majority of this problem to climate change. And I am here to tell you these costs will fall disproportionately on low-income people, low-income communities, and people of color in our country.

Are we here on the floor debating a real solution brought forward by the majority? Are we here having hearings?

No, we are not. We are here debating a resolution cutting off a solution that economists from all corners of the Earth believe is the most efficient way to address climate change.

A properly designed price on carbon can improve the overall performance of the U.S. economy, protect competitive-

ness, create jobs, promote investment, and lead us toward American energy independence.

The gentleman from Oregon is right: instead of debating this resolution, we should be having hearings discussing ways that we can sensibly lead the transition to renewable fuels and clean energy sources.

Even big oil companies like Royal Dutch Shell and BP have voiced support for carbon taxes in recent years, acknowledging that climate change is real and that we should be doing something about it.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 89, and let's start a real debate, a sensible debate on this existential threat to our Nation and to the globe.

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

I really appreciate this little window of an opportunity to talk about a carbon tax. I hope that the day will come when we will have an opportunity to have that discussion in a robust and thoughtful way in our Ways and Means Committee. Heaven knows it is important.

Lots of people have opinions and ideas. I think we would benefit from it, but I hope that we will have that discussion after we hear from a balanced, wide-ranging group of independent experts across the spectrum to be able to give us meaningful information about it.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Greg Dotson, who is the Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS,

Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Later this week, the U.S. House of Representatives will consider H. Con. Res. 89, a resolution that rejects the pricing of carbon pollution. On behalf of the Center for American Progress, I am writing to urge you to oppose this resolution. It is time for Congress to develop sensible policies that address the serious and potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change. Science informs us that we need an urgent solution to this problem. Although the current Administration has made historic progress on climate change, it is clear that we need to do more to achieve additional carbon pollution reductions and lead the world in responding to this global challenge.

Top economic advisors to both Democratic and Republican Presidents have expressed their support for putting a price on carbon as an effective and efficient approach for reducing pollution. Joseph Stiglitz, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) under President Bill Clinton, has stated, "Economic efficiency requires that those who generate emissions pay the cost, and the simplest way of forcing them to do so is through a carbon tax." Gregory Mankiw, former Chairman of the CEA under President George W. Bush, has stated, "Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."

In fact, carbon pollution is already priced in a significant portion of the world. In total, about 40 national jurisdictions and more than 20 cities, states, and regions on

five continents—representing almost a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions—have placed a price on carbon. In the United States, 25 percent of the population lives in a jurisdiction where carbon pollution is currently priced and where one-third of the country's economic activity takes place. The price on carbon in California is the highest of any state in the country at almost \$13 per ton of carbon dioxide equivalent, and yet the California economy is projected to grow at a faster pace than the rest of the United States over the next two years.

In recent years, momentum to expand the adoption of carbon pricing policies has been growing. More than 400 investors with more than \$24 trillion in assets have called on governments to establish "stable, economically meaningful carbon pricing." Already, more than 1,000 businesses apply a price on carbon to inform their investments and operations or plan to do so in the next two years. In addition, at the United Nations climate talks in Paris last December, governments, businesses, and nongovernmental organizations announced the new Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition to accelerate and expand the adoption of carbon pricing worldwide.

In order to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, the United States needs to consider all possible tools at its disposal, including the effective market-based mechanisms of carbon pricing. Members of Congress need to work together on a bipartisan basis to find ways to cut carbon pollution rather than advance polarizing measures that take useful tools off the table. I urge you to reject this ill-advised resolution.

Sincerely,

GREG DOTSON,
Vice President for Energy Policy,
Center for American Progress.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Let me just read a couple of items from Mr. Dotson's letter.

He points out that "top economic advisors to both Democratic and Republican Presidents have expressed their support for putting a price on carbon as an effective and efficient approach for reducing pollution."

He cites Gregory Mankiw, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President George W. Bush, who says: "Basic economics tells us that when you tax something, you normally get less of it. So if we want to reduce global emissions of carbon, we need a global carbon tax."

"In fact, carbon pollution is already priced in a significant portion of the world. In total, about 40 national jurisdictions and more than 20 cities, states, and regions on five continents—representing almost a quarter of global greenhouse gas emissions—have placed a price on carbon. In the United States, 25 percent of the population lives in jurisdictions where carbon pollution is currently priced and where one-third of the country's economic activity takes place."

That is in America right now. There is no acknowledgment of that in this debate. We could have talked about that in the committee.

"The price on carbon in California," referenced by my friend, Mr. HUFFMAN, "is the highest of any state in the country at almost \$13 per ton . . . yet the California economy is projected to grow at a faster pace than the rest of the United States over the next two years."

They reference the fact that "more than 400 investors with more than \$24

trillion in assets have called on governments to establish 'stable, economically meaningful carbon pricing.' Already, more than 1,000 businesses apply a price on carbon to inform their investments and operations or plan to do so in the next two years. In addition, at the United Nations climate talks in Paris last December, governments, business, nongovernmental organizations announced the new Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition to accelerate and expand the adoption of carbon pricing worldwide," in keeping with what we heard from Prime Minister Modi in this Chamber just 2 days ago.

□ 1015

Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle are not involved with our being able to discuss this in depth, being able to bring in the experts, being able to work together to design a pricing mechanism that avoids some of the cartoon characteristics that they establish here. We had that chance, and we haven't done it.

But this will not be the last word. This meaningless resolution will undoubtedly pass today. It is not going to have any impact in terms of the long term. The long term, we are on a path to price carbon, and we have the capacity to do so in a thoughtful and an effective way, like the conservative leaders, whose correspondence I put into the RECORD earlier, suggest.

It can be revenue neutral. It can be effective. It can help reverse the more damaging effects of climate change, and it is a way to promote economic opportunity and global competitiveness.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on this.

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

You know, although my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made this a conversation about climate change—which I agree that we can have and we should have in another venue, and that is in the committee structure—this is about a President who decided on his own, without coming to Congress to discuss this tax, this \$10 tax on a barrel of gasoline, because he was unable to get this carbon tax, when, by the way, the House and the Senate were both in his own party, he couldn't even get this passed. So this is a discussion for another day about climate change, which we can all have, and have in a very gentle way.

However, let me sum up what this would do if this were to pass, the impact that this carbon tax would have on the American people:

It would drive up the cost of energy, which would most affect those at the lower income.

It would destroy well-paying jobs in the energy industry, well-paying jobs. Right now, when we look at what our loss of jobs are here in this country, we have the lowest rate of jobs in 6 years.

Number three, it would directly hit working families the most, those at the very lowest income, and especially those who are elderly.

None of these help to grow our economy and get our economy moving or people back to work or raise their incomes. Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 89.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from opponents of H. Con. Res. 89:

JUNE 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 89. This resolution is the latest example of climate action denial being advanced by extreme members of the House of Representatives. Instead of listening to the national security experts, faith leaders, scientists, energy innovators, health professionals and many others who are sounding the alarm on climate change and have implored our nation's elected officials to support action, Rep. Scalise and the co-sponsors of H. Con. Res. 89 appear to be looking for another way to say "no." The sponsors of the resolution have no plan to address climate change and have opposed every proposal to do something about the planet's gravest environmental problem. Many of them don't even accept the scientific fact that climate change is occurring.

H. Con. Res. 89 ignores the huge costs that our country is already experiencing due to climate change—costs that fall disproportionately on low-income communities and communities of color. It is clear this resolution is meant to put the interests of the polluting fossil fuel companies ahead of the American public's best interest.

Instead of holding another just-for-show vote against climate action, the U.S. House of Representatives should be debating how it can best position our country to lead the global transition to clean energy sources. Last year more than half of the world's new energy came from renewable energy sources and the landmark Paris climate agreement sends a powerful signal to investors that this trend toward low-carbon energy will accelerate. More and more countries and hundreds of forward-looking companies are adopting policies to limit carbon pollution and correct the markets failure to capture the health and environmental costs of burning fossil fuels.

At a time when the American taxpayer is already paying to move vulnerable American communities to higher ground because of climate-driven sea level rise, we have no time to waste on empty resolutions that seek to take potential climate solutions off the table.

Sincerely,

Center for Biological Diversity, Clean Water Action, Earthjustice, Environment America, Environmental Defense Action Fund, Fresh Energy, League of Conservation Voters, League of Women Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Union of Concerned Scientists.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED \$10 TAX ON EVERY BARREL OF OIL

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 767, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

Whereas raising revenue and spending money are powers reserved to Congress by the Constitution;

Whereas according to global economists, the United States oil and gas industry is currently experiencing the worst industry decline since similar commodity price collapses in the 1980s and 1990s forced oil companies to slash payrolls and dividends;

Whereas global oil production exceeds demand by more than one million barrels a day, and Iran has promised to provide an additional 500,000 barrels a day to the world market, now that several sanctions have been lifted after the recent implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action;

Whereas the price of a barrel of oil is currently around \$30, less than a third of the \$90-plus it was selling for 18 months ago; which would mean the President's proposal would be equivalent to a 33.3 percent tax, making the United States Federal excise tax on oil the highest of any domestic product;

Whereas this tax could translate into as much as an additional 25 cents on a gallon of gas, when the Federal tax on gasoline is currently 18.40 cents per gallon;

Whereas the oil and gas industry accounts for significant employment and is an even more significant driver of investment spending and growth along the supply chain, ranging from aggregates to steelmaking and specialist equipment;

Whereas more than 258,000 people employed in oil and gas extraction and support activities globally, including more than 100,000 across the United States, have lost their jobs since October 2014;

Whereas every lost oil and gas job leads to an additional 3.43 jobs cut in other sectors;

Whereas that means the 114,000 job losses in the oil and gas sector wiped out an additional 391,000 jobs in other sectors last year and sliced economic growth to about 2.1 percent from 2.6 percent;

Whereas more layoffs are virtually certain in the months ahead in oil and gas production, as well as along the supply chain and in petroleum-dependent economies, as the continued price slump filters through to even less drilling activity;

Whereas the number of rigs drilling for oil and gas has fallen from over 1,900 in October 2014, to 744 at the end of November 2015, and just 619 at the end of January 2016, according to oilfield services firm Baker Hughes;

Whereas manufacturers, for example, announced 37,221 layoffs in the past 12 months;

Whereas shipments of steel in the United States—used to make oil and gas pipelines—were down 11.4 percent through the first 11 months of 2015 and the industry announced more than 12,000 layoffs during the past year, according to the American Steel and Iron Institute;

Whereas believing that oil companies will pay the fee with no effect on consumer prices requires also believing that the producers won't pass their increased cost on to refiners, who won't in turn pass their costs on to the public; in other words, requires suspending belief in basic economics;

Whereas this tax could also put American oil companies, at a competitive disadvantage with foreign oil companies, as imported oil may not face the same treatment;

Whereas the domestic midstream and downstream stages of oil and gas production will be at a competitive disadvantage to their global competitors due to a \$10 higher cost for every barrel of oil;

Whereas in combination with a stronger dollar, slowing growth in international markets, and an overaccumulation of inventories through much of the economy, the oil slump is creating headwinds for manufacturers, freight firms, and the wider economy; and

Whereas the oil and natural gas industry anchors our economy in terms of jobs, economic activity, and even State and local tax revenue in a challenging price environment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress finds that—

(1) any new tax placed on the struggling oil and gas industry will further prevent growth and development throughout the sector and encourage additional layoffs; and

(2) the effect of a \$10 tax on each barrel of oil sold in the United States—

(A) would raise the price of oil, and by extension gasoline; and

(B) would result in a decrease in the consumption of oil.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a new tax should not be placed on oil, and

(2) in considering future policy, Congress should carefully review the detrimental impacts of placing any new taxes on any industry that has seen a slash in jobs, revenue, and production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 112, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Obama administration, in its budget proposal, proposed a \$10.25 tax on each barrel of oil. This will severely harm

America's already struggling energy industry, but it will have a very detrimental impact throughout the American economy, and that is why I introduced H. Con. Res. 112, sending a very clear message that Congress and the American people refuse to allow this administration to fund an environmental agenda on the backs of working families.

It is pretty simple. At \$10.25 per barrel of oil, this increase would not only add significantly to the cost of a gallon of gasoline at the pump, certainly disproportionately hurting fixed-income families, seniors, and so forth, it would also have a detrimental impact on job creation, on wages, and on the Nation's overall economic health.

This also would effectively act as an export tax on oil, just as we opened up the door to export crude oil to allow American producers to have market access worldwide, just like our Iranian opponents worldwide currently have the luxury to do.

Why would we tie up the hands of American energy producers and allow the Iranians and OPEC to dominate world markets? Wrong.

Secondly, at a time when, in Louisiana and Texas and other States on the coast, we understand how important our environment, our economy and energy policies are, we are looking to use revenue sharing to help us rebuild coastline and marsh and replenish our beaches, the administration opposes this. They have listed that in their budget proposal.

This tax is a tax on hardworking American families. It is a tax on American competitiveness; it is a tax on American innovation; it is a tax on our energy security; and it is a tax on the very foundation of our national security.

Now, the oil and gas industry has watched as market conditions have changed because of slow growth globally—low demand and abundant supply thanks to American innovation, largely. We have seen the oil price drop from \$115 a barrel in November of 2014 to as low as \$27 a barrel in January 2016. Right now, prices are hovering around \$48, \$49, \$50 a barrel. This industry is struggling. This is the industry that took us out of recession with job creation and economic growth.

Now, I know in my home State of Louisiana, just last year, we lost 11,700 jobs alone in Louisiana in the oil and gas sector, 5,500 in my hometown of Lafayette alone. Even worse, globally, over 250,000 people have lost their jobs.

Of course, if you look at what happened in the first quarter of this year, the revised statistics on economic growth, 0.8 percent. How is American business going to create value and jobs with that kind of growth, that kind of private sector growth?

Not only that, just last week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics release showed

38,000 jobs created last month, the worst number since 2010. That is a terrible statistic, with real human dimensions.

This tax will make it worse if it were to go forward. In fact, the Tax Foundation created an economic model to show the impact of a \$10.25-per-barrel tax over 10 years; and what this would do, if implemented, an estimated 137,000 Americans in full-time employment in this sector would lose their jobs.

It is important to remember that oil is used for a lot more than just gasoline in our automobiles. The U.S. Energy Information Administration points out that a quarter of a barrel of crude—a quarter of each barrel of crude oil—is used for nonfuel goods such as plastic, asphalt, dyes, lubricants, power plants, home heating, and other nontransportation uses. In fact, products throughout the American economy have, as their base ingredient, these fossil fuel ingredients. This tax, \$10.25, will be passed on to those industries and consumers across this country.

The oil and gas industry supports more than 9 million American jobs, and what happens through this industry and within this industry reverberates throughout our entire U.S. economy.

But it is also important to look at what this proposal would do as we view it through a national security lens.

American innovation, the energy renaissance we saw with shale exploration and hydraulic fracturing, horizontal drilling, as well as new deepwater technology and better assessments of our reserves, has given us this tremendous opportunity to change global energy security away from an OPEC- or Russian-driven model, where state-owned enterprises control pricing and control supply, to an American view of energy security, which our allies desperately want. It is a view of energy security with diversity of supply sources, transparent pricing, open markets, a view of energy security globally, uniquely American, that would help economic growth globally and help so many countries that are struggling today, many currently in recession.

But energy security is linked to our national security, and we have an opportunity to create a Western Hemisphere energy trading bloc based on these principles rather than an OPEC or a Russian model. This is an opportunity for America to change not only energy security, but the entire national security environment in a more pro-American way. This tax would really be a stab in the heart of that. It is the wrong thing to do.

And, of course, this tax would increase the cost of domestic production, translating into higher prices for oil and all petroleum products, potentially eroding America's price competitiveness in the global marketplace.

If the purpose of this proposal was to increase revenue, then I would say that the President should be, instead, pur-

suing sound energy policies consisting of embracing this energy sector, American energy production, one of the clearest examples of American exceptionalism, not an unfettered drastic tax increase.

If you want to build roads, we need economic growth and sensible tax policies that will help us build out our transportation.

According to a report released by the American Petroleum Institute, our energy producers could create 1 million new jobs in just 7 years and increase revenue to Federal and State governments by \$800 billion by 2030 if we allow this energy sector to do its work responsibly.

It is time for our Nation to fully embrace the vast opportunities unleashed by this U.S. energy renaissance. Let's embrace this new era of abundance. Let's embrace this new era of energy diplomacy that puts America in a strong position.

It is time for the President to stop his relentless tax and regulatory assault on the oil and gas industry that is only worsening our economic problems. This resolution shows very clearly that Congress stands for job creation over a radical political agenda, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans don't like the President's budget proposal. They have never been able to bring their own to the floor—never.

They talk about economic growth and jobs. This administration has a proud record of creating jobs. They haven't done all we want, but they are successful in important respects.

This administration has had an energy policy that has really been working well, as can be seen by what has happened. There remain problems with it, and we will have some debate about where we go in the future.

The problem is that the Republicans start from a premise that is grievously wrong. They are in denial of climate change, and everything they do relating to energy stems from that. They are out of step with the American people.

A recent Gallup Poll showed this: 64 percent of Americans are worried a great deal or a fair amount about global warming. Fifty-nine percent of Americans say the effects of global warming have already begun. Only 10 percent of Americans say the effects of global warming will never happen—only 10 percent. Sixty-five percent of Americans, according to this Gallup Poll of recent times, say our planet's temperature increases over the last 100 years are primarily caused by human activities rather than natural causes.

□ 1030

But what do we hear from the now-leading Republican?

Well, going back a few years, this is what he had to say: "The concept of global warming was created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing noncompetitive."

That was 4 years ago, more or less.

Now the same person, who is now leading the Republican Party, says this: "I am not a great believer in man-made climate change." "If you look, they had global cooling in the 1920s, and now they have global warming, although now they don't know if they have global warming."

So we have today, from the Republican majority, our two sense of Congress resolutions. What is really needed instead is for the Republican Party to come to their senses on climate change, like the vast majority of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), one of our many Members—but this person in particular—who has devoted so much of his deep intelligence and his energy to this issue, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a very important member of the House Ways and Means Committee and someone who has extensive private sector experience.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. Speaker, again, before we came on to the floor, we were in the Cloakroom talking about what the debate was going to be. And I thought the debate was going to be about what was actually happening today, and not a scientific debate, not a debate about what people believe or what they don't believe, but on the reality that the President proposed a \$10 tax on a barrel of oil. That comes out to 25 cents per gallon at the pump.

Now, what do I mean by that? What I am talking about is, when hard-working American taxpayers go to fill up their car or their truck, it is going to cost them 25 cents more per gallon. It also translates into everything that they put on their backs, that they put in their mouths. Every aspect of life is going to be increased.

Now, keep in mind that, while there may be some kind of science that we want to turn this debate into, here are the facts: middle-income Americans and lower-income Americans have seen a drop in their wages—a significant drop in their wages. Last month, we saw that we have created one job for every 8,000 Americans.

So we talk about today how we need to talk about climate change. No. Here is what we need to talk about: we need to talk about real change in the marketplace. We need to talk about how

we are hurting the American economy. We need to talk about how we are eliminating the ability of America to compete in a global economy—an economy that I just don't want to participate in but I think America should dominate.

America is so blessed with so many assets. And while we worry about all the energy above, let's not forget all the energy below. Let's not forget what America's strongest card is to play, and that is energy self-sustainability. We are able to do that.

Why in the world would anybody think that by adding \$10 on a barrel of oil, somehow that is going to help the climate worldwide, when we know that we are the only ones proposing this? Other people around the world are looking and saying: I can't agree more with the President's ideas because we compete against the United States, and I would love to be on the shelf with a product that costs more than the one we are putting on the shelf.

So America is hurting America. America's policies are hurting everyday Americans. And if we truly want to make America great again, let's make America great again for every single American. That is not a political aspiration; that is a responsibility in America's House, and that is the House of Representatives.

Our sense that somehow this would be positive is absolutely wrongheaded and wrong thinking. It just doesn't work that way.

Why would we sit here and debate this today? Because we know it is going to hurt every single hard-working American taxpayer. It is going to add to our cost of living. It is going to increase the cost of everything we consume. We are going to do it with the idea that somehow, the rest of the world will follow suit, and we know that they won't.

What they will do is look at us and say: You know what? Let's take advantage of America's wrong-headedness. Let's make sure that we are able to buy up more of the market, the global market, because America continues to hurt itself and hurt its everyday citizens.

My goodness. This is America's House of Representatives. We do not come here representing ourselves—we come here representing 705,687 Americans who live back in our districts. We do not come here just representing Republican policy and Republican agenda. We do not just come here representing Democrat policy and Democrat agenda. We come here representing America. And if we cannot get it through our heads that, at the end of the day, the policy that comes out of this town—a town that is a wash in prosperity, good jobs, great restaurants.

I have never seen a town with more cranes in it. I am talking about industrial cranes. I would love some of my colleagues to walk back home with me and go into the cities, the towns, and the little villages that I represent. And

you tell those people: things are really getting good; we are on the right stage; we are on the right trajectory; that we are going to become good again. But the question is: When?

I would just suggest that—and I said this earlier—you cannot continue to put the burden of these policies—well-intended, though they may be—on the backs of hardworking American taxpayers, men and women who get up every day with one resolve and one resolve only, and that is to take care of their families, to build a better community, and to build a better life.

Why in the world do we have to waste time debating something today that could be debated elsewhere? But we come here today with a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President's ideas in his budget are absolutely wrong for every single American.

We can debate these things later. But we have to come to agreement at some point here, that we just don't represent our parties—we represent people. That is far more important than any party that we represent.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Look, I have only been here 5 years. But I come out of the private sector. I never, ever thought I would be serving in Congress because I never, ever thought I would have to. I thought people would come here representing me and my family; my community, my State, and my Nation; and that they would do the right thing. And I don't say that they don't think they are doing the right thing. But at the end of the day, the final results don't look very good.

In a Nation that is quickly approaching \$20 trillion in debt and burdening every single American taxpayer with more and more cost of being here while not increasing their opportunity, I think we need to take a hard look, take a look in the mirror and understand that it all changes, it all starts with each of us. We can change this. We can make it better. But we can't make it better by putting a heavy burden on our taxpayers. It just doesn't make sense.

As I said earlier, America can dominate a global economy. Just participating isn't enough. I would just suggest that that is all possible in a land that has been so graced by gifts from God that make it possible for us to do that. The only thing that can keep it from happening are policies coming out of Washington, D.C.

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

I always enjoy sharing the debate with my good friend from Butler, Pennsylvania, who cares passionately about this country. He has some, I think, great ideas. We often find areas that we

can agree. I think even the issue that we are debating today could be an area where we could find agreement, because what the President is proposing is not to levy a fee and have the money burned up. The President is proposing a fee to fix America's damaged infrastructure.

I know my friend from Butler cares passionately about the people who he represents. They are paying a tax today for poor infrastructure. The average American pays three times with annual damage to their cars than what this fee would be, if it were translated directly to a gas tax increase.

I note that his State of Pennsylvania actually has imposed an oil franchise fee which is the equivalent of about another 9.5 cent increase. Pennsylvania did that because their infrastructure is damaged.

Well, that is what we should have as part of this discussion today. Again, we have a cartoon proposal that assumes that there is just a barrel fee that is just a burden on the American public and not look at what the fee is for, what benefits would accrue if, again, we had actually had the Ways and Means Committee meet and discuss the legislation that was referred to us. We didn't have a hearing on this.

One of the things I have pleaded with Ways and Means leadership for as long as I have been on the committee: Let's sit down and actually have meaningful discussions with the men and women who manage, design, build, and operate America's infrastructure. If we would have had that debate in this Congress, we could have had arrayed before us the president of the AFL-CIO, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the president—actually, we did have the president of the American Trucking Association, the one witness the Democrats were allowed, who said: Raise the tax on my people, along with everybody else, to rebuild and renew America.

But we never had a robust, broad debate before our committee. If we did, we would have had the broadest coalition of any major issue that we considered: the people who design roads, the people who come forward with the asphalt, and the people who are the delivery services.

We are paying a tremendous price today because America is falling apart and falling behind. You don't have to go very far to ask people in Louisiana; Portland, Oregon; or Houston, Texas, if we have got a problem. This is an investment that more than pays for itself. Again, this isn't money down some rat hole. This is money that would be invested to rebuild and renew America.

If we would have had a real hearing on this proposal—which we didn't—we could have had the people from Standard & Poor's research come in and review their report. Every \$1.2 billion we spend on infrastructure creates \$2 billion of economic activity. These are the people who would have family-wage

jobs from coast to coast who would help revitalize local economies, while we make our infrastructure safer and more effective.

And it isn't just economic activity. That Standard & Poor's report would have revealed that that \$1.2 billion in infrastructure would have reduced the deficit by \$200 million, but we didn't have that debate. So we have people coming up here on the floor somehow claiming that the President's responsible proposal to fund infrastructure would be an economic disaster, ignoring the fact that we have an infrastructure crisis in this country right now.

The American Society of Civil Engineers points out that our failure to deal with this is a tax of over \$3,000 per family.

If we would be honest, have independent experts, if the committee would do its job, we wouldn't be having bizarre debates like this that suggest that the President's proposal would hurt the economy or would be costly. To the contrary, it would strengthen the economy, put millions of people to work at family-wage jobs, and improve the conditions of families from coast to coast.

We are going to have, I hope, more heard about this in the future. But I hope that we don't have proposals that are rushed to the floor without thoughtful committee action and making strange assertions that simply are not supported by facts.

□ 1045

If we impose the fee that the President is talking about to rebuild and renew America, it will create more economic activity, it will put people to work, and it will give Americans the infrastructure they deserve and enhance our economic security at home and abroad.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to something before I yield to my colleague.

Let me just say that I appreciate the gentleman's passion for transportation infrastructure. I share it. We have had many conversations. But he well knows that the ideal way to solve this is with a specific user fee for that purpose.

This particular tax, \$10.25 on a barrel of oil, has such a huge detrimental economic impact across all sectors of our economy. That is not the way to go. That is why I don't think this is something we should entertain as the President has proposed. I think we need thoughtful discussion about this, and that will come in due time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and someone I have great respect for.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate him bringing this up.

Mr. Speaker, I really regret the fact that this has devolved into a big par-

tisan debate or a big partisan discussion.

Everyone in this Chamber supports the concept of infrastructure investment. That is not what this is about. That is not what this is about. All of us support infrastructure investment, and all of us agree that we have underfunded infrastructure, that we need more investment in infrastructure.

In my home State, in Baton Rouge, in the capital region, we have the worst traffic in the Nation for a midsize city. Our people sit in traffic an average of 47 hours above the national average at home. It is ridiculous.

Here is what is going on right now. Here is what is going on. The gas tax was set up to be a user fee. It was set up to be a user fee that the more you drove, the more you used the roads, the more you paid for it. That is the way that this is supposed to work.

What has happened is that the President has come out and offered a proposal that disconnects the user fee. We support a user fee model. We support lock-boxing the dollars and making sure that they are dedicated to infrastructure as opposed to what has happened, for example, another issue that the sponsor of this legislation has worked on—the harbor maintenance trust fund—where billions of dollars have been charged on the auspices of one thing and diverted to something else. We support infrastructure investment.

Now, what is going on right now is we are seeing this continuation of policies out of this administration that is contrary to American interests, and I want to explain that.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon State probably—and I haven't verified this—but probably depended upon the State of Louisiana, one of the top producers of oil and gas in this country, to power their cars, to power their vehicles, and to power their airplanes that they fly back and forth from Washington, D.C., to the West Coast. We provide that. But at home, in our State of Louisiana, we have lost one-third of our oil and gas jobs. We are killing this industry because of overregulation.

Something that just shocks me is, last year, we listened to the Secretary of State, John Kerry, stand up and say: We need to allow Iran to export their oil so their economy can recover. Our Secretary of State said that. Yet, at the same time, at home, in Louisiana, we were prohibited from exporting our oil.

Why in the world would we treat Iran better than Louisiana, better than Texas, better than Oklahoma, and all of these energy-producing States across the United States?

So do you know what we did? After opposition from the White House, we finally lifted the 40-year-old oil export ban. So what happens? Within a month and a half, we get a proposal from the President to put a \$10.25-a-barrel tax on American oil.

What does that do? If we try and take our oil out to global markets, we are immediately met with a premium of 30 to 40 percent over global prices. It further kills our industry. It further kills our domestic production that we have lost one-third of the jobs on. And I know everybody wants to see us fly solar airplanes. It is not happening right now. We need to continue to rely on these fuels moving forward.

This should not be a partisan debate. We support infrastructure investment. It needs to continue to be a user fee. We should not divorce it from a user fee, and we should not do it in a way that is going to kill our energy industry in the United States to further increase our reliance upon foreign energy sources.

It is a flawed policy. This is consistent with what we saw last year when the President of the United States was standing up and saying, "Give us free trade authority. We need the ability to engage in free trade because we can outcompete other countries," and, at the exact same time, standing up and overregulating our economy to where we send American workers out there in the workforce trying to compete with these other countries with our arms tied behind our back. These policies aren't consistent, and they are not in the interest of the United States.

I agree with the gentleman from Oregon; we need to work together. We need to work together in a bipartisan manner to come up with a new user fee concept to get us additional dollars for infrastructure.

This was a unilateral proposal. This was not subject to hearings, and it is not appropriate. It is contrary to our economy; it is contrary to American interests; and it is going to increase our trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that we support this legislation and that we move forward in a bipartisan manner to fix the user fee concept to increase the investment in infrastructure to where we can improve our roadways.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Louisiana and his assessment. Actually, I agree with him. We should have a different mechanism.

I have had proposals to have different approaches to funding infrastructure. Some of them have been embedded in the more recent transportation reauthorization, but this is something that we never took up in our Ways and Means Committee. I have had legislation there for several Congresses. It is time for people to stop saying that they support infrastructure and then not work with us to figure out ways to fund it going forward.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in Congress in my tenure who has done more to think about what we do for America's infrastructure. He has had many innovative proposals to fund infrastructure. He has been a tireless champion of it. He is the ranking Democrat

on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Those watching or listening might be a little confused what this is about. It is about a meaningless piece of paper. It is called House Concurrent Resolution 112. It is expressing the sense of Congress that something that the President proposed is bad and they don't like it.

Well, he proposed it and they are not going to take it up. Why are we wasting time debating something that they are not going to put on the schedule and isn't a reality? I don't know. Because they are trying to fill up time? It is not clear to me.

What they are doing is continuing to avoid the discussion of how we are going to pay for America's infrastructure. Dwight David Eisenhower said, Let's have a user fee, a gas tax. The last time we increased the gas tax federally was 1993—18.4 cents a gallon. That figured out to be about 15 percent of every gallon you bought. I paid \$2.50 a gallon in Oregon last weekend. The Federal tax is still 18.4 cents. That is about 7 percent per gallon, and those dollars are worth less.

We are talking about what it is going to do to jobs if we have some sort of tax on oil that we use to pay for infrastructure. Let's talk about the other side where we can create one heck of a lot of jobs. Every penny for a gas tax, every penny, raises about \$1.7 billion for the Federal trust fund. \$1.7 billion, under the most conservative estimates, most conservative, is more than 25,000 jobs. So one penny, 25,000 jobs. But, no, we can't go there.

I proposed we index the existing gas tax to inflation. No, we can't do that. All right. Didn't want to do that.

I proposed that we tax the fraction of a barrel of oil that goes into taxable transportation uses, not manufacturing, not agriculture, not any of this other stuff that they are talking about. I put that proposal forward 7 years ago. I put it forward to my colleagues and to the White House. Now, the White House has burped out something different here—this more indiscriminate tax—which would go to other uses.

The point is that there are thoughtful ways to approach this and pay for what we need. America is falling apart. 140,000 bridges nationwide—including the highest proportion in the State of Pennsylvania, by the way, which we heard from earlier—are in need of replacement or significant repair. Trucks are detouring around them. People are being detoured around them.

There are potholed roads. Forty percent of the national highway system needs not just to be resurfaced, it needs to be dug up it has failed so badly. People are breaking their rims, blowing out tires, and damaging their cars. It is costing Americans a lot. People are locked in congestion because we are not dealing with the growth in traffic.

And, oh, let's just look out just a little way outside the capital here to the worst example. We are killing people, killing people, on our transit systems unnecessarily because Congress has failed to partner with the cities of America and the rural areas who have transit. We have an \$84 billion backlog to bring transit up to a state of good repair, not new transit options to get people out of their cars and help them deal with congestion to get around. \$84 billion just so we are not killing people.

And we are talking about, oh, we can't be competitive. Yeah, we are not competitive in the world economy. I go around talking about how we are now degraded. We used to have an infrastructure that was the envy of the world.

And I talked about how we are becoming Third World. My colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) criticized me very, very adamantly about that one day. I said, What do you mean, EARL, you know how bad it is? He said, No, no, that is insulting to Third World countries. They are investing a larger percentage of their gross domestic product in infrastructure than we are here in the United States of America. And that is true. So now I have taken to calling us Fourth World.

We used to be the world's leader in infrastructure, and now we are vaulting over everybody, including places like Zimbabwe, to the back of the pack. Give me a break.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And where is the discussion? It is no, no, no. No, can't have a barrel tax. No, can't increase the gas tax. No, can't index the gas tax.

Oh, but we want to talk about a user fee. What user fee? Why are we wasting time on this? You are not going to bring it up. You are in charge. You set the agenda. Why are we passing a bill to say we are not going to take something up?

I would be kind of embarrassed if I was in the majority and that is what I was wasting time on while people are trapped in traffic, while people are dying, because we can't maintain our transit systems. People are blowing out tires because we can't repair the roads.

And, oh, we are all for infrastructure until it comes to paying for it. We passed a 5-year bill. We paid for it with phony money. We pretended that when we have private tax collection, that it will make money—private tax collection. Republicans have passed that twice before. It kind of pissed off the American people. And guess what, it lost money each time, and then we put it back in the IRS.

But, no, this time it is going to make money and we are going to use it and pay for infrastructure. Give me a

break. And the Federal Reserve makes that money and puts it in a reserve account with a computer. Let's take that money and spend it.

Basically, you are just averting the real problem here, which is we need to have a serious discussion about how we are going to pay to build America's infrastructure and become a world leader again and be the envy of the world again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members of the House to refrain from vulgarity in debate.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my friend and colleague from across the Potomac River, who cares a great deal about environmental policy and infrastructure.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution and add my strong opposition to the resolution before, also.

As I read the text of H. Con. Res. 89, whereas by whereas, I found myself in disagreement with virtually every alleged predictive statement. This resolution is framed as long-term economic wisdom, yet exemplifies short-term thinking and economic folly.

A carbon tax should, in fact, increase the cost of fossil fuels, but will also accelerate the rapidly falling cost of all other fuels: solar, wind, geothermal, hydro, and perhaps even nuclear.

A carbon tax absolutely must not fall hardest on the poor, the elderly, and those with fixed incomes. The best of the carbon tax plans, Representative VAN HOLLEN's carbon cap and economic dividend, returns every dollar gathered by a carbon cap to every U.S. citizen with a Social Security number.

This carbon cap is actually progressive, with a net increase in the disposable income for most Americans, and certainly our neediest citizens. This will be a net job creator.

□ 1100

The resolution suggests that jobs and businesses will move overseas and that a carbon tax will restrain economic growth. British Columbia instituted a carbon tax in July 2008, and over the following 5-year period, its GDP growth actually outpaced the rest of non-carbon-priced Canada.

In one "whereas," it states that U.S. energy policy should encourage private sector innovation and development, but nothing would stimulate and sustain such innovation as powerfully as would appropriate carbon pricing. Every manufacturer, perhaps every family, would continue to search out the best ways to minimize the costs of production and to maximize family welfare. We are resilient, creative, and adaptive.

For a long time, conservative and liberal economists have agreed that a carbon tax is the most efficient and effective way to deal with climate change.

Let me quote from a recent letter from four conservative and libertarian leaders to Members of Congress:

The least burdensome, most straightforward, and most market friendly means of addressing climate change is to price the risks imposed by greenhouse gas emissions via a tax. This would harness price signals, rather than regulations, to guide a market response. That is why carbon pricing has the support of free market economists, a majority of the global business community, and a large number of the largest multinational private oil and gas companies in the world.

One of the policy issues that most divides our Congress is the debate on the appropriate level of governmental regulation. But to quote again from the same letter:

An economy-wide carbon tax that replaces existing regulatory interventions could reduce the cost of climate policy and deregulate the economy.

Jerry Taylor of the Niskanen Center wrote a paper called "The Conservative Case for a Carbon Tax." He argues that, if conservative denial of climate science is grounded in ideological aversion to command-and-control regulation, as proposed in the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan, conservatives should embrace and promote a revenue-neutral carbon tax as a more efficient, less burdensome, free market alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose both resolutions as they are unwise, unnecessary, and of backward thinking.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, as I have no further requests for time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I appreciate the opportunity for us to visit on this proposal today. I don't agree with the resolution by any stretch of the imagination, but at least it is an opportunity for us to have a little bit of the conversation that we should have been having all along.

I enjoy debating with my good friend from Louisiana. I respect his intellect and his humor, and it is fun to do a little bit of this today. It would have been far better if we would have been able to do so in the context of a full committee hearing where we would have been able to dig deeply into these issues. For example, we could have had the Transportation Construction Coalition.

I include in the RECORD a letter on this resolution, a letter which is dated June 9 of this year.

JUNE 9, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House is scheduled to consider later this week a resolution opposing President Obama's proposal for a \$10.25 per barrel of oil tax. While H. Con. Res. 112 makes many statements regarding an oil barrel tax, the resolution fails to mention the intent of the President's proposal is to generate resources to stabilize and grow federal surface transportation investment. The resolution also does not remind members that recurring Highway Trust Fund revenue shortfalls caused repeated disruptions to their state's transportation program over the past eight years.

Since 2008, Congress has approved seven pieces of legislation transferring a total \$143 billion in borrowed or General Fund revenue into the Highway Trust Fund to prevent cuts in federal highway and transit investment. Over that same period, the trust fund's permanent revenue deficit has led to 14 temporary extensions of the surface transportation programs and one short-term reauthorization bill. Furthermore, upon the expiration of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act at the end of FY 2020, the Congressional Budget Office projects the trust fund's average annual shortfall will grow to \$18 billion.

While the sincerity of the Obama Administration's proposal for a Highway Trust Fund solution is dubious given its release three months after the President signed the FAST Act into law, a per barrel oil tax of that magnitude would be a real and permanent solution. And its nexus to highway users as a revenue mechanism is far more honest than the budget gimmicks, deficit spending and burdens placed on non-transportation sectors of the economy that the Congress has deployed since 2008 to keep investment in the surface transportation programs essentially static.

We certainly respect the right of members of Congress to disagree with the President's proposal, but it is incumbent upon anyone who does so to bring forward an alternative way to achieve the same objective. We strongly believe all potential revenue options should be on the table. Preliminarily disparaging one significant solution just makes it more difficult to resolve a problem that has plagued Congress for nearly a decade.

Rather than making rhetorical statements about taxes five months before an election, Congress should be working in a bipartisan manner to ensure that a permanent mechanism to preserve and grow federal highway and public transportation investment is in place well before the U.S. Department of Transportation starts warning states of the next highway program shutdown.

Sincerely,

THE TRANSPORTATION
CONSTRUCTION COALITION.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, they point out that the resolution fails to mention that the intent of the President's proposal is to generate resources to stabilize and grow Federal surface transportation investment. The resolution does not remind Members that the recurring Highway Trust Fund revenue shortfalls caused repeated disruptions to their States' transportation programs over the past eight years.

We have had to have 14 temporary extensions of the Surface Transportation Act, and the only way we got the FAST Act passed, as my friend Congressman DEFAZIO pointed out, was with a series of budget gimmicks, not real solutions. At the end of 2020, when that legislation expires, we are going to face a \$20 billion annual deficit.

The per barrel oil tax of this magnitude, according to the Transportation Construction Coalition, would be a real and a permanent solution. We wouldn't be chasing our tails all the time. And its nexus to highway users as a revenue mechanism is far more honest than the budget gimmicks, deficit spending, and burdens placed on non-transportation sectors of the economy that Congress has deployed since

2008 to keep investment, essentially, static.

They state that they believe all potential revenue options should be on the table, that it is incumbent upon anybody who wants to disagree with the President to bring forward an alternative way to meet the same objective, which, sadly, has not happened. We haven't even been able to discuss it in the Ways and Means Committee.

They write:

Preliminarily disparaging one significant solution just makes it more difficult to resolve a problem that has plagued Congress for more than a decade.

Rather than making rhetorical statements about taxes 5 months before an election, Congress should be working in a bipartisan manner to ensure that a permanent mechanism to preserve and grow Federal highway and public transportation investment is in place well before the Department of Transportation starts warning States about the next program shutdown.

I seldom read statements from other groups on the floor, but I couldn't have said it better myself.

That is what we should be doing rather than this exercise today, which completely misses the point. This oil barrel fee may not be perfect, but it would go a long way toward solving the problem. It will put millions of Americans to work at family-wage jobs. It will create more economic activity than the cost of the program. For every \$1.2 billion that it generates, it will generate \$2 billion of economic activity, and it will reduce the deficit \$200 million. If we had actually had the committee do a deep dive and spend a week in working on it, this would have been on the table, and I think we would have found wide areas of agreement.

Rather than engaging in this exercise regarding H. Con. Res. 112, I would like to think of what Ronald Reagan did in 1982. The economy was pretty rocky in 1982. There were some contentious politics in Congress. Ronald Reagan, in his Thanksgiving Day speech on November 29, 1982, called on Congress to come back from their Thanksgiving recess and work together to more than double the Federal gas tax, because in one of the best speeches, frankly, I have ever heard anybody give, he pointed out the little cost to the American consumer would be more than offset by damage, for example, for a couple pair of shock absorbers.

Congress reacted to President Reagan's call for a gas tax increase on a bipartisan basis. It more than doubled it. It added hundreds of thousands of jobs, and it improved the quality of life for Americans. It did so in keeping the bipartisan tradition surrounding infrastructure. Rather than this partisan partial debate, we ought to go back to the basics, follow Ronald Reagan's example, and have a spirited, comprehensive approach to solving the problem rather than tilting at straw men.

I strongly urge the rejection of the resolution, but, more important, the rejection of this approach to continue to stick our heads in the sand and

avoid our responsibility to fund American infrastructure and to rebuild and renew this great country.

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

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

I appreciate the gentleman's passion and intellect, and we have had many conversations. We do agree that we have to fix our deplorable infrastructure, and he and I have worked on some of these things together; but I have to say this: When I was in medical school—and I am a heart surgeon and I have had years of medical training—one of the things we learned a long time ago in medicine was to avoid iatrogenic treatment, which is a fancy, Greek-derived word which means to avoid a treatment that makes the problem worse. That is what this \$10.25 tax would do on a barrel of oil.

I have often referred to that plaque above the Speaker's desk. It is a quote from Daniel Webster. The very first line of that reads: "Let us develop the resources of our land." I think it goes beyond simple concepts of highway transportation. It is all the resources of our land.

We should be embracing the energy revolution that has been unleashed by American innovation, not taxing it into oblivion, not overregulating it into oblivion. This has offered tremendous hope not only for Americans, but for the world over, to offer a new view of energy security, taking us away from the Iranian approach or the OPEC approach or a Russian view by which they hoard resources and use this for their own political purposes. America can reshape it by embracing this energy revolution, and we can grow the economy, create jobs, improve wages, and have the revenues to take care of our infrastructure.

As the gentleman well knows, Ronald Reagan believed that a user fee was important, a specific user fee. I think he and I would both agree that a specific user fee is important for infrastructure. This is not a user fee. This is a detrimental tax on American competitiveness, on American jobs, on American wages, on American energy security, and it hits at the very foundation of our national security. It is the wrong way to go. It is an iatrogenic solution, a harmful solution. It is not pro-growth. We are not proud of the economic performance we have seen in recent months: 0.8 percent economic growth in the first quarter, only 38,000 non-farm jobs created last month, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor. That is deplorable.

America must lead, and America can lead by embracing the energy revolution. Let's look at all of the impacts it will have across our entire economy, and then we can fashion specific solutions for transportation and infrastructure and for the other things we need to do.

This is why I stand here. That is why I oppose this tax. That is why I think

this debate was important, and that is why I think it is very important to go on record as opposing this very detrimental tax.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in opposition to H. Con. Res. 112, expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil.

During my time in Congress, I have represented all five major refineries and countless energy production firms in East Harris County.

I know the importance of the domestically produced and refined oil to the U.S. economy.

I also know the importance of a well-funded transportation system. Houston is growing rapidly and our transportation system needs to expand with our population.

I stand in opposition to today's Sense of Congress because of this knowledge and experience.

But to clarify, we shouldn't make things tougher on American companies and domestically-produced crude.

I do not support a \$10 dollar tax on our natural resources.

I do not support a \$10 dollar tax on wildcaters in West Texas, North Dakota or any other areas in the U.S. that supply crude to the Texas Gulf Coast.

It is these companies that are responsible for the energy renaissance in the U.S.

These entrepreneurs lowered our gas prices, reduced our foreign dependence and made the U.S. the largest producer of oil in the world.

I do support a \$10 dollar tax on imported oil from foreign sources.

Imported oil from countries that may or may not be our friends does not benefit our national security or domestic economy.

We should sharpen our competitive edge and expand our 21st century transportation system by taxing imported oil.

I stand with our domestic companies, we should continue to produce and refine U.S. crude for the benefit of U.S. consumers and workers.

But I stand in opposition of this overly expansive Sense of Congress and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, putting a regressive tax on hardworking Americans is not the way to strengthen the economy, balance the budget, or create jobs.

The President's proposed \$10.25 per barrel tax on crude oil is an administrative grab to increase spending and tax a targeted industry.

Thousands of jobs have been lost in these uncertain times for the oil and gas industry and impacted communities.

Now is not the time to make matters worse for an important economic engine and slow an already weak economic recovery.

The Obama Administration knows this tax would be passed down to American families.

The non-partisan Congressional Research Service reported that this tax could increase the price of a gallon of gasoline by 25 cents—which is a 10 percent hike on today's prices.

That would increase the cost of a wide range of goods for all consumers.

The resolution before us takes a strong stand and makes perfectly clear that Congress will not allow the President's harmful tax to go forward.

It also pushes for a tough review of the effects of ill-conceived tax proposals that target

specific industries, as the President's tax does.

We must ensure that tax policy decisions are made in a reasoned way that protects working families—rather than harms them in a single-minded hunt for revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 112 and voting for its passage.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives will consider H. Con. Res. 112—Expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil. This unserious, non-binding resolution is simply nothing more than a cynical Republican political messaging bill. Indeed, the resolution purposely fails to include that the proposal was a serious attempt by the President to finance the critical infrastructure needs our country most certainly requires. The energy industry is critical to the global economy. Unfortunately, the manner in which the majority has decided to have this discussion leaves little room for thought or earnest debate. For these reasons, I will vote Present, and will encourage my colleagues to continue to work in earnest to find a long-term, sustainable solution to move forward with putting Americans to work in building out our transportation needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 767, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5325 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 771 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. 5325.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 1114

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. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 9, 2016, the Chair had announced that it was in order to consider amendment No. 7, printed in House Report 114-611.

□ 1115

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam 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 deliver a printed copy of the United States House of Representatives Telephone Directory to the office of any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment that will prevent wasteful spending in this bill and the unsolicited delivery of printed copies of the House telephone directory to 435 House congressional offices.

I hold here the United States House of Representatives Telephone Directory for 2016. This book, printed by the Government Publishing Office, contains 378 pages of names, addresses, and the contact information for Members of Congress and their staffs. While the Clerk of the House does get a deal from the GPO on these printing costs, this directory is sold to the public online at a cost of \$52 per book. GPO stated that 14,080 copies of this directory were sent this year to the House Postal Operations for delivery.

This year, all 435 House Member offices received this stack—this whole stack right here—unsolicited from the Office of the Clerk, 20 copies, total, for each office.

Each year we get this directory and, to be frank, it is not needed. All the information contained within these pages is readily available online, both publicly and through House Web sites.

To make matters worse, often, the information contained is out of date by the time we receive these bound copies. For example, by the time I received my 20 copies of this directory, the information listed for my staff was no longer current.

According to a CRS report from 2011, approximately 97 percent of all government documents originate in digital form and are distributed electronically but are not printed. This same CRS report estimated that it costs Congress about \$134 per page for prepress costs for miscellaneous publications, of which this directory is one.

Madam Chairman, I don't think I need to remind anyone here that we are currently \$19 trillion-plus in debt as a result of excessive and unnecessary spending. I will be the first to admit that this amendment will not be saving millions of dollars this year alone, but in a time of such financial crisis, we should remain vigilant and save every penny we can.

This book is unnecessary, and its unsolicited distribution en masse is excessive. Why does each D.C. office get 20 unsolicited copies? My D.C. office only has eight employees, none of which utilize these wasteful directories.

I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will save precious taxpayer money and prevent future unsolicited deliveries of this directory in every single House office on the Hill.

I thank the distinguished chair and ranking member for their work on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam 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 deliver a printed copy of the Budget of the United States Government; Analytical Perspectives, Budget of the United States Government; or the Appendix, Budget of the United States Government, to the office of any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer another commonsense amendment that will prevent wasteful spending in this bill by preventing the delivery of this packet of nearly 2,000 pages containing the President's budget request to 435 House congressional offices.

In its 2017 budget justification, the Government Publishing Office states:

“Since 2012, GPO has made the annual Budget of the U.S. Government available as a mobile app. The FY 2016 Budget app, released in January of 2015, provided users with access to the text and images of the Budget, including the Budget Message of the President, information on the President's priorities, and budget overviews organized by agency. This app provides links to GPO's FDsys where summary tables and additional books of the Budget, including the Analytical Perspectives, Appendix, and Historical Tables, are available.”

This package, which contains the President's budget, analytical perspectives of the budget, and the appendix of the budget are all available on an app for your phone for free. Furthermore, all three are available in their entirety online at www.whitehouse.gov/omb/, where they are more easily searchable.

While the Office of Management and Budget does get a great deal from GPO on printing costs, each individual copy sells online for \$38, \$56, and \$79, respectively. These documents comprise 170 pages, 409 pages, and 1,413 pages, respectively. OMB orders one copy of the budget for all 435 Members of the House, and this publication is then printed by the Government Publishing Office and delivered by House Postal Operations.

In a time when our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis and has a \$19 trillion-plus debt as a result of excessive and unnecessary spending, we should not be squandering more money printing nearly 2,000 pages of the President's budget that most Members throw in the trash, recycle, or don't even open.

Furthermore, this massive document is not even a serious proposal and has been routinely rejected with strong bipartisan support. The Senate defeated President Obama's budget by a vote of 97-0 for fiscal year 2011, 99-0 in fiscal year 2012, and 98-1 last year.

Again, I will be the first one to admit that this amendment will not save millions of dollars this year alone, but, in a time of such fiscal crisis, we should remember the old adage that a penny saved is a penny earned.

The printing and distribution of the President's budget to 435 House offices is excessive. I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and we will save precious taxpayer money and prevent future mass deliveries. Again, all these publications are online in their entirety, where they are more easily searchable, and they are also on a free mobile app.

I thank the distinguished chair and ranking member for their work on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-611.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

(1) within a three-year period preceding the 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;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this is an amendment that is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule during the 113th and 114th Congresses. I extend my thanks to the Rules Committee for ruling this amendment in order.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractors. I hope that this amendment remains noncontroversial, as it has been, and will again be passed unanimously by the House.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment.

This is a commonsense amendment which would prohibit funding in this bill from being used to pay contractors engaged in fraud or tax evasion. As the gentleman said, similar amendments have been adopted on other appropriations bills.

I urge Members to vote "aye."

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Technology Assessment as authorized by the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 471 et seq.) \$2,500,000, to be derived from a reduction of \$2,500,000 in the amount provided in this Act for the item for "Architect of the Capitol, Capital Construction and Operations".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise today in support of my amendment, which would restore funding to the Office of Technology Assessment, or OTA. The foundation for good policy is accurate and objective analysis; and for more than two decades, the OTA set that foundation by providing relevant, unbiased technical and scientific assessments for Members of Congress and staff.

In 1995, the OTA was defunded, stripping Congress of a valuable resource to understand both emerging technologies as well as the nuances of the legislative process. In its absence, the need for OTA has only grown. Many of the issues OTA studied 20 years ago are even more pressing today: antibiotic-resistant bacteria, electronic surveillance in the digital age, and testing in America's schools. These are the complex challenges our Nation will continue to face, and Congress should have access to the thorough and insightful analysis OTA can provide.

Investing in the OTA now will actually save us money in the future. In the last year it operated, OTA's budget was \$23 million, but its studies on the Synthetics Fuels Corporation saved taxpayers tens of billions of dollars.

Our amendment restores a modest \$2.5 million to the OTA account for salaries and expenses to begin rebuilding the office. The cost is offset by a reduction of the same amount to the AOC's capital construction and operations account, which is an administrative account. So this will not take resources from specific construction projects.

Madam Chair, a great surgeon does not operate without modern tools, a master chef does not cook without fresh ingredients, and Members of Congress should not make policy decisions without relevant and unbiased information.

I urge Members to vote "yes" on this amendment to restore funding to the Office of Technology Assessment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California. I know he has great intentions with this amendment.

As we discuss the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, we are really discussing what is important to the House of Representatives, because that is what this bill reflects.

I know that this office was created in 1972 and was eliminated years later, but in 1972, I was 2 years old. Technology was very different. I see no need to re-create something that was started dealing with technology when I was 2 years old, almost two decades prior to the first Web site.

Currently, these tasks are being handled by GAO. They are being handled sufficiently. They are being handled with the \$2.5 million already, and we have yet to receive any complaints.

Now, if there is a more comprehensive need for technology assessment, I think that is a bigger discussion for cyber policy in general, and that is a conversation that should take place outside of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee's jurisdiction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I rise in support of the amendment to revive the Office of Technology Assessment.

When I was chair of the subcommittee, we tried to restart it within the Government Accountability Office. In fiscal years 2008 to 2010, I included \$2.5 million in this bill with GAO to support that initiative. However, the supporters of the amendment make an impassioned case that the Office of Technology Assessment should be a part of Congress itself, rather than GAO, in order to provide objective analysis of complex, scientific, and technical issues which certainly, I think we can all agree, actually exist today.

We are not trying to go back to 20th century technology. We have important issues that need to be reviewed, and we don't always have the expertise in Congress necessary to be able to make sure we can get that cogent analysis, particularly when we are still at funding levels back to 2010 in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

This is a bill in which we are tackling copyright modernization, specifically dealing with technology challenges, and an OTA would add to the rigor of our analysis on that topic and others.

I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I will just point out that one of our focuses in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is to be very responsible with taxpayer dollars. During these lean times when we are \$19 trillion in debt, we have really led the

charge when it comes to reducing spending from our operations, down 13.2 percent. We have eliminated some agencies and programs and even, in this bill, eliminate the Open World Center.

□ 1130

I don't see this as the time that we need to restart a new program that was eliminated 20 years ago.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining on my side?

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and a respected physicist.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chair, thank you to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and to my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for helping to bring this amendment to the floor.

This amendment would provide \$2.5 million to resurrect the Office of Technology Assessment to revive this crucial service of providing Congress with unbiased, nonpartisan reports on a wide range of issues in science and technology.

This office is no less necessary today than when it first started in 1972. As technology continues to advance at an increasingly rapid pace and our partisan divide seems to grow deeper, Congress needs this now more than ever.

I ask my colleagues to consider just one single one of the recommendations from the Office of Technology Assessment, that the United States rapidly adopt a standardized electronic medical record format. Had this been done, we would have been able to save hundreds of millions of dollars in medical costs over the last decades and hundreds of thousands of lives of Americans through prevention of preventable medical accidents.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to restore this vital source of credible and nonpartisan scientific expertise in Congress.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Chair, I reiterate my support for the Office of Technology Assessment. Congress does not suffer from a lack of information, but it suffers from a lack of trusted information to help make wise policy decisions. We need information that is not spun even by our own agencies, the FBI or other agencies. We need information that is not spun from particular sectors. This agency, this Office of Technology Assessment, will be overseen by a bipartisan group of lawmakers who will vet the experts that work for it.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Madam Chair, I will just again thank my colleague from California for his thoughtful and well-debated argument here for the need, as he sees it. I will again reiterate that the GAO provides a valuable service which I believe can continue doing the job that is necessary.

In these lean times, I would encourage our colleagues to oppose this amendment not because of the gentleman from California, but just because of the lean times and the concept in which it is just not the right time to adopt that. I will oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. RUSSELL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Federal Register to a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) unless the Member requests a copy.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Chair, the fiscal year 2017 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act contains several excellent provisions to cut down on unnecessary printing of paper documents in the House of Representatives. Section 102 of the act, for example, prohibits printed copies of bills from being sent to Members of Congress unless they specifically request them. This amendment is very similar. It prohibits the Federal Register from being sent to Members unless they specifically request it. It uses the exact same terminology as section 102.

The Federal Register, while important because it contains rules, proposals, and various other publications released by Federal agencies, unfortunately every business day Members of Congress receive paper copies of this

Register, while it is available online and queryable. Sadly, most of these hundreds of pages in length end up in the waste bin.

The Federal Register, being available online, is a better way to go with this measure. The Government Printing Office sends 617 copies of the Register every single day to House Members alone. This includes subscriptions for personal offices, committees, archival offices, and others. Each annual subscription costs the Government Printing Office \$750 a year to produce in paper and ink alone. These costs are charged to Federal agencies that publish in the Federal Register.

Among all the Members of Congress and six nonvoting Members in the House, paying for an annual subscription for all of these costs and other estimated delivery costs exceeds \$400,000 annually. To put that into perspective, that could pay for the annual salaries of a dozen Special Forces sergeants who are defending our country abroad.

None of the funds made available by this act may be used to deliver a printed copy of the Federal Register to a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress, unless the Members request specifically a copy.

This simple amendment will build on the reforms of the congressional printing of sections 102, 103, and 105, allowing Federal agencies to better use precious taxpayer dollars. I encourage support for this amendment, Madam Chair, because, once again, we will never win the war on our national debt in some giant spending measure that will only divide us within our respective parties and within the Chamber. Instead, we will win it by combating waste one agency at a time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-611.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$190,970)".

Page 5, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$190,970)".

Page 6, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$190,970)".

Page 42, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$190,970)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 771, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

Madam Chair, despite what has been said about this amendment, it is very simple. There are two bodies that are funded through the appropriations process in the U.S. Congress. One is the House Committee on Ethics. That is the one that we all know as Members of Congress. But there is another body called the Office of Congressional Ethics that works pretty well outside of this body.

Now, my amendment is simply taking this year's increase away from that outside body. Again, no change to the ethical process inside the body, the one that we are all familiar with and feel accountable to. But we are deducting \$191,000 from this outside group because in this time of budget constraints, when I look at my office and all the other offices, our spending has been reduced. Our budgets have been reduced by approximately \$200,000 since 2008.

Now, we have to deal with 750,000 to 900,000 constituents. I have five field offices. Generally we drive, as a staff, somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000 miles per year to deal with our constituents. Our budgets have gone down \$200,000, with a small increase this year of \$12,000.

Then, on the other hand, I see a \$191,000 increase on this outside group. I just feel like that is extraordinary and would suggest that the appropriations bill, H.R. 5325, be reduced in that amount in this budget area.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, the Office of Congressional Ethics is crucial to ensuring accountability and transparency in this body. Any attempts to cut its budget would only serve to erode our constituents' trust and faith in Congress, which certainly has already suffered a significant amount of erosion.

As many of my colleagues will recall, the House created the Office of Congressional Ethics nearly a decade ago to improve the integrity of the ethics process in the House. The House was recovering from the Mark Foley scandal, and it was clear that we needed to do something to rebuild the American people's trust in their elected Representatives. That is why OCE's core "mission is to assist the U.S. House in upholding high ethical standards with an eye toward increasing transparency and providing information to the public."

I acknowledge that there are proposals to improve the operations of the Office of Congressional Ethics, and we should certainly take a look at those, Madam Chair, but it is common sense that these improvements can't be made by cutting funding for the office that we are actually seeking to improve.

Moreover, the issue of congressional ethics is far too important to reduce to a 10-minute debate on the House floor. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I find it odd that we received the words today on the House floor that we are going to increase transparency through the Office of Congressional Ethics. That is exactly what they do not do.

The Sixth Amendment of the Constitution gives the accused the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. I will quote from a letter, a legal letter that was given to the OCE:

This investigation has again revealed due process deficiencies within the OCE rules. While the Sixth Amendment of the United States provides for the fundamental right to confront one's accusers, the OCE rules do not allow to confront the accused with the accusers.

Secondly, the Sixth Amendment gives us the right to a lawyer. I will again quote from PAUL SOLIS, an employee of the OCE, in an email to my chief of staff:

I forgot to mention on our call that should you retain a lawyer for the office, that lawyer would most likely be prohibited under our rules from representing a subject of this review to the extent that subject is a current staff member.

So the OCE, in their email to our office, says you don't have the right to legal counsel, even though the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution says that you do.

The third thing that I see is that we should be able to find out the nature of the charges under the Sixth Amendment. Again, our experience and the experience of others who have confronted OCE realizes you do not know what the charges are, you are not going to get to get a lawyer, and you cannot know who is accusing you. This hardly meets the word "transparency" that my good friend alluded to.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, while I can appreciate the gentleman's concerns, he has listed a number of substantive differences of opinion with the way the Office of Congressional Ethics handles their work. This appropriations bill is not the appropriate place to address those.

The Office of Congressional Ethics was created through legislation. It is a substantive issue, and it is one that should be debated and discussed on an authorizing bill, not on the funding of the legislative branch. You don't just cut the budget of an office with whose decisions you disagree. We can debate and discuss these concerns, but cutting \$190,000 out of the OCE's budget is not the way to address that.

For those reasons and the fact that the public already has some pretty significant concerns with the way we do business here, this would send the wrong message. If we are going to have

this discussion, we should do it in a forum that allows for more robust discussion and debate over how to address those challenges long term.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1145

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Chair, I would remind my friend and colleague that this amendment only addresses the funding. I simply used my time in order to advertise for this agency and the way that they operate.

I would like to quote from an email that I got this morning:

I cried when I saw what your boss did last night on the Leg Branch.

This is referring to my amendment.

I was unfairly targeted by OCE in 2013, for an action in 2008, which had been approved by the Ethics Committee. OCE even admitted there was no evidence. I complied with every provision of the policy, without exception. One of the staffers that was being investigated in this same circumstance left the Hill early on. I considered doing the same thing. I certainly had to endure all the phases of the OCE process, including referral to the Ethics Committee.

The Ethics Committee dismissed the case against us, but it is, by far, the worst thing that has ever happened to me in my 21 years on the Hill. I am a strong person with resources, and was an emotional wreck over the thought of losing my credibility over an ethics investigation. I cried virtually every day for several months. And the prolonged process over many, many months took a toll on my life.

And we are asking to give this agency another \$191,000 to continue this kind of action? I think this debate is exactly called for at this moment on this bill and on this spending.

Madam Chair, I urge Members to support the amendment to give notice to the OCE that we are watching what they are doing.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from New Mexico and his concerns for the operation of the Office of Congressional Ethics. However, all that we would be doing here, if his amendment were to pass, is to send a \$190,000 message to the Office of Congressional Ethics. It would not achieve any of the gentleman's goals.

If we do need to take a look at the way the office functions, then there is a process for doing that. The only thing we achieve here by adopting this amendment is cutting their budget by \$190,000.

So, if the majority believes that it is important to take a look at the function of this office, then there is a process for doing that and to take up legislation to change the way they do business. That is certainly appropriate. But we don't accomplish any of the gentleman's goals by cutting \$190,000.

In fact, the public has certainly already sent multiple messages to the United States Congress that they don't have a whole lot of confidence in the business that we are doing here. This would send the absolute wrong message back to them—that we don't get it.

So I urge Members to oppose the amendment because it would not achieve the gentleman's goals and because we have a more appropriate place to actually achieve those goals in the authorizing committee.

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

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

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-611 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 6 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 241, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—157

Ashford	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Bera	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Beyer	Butterfield	Cicilline
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Cárdenas	Clay
Boyle, Brendan	Carney	Cleaver
F.	Carson (IN)	Connolly

Conyers	Kennedy	Rangel	Palazzo	Roskam	Trott
Courtney	Kildee	Rice (NY)	Palmer	Ross	Turner
Crowley	Kilmer	Richmond	Paulsen	Rothfus	Upton
Cuellar	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Pearce	Rouzer	Valadao
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz	Perry	Royce	Wagner
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Ruppersberger	Peterson	Russell	Walberg
DeFazio	Langevin	Rush	Pittenger	Salmon	Walden
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)	Pitts	Sanford	Walker
Delaney	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda	Poe (TX)	Scalise	Walorski
DeLauro	Levin	T.	Poliquin	Schrader	Walters, Mimi
DeBene	Loebsack	Sanchez, Loretta	Polis	Schweikert	Weber (TX)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sarbanes	Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Schakowsky	Posey	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup
Dingell	Lowe	Schiff	Price, Tom	Sessions	Westerman
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)	Ratcliffe	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Scott, David	Reed	Shuster	Whitfield
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	(NM)	Reichert	Simpson	Williams
Duckworth	(NM)	Serrano	Renacci	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Edwards	Lynch	Sewell (AL)	Ribble	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Ellison	Maloney,	Sherman	Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Womack
Eshoo	Carolyn	Sinema	Rigell	Smith (TX)	Woodall
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter	Roby	Stefanik	Yoder
Gabbard	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Roe (TN)	Stewart	Yoho
Gallego	McCollum	Speier	Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Young (AK)
Galleo	McDermott	Swalwell (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman	Young (IA)
Garamendi	McGovern	Takai	Rohrabacher	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Graham	McNerney	Takano	Rokita	Thornberry	Zeldin
Grayson	Meng	Thompson (CA)	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi	Zinke
Green, Al	Moore	Thompson (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton	
Green, Gene	Moulton	Titus			
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Tonko			
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Torres	Adams	Farr	Larson (CT)
Hahn	Napolitano	Tsongas	Amodei	Fattah	Lee
Hastings	Nolan	Van Hollen	Barletta	Fincher	Lewis
Heck (WA)	Norcross	Vargas	Bass	Franks (AZ)	Lieu, Ted
Higgins	O'Rourke	Veasey	Black	Fudge	Luetkemeyer
Honda	Pallone	Vela	Brat	Gosar	Meeks
Hoyer	Pascrell	Velázquez	Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Huffman	Pelosi	Visclosky	Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Israel	Perlmutter	Walz	Cohen	Hinojosa	Payne
Johnson (GA)	Peters	Wasserman	Davis, Danny	Hunter	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Pingree	Schultz	Duffy	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman	Engel	Jeffries	Yarmuth
Keating	Quigley	Welch			
Kelly (IL)		Wilson (FL)			

NOES—241

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

NOT VOTING—36

Adams	Farr	Larson (CT)
Amodei	Fattah	Lee
Barletta	Fincher	Lewis
Bass	Franks (AZ)	Lieu, Ted
Black	Fudge	Luetkemeyer
Brat	Gosar	Meeks
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Cohen	Hinojosa	Payne
Davis, Danny	Hunter	Sires
Duffy	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Engel	Jeffries	Yarmuth

□ 1208

Messrs. DIAZ-BALART, WITTMAN, and COLLINS of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 289 on agreeing to the Ellison Amendment for H.R. 5325, I am not recorded because I was unavoidable detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 237, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—165

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)
Allen	Black	Brat
Amash	Blackburn	Bridenstine
Babin	Blum	Brooks (AL)
Barton	Bost	Brooks (IN)
Bilirakis	Boustany	Buchanan

Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Lummis
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pitts
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom

Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—237

Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings

Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)

Higgins
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNeerney
Meehan
Meng
Mica
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Price (NC)

Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—32

Adams
Amodei
Barletta
Cohen
Costa
Davis, Danny
Duffy
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Fincher

Fudge
Gosar
Hardy
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Honda
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jackson Lee
Jordan
Lee

Lieu, Ted
Luetkemeyer
Meeks
Miller (MI)
Neal
Payne
Rush
Sires
Waters, Maxine
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1212

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

Stated for:
Mr. HURT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I was
not present for rollcall vote No. 290 on the
Blackburn of Tennessee Amendment No. 6.
Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
TAKANO) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 179, noes 223,
not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—179

Aguilar
Amash
Ashford

Bass
Beatty
Becerra

Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al

Grothman
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)

NOES—223

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishkek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)

Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith

Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta

Long	Peterson	Smith (MO)	Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Reichert	McClintock	Rice (NY)	Takano
Loudermilk	Pittenger	Smith (NE)	Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Renacci	McCollum	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Love	Pitts	Smith (NJ)	Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ribble	McDermott	Rigell	Thompson (MS)
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)	McGovern	Roby	Thompson (PA)
Lummis	Poliquin	Stewart	Collins (GA)	Kline	Roe (TN)	McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi
MacArthur	Pompeo	Stutzman	Conaway	Labrador	Rogers (AL)	McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Marino	Posey	Thompson (PA)	Crawford	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Rodgers	Rothfus	Titus
Massie	Price, Tom	Thornberry	Crenshaw	Lance	Rohrabacher	McNerney	Rouzer	Tonko
McCarthy	Ratcliffe	Tiberi	Culberson	Long	Rokita	McSally	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McCaul	Reed	Tipton	Davidson	Loudermilk	Roskam	Meehan	Royce	Trott
McClintock	Reichert	Trott	DesJarlais	Lucas	Ross	Meng	Ruiz	Tsongas
McHenry	Renacci	Turner	Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Russell	Mica	Ruppersberger	Turner
McKinley	Ribble	Upton	Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Salmon	Moore	Rush	Valadao
McMorris	Rice (SC)	Valadao	Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Schweikert	Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Rodgers	Rigell	Wagner	Farenthold	Marino	Scott, Austin	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Vargas
McSally	Roby	Walberg	Fleischmann	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner	Murphy (PA)	T.	Veasey
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Walden	Flores	McCauley	Sessions	Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Walker	Foxx	McHenry	Simpson	Napolitano	Sanford	Velázquez
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Walorski	Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Sinema	Noem	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Mica	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi	Frelinghuysen	Messer	Smith (MO)	Nolan	Scalise	Wagner
Miller (FL)	Rokita	Weber (TX)	Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)	Norcross	Schakowsky	Walden
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Webster (FL)	Gohmert	Moolenaar	Smith (TX)	O'Rourke	Schiff	Walker
Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Wenstrup	Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Stewart	Pallone	Schrader	Walorski
Mullin	Ross	Westerman	Govdy	Mullin	Stivers	Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Walters, Mimi
Mulvaney	Rothfus	Westmoreland	Granger	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Paulsen	Scott, David	Walz
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Whitfield	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Thornberry	Pelosi	Serrano	Wasserman
Neugebauer	Royce	Williams	Graves (MO)	Newhouse	Upton	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Newhouse	Sanford	Wilson (SC)	Griffith	Nugent	Walberg	Peters	Sherman	Watson Coleman
Noem	Scalise	Womack	Grothman	Nunes	Weber (TX)	Pingree	Shimkus	Welch
Nugent	Schrader	Woodall	Harper	Olson	Webster (FL)	Pittenger	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
Nunes	Schweikert	Yoder	Harris	Palazzo	Wenstrup	Pocan	Slaughter	Wittman
Olson	Scott, Austin	Yoho	Hastings	Palmer	Westerman	Poliquin	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)	Hensarling	Pearce	Westmoreland	Polis	Smith (WA)	Young (IA)
Palmer	Sessions	Young (IA)	Hice, Jody B.	Perry	Whitfield	Price (NC)	Speier	Young (IN)
Paulsen	Shimkus	Young (IN)	Hill	Peterson	Williams	Quigley	Stefanik	Zeldin
Pearce	Shuster	Zeldin	Holding	Pitts	Wilson (SC)	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)	Zinke
Perry	Simpson		Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Womack	Reed	Takai	
			Hultgren	Pompeo	Woodall			
			Hunter	Price, Tom	Yoho			
			Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Young (AK)			
			Jordan					

NOT VOTING—32

Adams	Fudge	Marchant
Amodei	Gosar	Meeks
Barletta	Grijalva	Miller (MI)
Ciçilline	Gutiérrez	Neal
Cohen	Hardy	Payne
Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Sires
Duffy	Hinojosa	Stivers
Engel	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Lee	Wittman
Fattah	Lieu, Ted	Yarmuth
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1216

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) 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 137, noes 270, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—137

Abraham	Benishek	Boustany
Allen	Bilirakis	Brat
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Black	Burgess
Barton	Blackburn	Carter (GA)

Aderholt	Crowley	Honda
Aguilar	Cuellar	Hoyer
Ashford	Cummings	Hudson
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Huelskamp
Bass	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Beatty	Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)
Becerra	DeFazio	Hurt (VA)
Bera	DeGette	Israel
Beyer	Delaney	Issa
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Jeffries
Bishop (MI)	DelBene	Jenkins (KS)
Blum	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Blumenauer	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Bonamici	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Bost	DeSaunier	Johnson, E. B.
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Jolly
F.	Dingell	Jones
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Joyce
Bridenstine	Dold	Kaptur
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Katko
Brown (FL)	Doyle, Michael	Keating
Brownley (CA)	F.	Kelly (IL)
Buchanan	Duckworth	Kennedy
Buck	Edwards	Kildee
Bucshon	Ellison	Kilmer
Bustos	Ellmers (NC)	Kind
Butterfield	Emmer (MN)	King (NY)
Byrne	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Calvert	Esty	Knight
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Kuster
Capuano	Fleming	LaHood
Cárdenas	Forbes	LaMalfa
Carney	Fortenberry	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Poster	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Latta
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Levin
Ciçilline	Garrett	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Gibson	Lipinski
Clarke (NY)	Graham	LoBiondo
Clay	Graves (LA)	Loeb
Cleaver	Grayson	Lofgren
Clyburn	Green, Al	Love
Coffman	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Cole	Grijalva	Lowe
Collins (NY)	Guinta	Lujan Grisham
Comstock	Guthrie	(NM)
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Conyers	Hahn	(NM)
Cook	Hanna	Lynch
Cooper	Hartzler	Maloney,
Costa	Heck (NV)	Carolyn
Costello (PA)	Heck (WA)	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Higgins	Massie
Cramer	Himes	Matsui

NOES—270

Hond	McClintock	Rice (NY)	Takano
Hoyer	McCollum	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Hudson	McDermott	Rigell	Thompson (MS)
Huelskamp	McGovern	Roby	Thompson (PA)
Huffman	McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Tiberi
Hurd (TX)	McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Hurt (VA)	Rodgers	Rothfus	Titus
Israel	McNerney	Rouzer	Tonko
Issa	McSally	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Jeffries	Meehan	Royce	Trott
Jenkins (KS)	Meng	Ruiz	Tsongas
Jenkins (WV)	Mica	Ruppersberger	Turner
Johnson (GA)	Moore	Rush	Valadao
Johnson (OH)	Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Vargas
Jolly	Murphy (PA)	T.	Veasey
Jones	Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela
Joyce	Napolitano	Sanford	Velázquez
Kaptur	Noem	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Katko	Nolan	Scalise	Wagner
Keating	Smith (MO)	Schakowsky	Walden
Kelly (IL)	Smith (NE)	Schiff	Walker
Kennedy	Smith (TX)	Schrader	Walorski
Kildee	Stewart	Scott (VA)	Walters, Mimi
Kilmer	Stivers	Scott, David	Walz
Kind	Stutzman	Serrano	Wasserman
King (NY)	Thornberry	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Kirkpatrick	Upton	Sherman	Watson Coleman
Knight	Walberg	Shimkus	Welch
Kuster	Weber (TX)	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
LaHood	Webster (FL)	Slaughter	Wittman
LaMalfa	Wenstrup	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Langevin	Westerman	Smith (WA)	Young (IA)
Larsen (WA)	Westmoreland	Speier	Young (IN)
Larson (CT)	Whitfield	Stefanik	Zeldin
Latta	Williams	Swalwell (CA)	Zinke
Lawrence	Wilson (SC)		
Levin	Womack		
Lewis	Woodall		
Lipinski	Yoho		
LoBiondo	Young (AK)		
Loeb			
Loeb			
Lofgren			
Love			
Lowenthal			
Lowe			
Lujan Grisham			
(NM)			
Luján, Ben Ray			
(NM)			
Lynch			
Maloney,			
Carolyn			
Maloney, Sean			
Massie			
Matsui			

NOT VOTING—27

Adams	Fattah	Lieu, Ted
Amodei	Fincher	Luetkemeyer
Barletta	Fudge	Meeks
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Hardy	Neal
Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Payne
Duffy	Hinojosa	Sires
Engel	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Lee	Yarmuth

□ 1220

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 771, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Castro of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5325 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Capital Construction and Operations" account, on page 17, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)".

In the "Library of Congress—Salaries and Expenses" account, on page 25, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak on this amendment, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has been a strong advocate and leader on this issue, for an opportunity to say a few words.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, Congressman JOAQUIN CASTRO, to urge the majority to finally allow the House to strike a destructive political provision that has made its way into the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

If those listening are wondering why we are talking about the pejorative term "illegal aliens" on the bill that funds the legislative branch, then you are not alone. This legislation's accompanying report includes language that would have the Library continue to use the term "illegal aliens," "to the extent practicable"—even though the Library itself has said that there is no practicable means to continue to use the term "illegal aliens."

The Library changes thousands of subject headings each year without interference from Congress. Why this one? Why now?

The Library once used the subject heading "Negro," then moved to "Afro-American," and now "African American." They didn't wait until the entire U.S. Code was free of the pejorative term "Negro" before they changed their subject heading. As a matter of fact, Congress only recently removed the last vestiges of the terms "Negro" and "Oriental" from the U.S. Code in May of 2016.

That bill passed with a unanimous vote, including the "yes" vote of the chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee. If we removed "Negro" and "Oriental" in the subject headings of the Library of Congress before we changed the U.S. Code, then we should do the same for the now-pejorative term, "illegal alien."

The Library of Congress is our Nation's first established cultural institution, and it is hard to fathom why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would try to tie its hands to the slow-moving wheels of the U.S. Code.

Entering into an immigration debate on the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is a terrible precedent. If the majority is really serious about debating the U.S. Code, then let's have the Republican Rules Committee bring up the Castro bill that would remove the hurtful and inaccurate term "illegal aliens" once and for all from the U.S. Code.

We are Members of Congress, not captains of the word police. Free the card catalog and depoliticize this bill.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes and 35 seconds remaining.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1922, the only grandparent I would come to know came from Mexico to the United States. She was not a rapist or a murderer or an alien. She was a 6-year-old girl whose parents had died around the time of the Mexican Revolution, and the closest relatives who could take her and her sister in were in Texas.

I bet if we went around this Chamber, I know there would be beautiful stories, similar stories, of ancestors who came from Italy, Germany, Ireland, Africa, Asia, and every corner of the world. They are the immigrants to this country. They are the strength of this country.

Language matters. Recently, the Library of Congress decided to retire the term "illegal alien" because it is dehumanizing. For the first time in American history, today, the Congress is ready to interfere with the business of the Library of Congress.

In the years of the Congress and the Library, language has evolved. That is why we have done away with terms like "Negro," "Oriental," "lunatic," and "retarded," because we understand that even words that start off as neutral descriptors can, over time, become used as verbal weapons and knives to inflict pain and disrespect and sow division. That is the case today.

There are times in our country's history where our politics have also been a race to the bottom. Those Irish ancestors were greeted by signs that read "no Irish need apply" in cities like New York and Boston. The Japanese, German, and Italian Americans even were interned during World War II. Chinese were excluded from this coun-

try for decades. During the Eisenhower administration, many Hispanics in this country were rounded up and deported to Mexico even if they were American.

□ 1230

What I am asking is for us not to fuel the flames of this season and for us to take a better course and do the right thing. I am asking you to support this motion to recommit because the words "illegal alien" will be retired. This will change, whether it is now or 6 months from now or 10 years from now. The question for all of us is whether we, today, will do the right thing or whether a few years from now we apologize for doing the wrong thing.

Please support this motion to recommit and do the right thing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this quick because I want to make sure the House knows what offensive language is in this bill. It is so offensive that I am going to read it.

To the extent practicable, the committee instructs the Library to maintain certain subject headings that reflect terminology used in title 8, United States Code.

That is what is so offensive to the minority party.

For 7½ years, we have had a President who wants to ignore the intent of the laws of our land. We will not allow this body, this House, to ignore the definitions nor the words of the laws that have been voted on in this body, passed by the Senate, and signed into law by the President.

I am asking this body to vote "no" on this motion to recommit, vote "yes" to uphold the laws of this land, vote "yes" for your constituents on final passage, and have a good weekend.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 89, and adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 112.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 237, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—170

Aguilar	Gabbard	Nolan
Ashford	Galleo	Norcross
Bass	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Beatty	Graham	Pallone
Becerra	Grayson	Pascrell
Bera	Green, Al	Pelosi
Beyer	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Peters
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Bonamici	Hahn	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Quigley
Bustos	Honda	Rangel
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capps	Huffman	Richmond
Capuano	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schrader
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kuster	Scott, David
Clyburn	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lawrence	Sinema
Costa	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Speier
Cuellar	Loeback	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Takai
DeFazio	Lowey	Takano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DelBene	(NM)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Torres
Deutch	Maloney	Tsongas
Dingell	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Veasey
Duckworth	McCollum	Vela
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Eshoo	McNerney	Walz
Esty	Meng	Wasserman
Foster	Moore	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Watson Coleman
	Murphy (FL)	Welch
	Nadler	Wilson (FL)

NOES—237

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Aderholt	Comstock	Gohmert
Allen	Conaway	Goodlatte
Amash	Cook	Gowdy
Babin	Costello (PA)	Granger
Barr	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Barton	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Benishkek	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffith
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Guinta
Black	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Blackburn	Denham	Hanna
Blum	Dent	Harper
Bost	DeSantis	Harris
Boustany	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Brat	Dold	Hensarling
Bridenstine	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Buchanan	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Buck	Emmer (MN)	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Byrne	Fleischmann	Hunter
Calvert	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Carter (GA)	Flores	Hurt (VA)
Carter (TX)	Forbes	Issa
Chabot	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Chaffetz	Fox	Jenkins (WV)
Clawson (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Coffman	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cole	Garrett	Jolly
Collins (GA)	Gibbs	Jones

Jordan	Newhouse	Shimkus	Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Joyce	Noem	Shuster	Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Katko	Nugent	Simpson	Collins (NY)	Jordan	Rigell
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Comstock	Joyce	Roby
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Conaway	Katko	Roe (TN)
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Cook	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
King (NY)	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Cooper	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Kinzinger (IL)	Paulsen	Stefanik	Costa	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Kline	Pearce	Stewart	Costello (PA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Knight	Perry	Stivers	Cramer	Kline	Rooney (FL)
Labrador	Pittenger	Stutzman	Crawford	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
LaHood	Pitts	Thornberry	Crenshaw	Labrador	Roskam
LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)	Cuellar	LaHood	Ross
Lamborn	Pompeo	Tiberi	Culberson	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Lance	Pompeo	Tipton	Curbelo (FL)	Lamborn	Rouzer
Latta	Posey	Trott	Davis, Rodney	Lance	Royce
LoBiondo	Price, Tom	Turner	Denham	Latta	Ruiz
Long	Ratcliffe	Upton	Dent	LoBiondo	Russell
Loudermilk	Reed	Valadao	DesJarlais	Long	Salmon
Love	Reichert	Wagner	Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Sanford
Lucas	Renacci	Walberg	Dold	Love	Scalise
Lummis	Ribble	Walden	Donovan	Lucas	Schweikert
MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Walker	Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Marchant	Rigell	Walorski	Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Sensenbrenner
Marino	Roby	Walters, Mimi	Emmer (MN)	Marchant	Sessions
Massie	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)	Farenthold	Marino	Shimkus
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)	McCarthy	McCarthy	Shuster
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Westerman	McCaul	McCaul	Simpson
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Whitfield	McHenry	McHenry	Sinema
McHenry	Rokita	Williams	McKinley	McKinley	Smith (MO)
McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)	McMorris	McMorris	Smith (NE)
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman	Rodgers	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Rodgers	Roskam	Wittman	McSally	McSally	Smith (TX)
McSally	Ross	Womack	Meadows	Meadows	Stefanik
Meadows	Rothfus	Woodall	Garrett	Garrett	Stewart
Meehan	Rouzer	Yoder	Gibbs	Gibbs	Stivers
Messer	Royce	Yoho	Gibson	Gibson	Stutzman
Mica	Russell	Young (AK)	Gohmert	Gohmert	Thompson (PA)
Miller (FL)	Salmon	Young (IA)	Goodlatte	Goodlatte	Thornberry
Mooleenaar	Sanford	Young (IN)	Gowdy	Gowdy	Tiberi
Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Zeldin	Mullin	Mullin	Tipton
Mullin	Schweikert	Zinke	Granger	Granger	Trott
Mulvaney	Scott, Austin		Graves (GA)	Graves (GA)	Turner
Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner		Graves (LA)	Graves (LA)	Upton
Neugebauer	Sessions		Graves (MO)	Graves (MO)	Valadao

NOT VOTING—27

Adams	Fincher	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fudge	Meeks
Barietta	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Hardy	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Duffy	Hinojosa	Payne
Engel	Jackson Lee	Sires
Farr	Lee	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Lieu, Ted	Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1237

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 293.

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 233, nays 175, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Buck
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Aguilar	Black	Burgess
Blackburn	Blackburn	Byrne
Bost	Bost	Calvert
Babin	Boustany	Carter (GA)
Barr	Brady (TX)	Carter (TX)
Barton	Brat	Chabot
Bridenstine	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Brooks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Clawson (FL)
Buchanan	Buchanan	Coffman

Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Jolly	Rice (SC)
Jordan	Rigell
Joyce	Roby
Katko	Roe (TN)
Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Kline	Rooney (FL)
Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
Labrador	Roskam
LaHood	Ross
LaMalfa	Rothfus
Lamborn	Rouzer
Lance	Royce
Latta	Ruiz
LoBiondo	Russell
Long	Salmon
Loudermilk	Sanford
Love	Scalise
Lucas	Schweikert
Lummis	Scott, Austin
MacArthur	Sensenbrenner
Marchant	Sessions
Marino	Shimkus
Ryan (OH)	Shuster
Sánchez, Linda T.	Simpson
Sanchez, Loretta	Sinema
Sarbanes	Smith (MO)
Schakowsky	Smith (NE)
Schiff	Smith (NJ)
Schrader	Smith (TX)
Scott (VA)	Stefanik
Scott, David	Stewart
Serrano	Stivers
Sewell (AL)	Stutzman
Sherman	Thompson (PA)
Sinema	Thornberry
Slaughter	Tiberi
Smith (WA)	Tipton
Speier	Trott
Swalwell (CA)	Turner
Swalwell (CA)	Upton
Takai	Valadao
Takano	Wagner
Thompson (CA)	Noem
Thompson (MS)	Nugent
Titus	Nunes
Tonko	Olson
Torres	Palazzo
Tsongas	Palmer
Van Hollen	Paulsen
Vargas	Pearce
Veasey	Perry
Vela	Peters
Velázquez	Peterson
Visclosky	Pittenger
Walz	Pitts
Wasserman	Poe (TX)
Schultz	Poliquin
Watson Coleman	Pompeo
Welch	Posey
Wilson (FL)	Price, Tom
	Ratcliffe
	Reed
	Reichert
	Renacci

NAYS—175

Amash	Cleaver	Gabbard
Bass	Clyburn	Galleo
Beatty	Connolly	Garamendi
Becerra	Conyers	Graham
Beyer	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Blum	Cummings	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Davidson	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Guinta
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hahn
Brooks (AL)	Delaney	Hastings
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Higgins
Butterfield	DeSantis	Himes
Capps	DeSaulnier	Honda
Capuano	Deutch	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Dingell	Huffman
Carney	Doggett	Israel
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jeffries
Cartwright	F.	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Jones
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Kaptur
Cicilline	Ellmers (NC)	Keating
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Esty	Kennedy
Clay	Fleming	Kildee
	Foster	Kilmer
	Frankel (FL)	Kind

King (IA)	Moulton	Scott, David	Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Reichert	Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Schrader
Kirkpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Burgess	Issa	Renacci	Kaptur	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Kuster	Nadler	Sewell (AL)	Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble	Keating	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Langevin	Napolitano	Sherman	Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)	Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Serrano
Larsen (WA)	Nolan	Slaughter	Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell	Kennedy	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)
Larson (CT)	Norcross	Smith (WA)	Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Roby	Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Lawrence	O'Rourke	Speier	Chabot	Jones	Roe (TN)	Kilmer	Norcross	Slaughter
Levin	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)	Chaffetz	Jordan	Rogers (AL)	Kind	O'Rourke	Smith (WA)
Lewis	Pascrell	Takai	Coffman	Joyce	Rogers (KY)	Kuster	Pallone	Speier
Lipinski	Pelosi	Takano	Cole	Katko	Rohrabacher	Langevin	Pascrell	Swalwell (CA)
Loebsack	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)	Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Rokita	Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Takai
Lofgren	Pingree	Thompson (MS)	Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Takano
Lowenthal	Pocan	Titus	Comstock	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Lawrence	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lowe	Polis	Tonko	Conaway	King (NY)	Roskam	Levin	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Price (NC)	Torres	Cook	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross	Lewis	Pocan	Titus
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Quigley	Tsongas	Costello (PA)	Kirkpatrick	Rothfus	Lipinski	Polis	Tonko
Lynch	Rangel	Van Hollen	Cramer	Kline	Rouzer	Loebsack	Price (NC)	Torres
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (NY)	Vargas	Crawford	Knight	Royce	Lofgren	Quigley	Tsongas
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Veasey	Crenshaw	Labrador	Russell	Lowenthal	Rangel	Van Hollen
Massie	Roybal-Allard	Vela	Cuellar	LaHood	Salmon	Lowe	Rice (NY)	Vargas
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Velázquez	Culberson	LaMalfa	Sanford	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Richmond	Veasey
McClintock	Rush	Visclosky	Curbelo (FL)	Lamborn	Scalise	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Vela
McCormack	Ryan (OH)	Walz	Davidson	Lance	Schweikert	Maloney, Carolyn	Ruiz	Velázquez
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman	Davis, Rodney	Latta	Scott, Austin	Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
McGovern	T.	Schultz	Denham	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	Matsui	Rush	Walz
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson Coleman	Dent	Long	Sessions	McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Meng	Sarbanes	Weber (TX)	DeSantis	Loudermilk	Shimkus	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Moore	Schakowsky	Welch	DesJarlais	Lucas	Shuster	McGovern	T.	Watson Coleman
	Schiff	Wilson (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Simpson	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
	Schrader	Wittman	Dold	MacArthur	Sinema	Meng	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
	Scott (VA)		Donovan	Marchant	Sinema		Schakowsky	
			Duncan (SC)	Marino	Smith (MO)		Schiff	
			Duncan (TN)	Massie	Smith (NE)			
			Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)			
			Farenthold	McCaul	Smith (TX)	Jolly	Lujan Grisham (NM)	
			Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Stefanik			
			Fleischmann	McHenry	Stewart			
			Fleming	McKinley	Stivers			
			Flores	McMorris	Stutzman			
			Forbes	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)	Adams	Fattah	Luetkemeyer
			Fortenberry	McSally	Thornberry	Amodei	Fincher	Meeks
			Fox	Meadows	Tiberi	Barletta	Fudge	Miller (MI)
			Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Tipton	Blackburn	Gosar	Neal
			Frelinghuysen	Messer	Trott	Clawson (FL)	Hardy	Payne
			Garrett	Mica	Turner	Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Sires
			Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Upton	Cohen	Hinojosa	Waters, Maxine
			Gibson	Moolenaar	Valadao	Davis, Danny	Hurt (VA)	Yarmuth
			Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wagner	Duffy	Jackson Lee	
			Goodlatte	Mullin	Walberg	Ellmers (NC)	Lee	
			Gowdy	Mulvaney	Walden	Engel	Lieu, Ted	
			Granger	Murphy (PA)	Walker	Farr	Love	
			Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Walorski			
			Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Walters, Mimi			
			Graves (MO)	Noem	Weber (TX)			
			Griffith	Nugent	Webster (FL)			
			Grothman	Nunes	Wenstrup			
			Guinta	Olson	Westerman			
			Guthrie	Palazzo	Westmoreland			
			Hanna	Palmer	Whitfield			
			Harper	Paulsen	Williams			
			Harris	Pearce	Wilson (SC)			
			Hartzler	Perry	Wittman			
			Heck (NV)	Peterson	Womack			
			Hensarling	Pittenger	Woodall			
			Hice, Jody B.	Pitts	Yoder			
			Hill	Poe (TX)	Yoho			
			Holding	Poliquin	Young (AK)			
			Hudson	Pompeo	Young (IA)			
			Huelskamp	Posey	Young (IN)			
			Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom	Zeldin			
			Hultgren	Ratcliffe	Zinke			
			Hunter	Reed				

NOT VOTING—26

Adams	Fincher	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fudge	Meeks
Barletta	Gosar	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Hardy	Neal
Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler	Payne
Duffy	Hinojosa	Sires
Engel	Jackson Lee	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Lee	Yarmuth
Fattah	Lieu, Ted	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1244

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 163, answered “present” 2, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Benishek	Boustany
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Brat
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Bridenstine
Ashford	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Black	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Blum	Buchanan
Barton	Boat	Buck

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

NAYS—163

Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Ellison
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Beatty	Clay	Esty
Becerra	Cleaver	Foster
Bera	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Beyer	Conyers	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Cooper	Galleo
Bonamici	Costa	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Graham
F.	Crowley	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Green, Al
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Bustos	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	Delaney	Hahn
Capps	DeLauro	Hastings
Capuano	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Cardenas	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Carney	Deutch	Himes
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Honda
Cartwright	Doggett	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael	Huffman
Castro (TX)	F.	Israel
Chu, Judy	Duckworth	Jeffries
Ciulline	Edwards	Johnson (GA)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Jolly	Lujan Grisham (NM)
-------	--------------------

NOT VOTING—32

Adams	Fattah	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fincher	Meeks
Barletta	Fudge	Miller (MI)
Blackburn	Gosar	Neal
Clawson (FL)	Hardy	Payne
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Sires
Cohen	Hinojosa	Waters, Maxine
Davis, Danny	Hurt (VA)	Yarmuth
Duffy	Jackson Lee	
Ellmers (NC)	Lee	
Engel	Lieu, Ted	
Farr	Love	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1250

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 295 on H. Con. Res. 89. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS OPPOSING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED \$10 TAX ON EVERY BARREL OF OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed \$10 tax on every barrel of oil, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays

144, answered “present” 2, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—253

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

NAYS—144

Bass	Bonamici	Bustos
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Butterfield
Becerra	F.	Capps
Beyer	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Blumenauer	Brown (FL)	Cárdenas

Carney	Himes	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Honda	Peters
Cartwright	Hoyer	Pingree
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pocan
Chu, Judy	Israel	Polis
Cicilline	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clay	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Keating	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Conyers	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Costa	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Courtney	Kind	Schakowsky
Crowley	Langevin	Schiff
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lawrence	Scott, David
Delaney	Levin	Serrano
DeLauro	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Lipinski	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Loebsack	Slaughter
Deutch	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Lowenthal	Speier
Doggett	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Takai
F.	Maloney,	Takano
Edwards	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Matsui	Titus
Eshoo	McCollum	Tonko
Esty	McDermott	Torres
Foster	McGovern	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	McNerny	Van Hollen
Gabbard	Meng	Vargas
Gallego	Moore	Velázquez
Garamendi	Moulton	Visclosky
Grayson	Nadler	Walz
Grijalva	Napolitano	Wasserman
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Schultz
Hahn	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Hanna	O'Rourke	Welch
Hastings	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Heck (WA)	Pascrell	
Higgins	Pelosi	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Castro (TX) DeFazio

NOT VOTING—35

Adams	Fattah	Meeks
Amodei	Fincher	Miller (MI)
Barletta	Fudge	Murphy (PA)
Blackburn	Gosar	Neal
Clawson (FL)	Hardy	Payne
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Hinojosa	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Hurt (VA)	T.
Duffy	Jackson Lee	Sires
Ellmers (NC)	Lee	Stivers
Engel	Lieu, Ted	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Luetkemeyer	Yarmuth

□ 1258

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 296 on H. Con. Res. 112. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 289—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 290—I would have voted “yes.” On rollcall No. 291—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 292—I would have voted “yes.” On rollcall No. 293—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 294—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 295—I would have voted “yes.” On rollcall No. 296—I would have voted “yes.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that later votes than normal are possible on Thursday and to keep their travel plans flexible.

No votes are expected in the House on Friday.

□ 1300

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

The House will consider H.R. 5053, the Preventing the IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, sponsored by Representative ROSKAM. This common-sense bill prohibits the IRS from collecting donor information, which has been used by the IRS to improperly target tax-exempt organizations.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 5293, the FY17 Defense appropriations bill, sponsored by Representative RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN. We expect a large number of amendments to be considered on this bill. So, again, Members are reminded to keep their travel schedules flexible at the end of next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Today, we considered a third appropriations bill. It was a structured rule, which is not uncommon on both sides of the aisle to have a structured rule.

But next week, the gentleman has announced the Defense appropriations bill, and I am wondering whether or not that will be an open rule so that amendments will be able to be offered by Members without constraint of being limited?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, to answer the gentleman’s question, yes, that will come under a structured rule. So Members will be able to offer amendments but before the Rules Committee and then have the debate on the floor prior to passage of the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, does the gentleman mean by “structured rule” that we will simply require amendments to be filed as of a certain time, but that there will be no restriction on amendments that will be in order?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, it will be a structured rule exactly the same as we have used a structured rule before. Amendments will be presented to the Rules Committee, be debated, and then brought to the floor for a vote.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, to further clarify, my understanding, therefore, is that the majority leader expects the Rules Committee to choose which amendments will be made in order on the bill. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, yes, it will be a very fair, wide open process in the Rules Committee looking at amendments—those that have not been able to be offered already in committee, where these bills have gone through subcommittee and full committee with amendments being offered, and then they will be brought to the floor so we can get the work done and move the bill forward.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying.

And it appears to me that it is an abandonment of the Speaker and others' representations that when appropriations bills are brought to the floor that they will be brought to the floor with an open rule or a rule that will allow any and all amendments that seek to be offered by Members on both sides of the aisle to be offered.

From the gentleman's explanation, I believe that is not the case and a deviation from the announced policy at the beginning of the year. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that it is a pragmatic judgment that some amendments are making it difficult on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

As someone who has been here for some period of time, that has been my experience when we were in the majority that the gentleman's side, under open rules, offered a lot of very difficult amendments that we had to confront. The Maloney amendment obviously was a difficult amendment for Members to confront on the gentleman's side and led to the defeat of apparently one of the bills, the Energy and Water bill, which failed on this floor.

Would I not be correct in saying that this is a policy that is now being pursued that is different from that which was represented at the beginning of the year where the floor would be open to any and all amendments and would be considered by the House on their merits?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has sat in this position that I have today as majority leader in the past, and the gentleman knows the history of bills he brought to the floor and the manner in which they did.

But if I could be frank with my friend, I am a little disappointed. This is not a place to play politics. This is not about one amendment. We have a

process for amendments for Members that are serious about making a passionate argument for a bill, not to kill a bill and not to have an amendment pass and then an entire side of the aisle vote against it.

What we are bringing forth is a process that the American people want to see. They want to see ideas get brought here, debated, and moved forward. If we look at the appropriations process in the Senate, they have amendments that go through. If the gentleman wants to go back and recite a history of the number of bills that were open here under his leadership, I more than welcome him to do that.

But we should be honest with one another. If Members want to offer an amendment and want to debate the amendment and want to make the bill, in their view, better, I would suspect that, if they win an amendment, they would vote for the bill. The gentleman has a long history here, and that is really probably the history that he remembers as well.

I want to see the work get done. So any ideas that get brought forth in committee, they are debated, they are offered, and they are voted on. Ideas will get brought forth further as the bill comes forward. If it is an amendment and someone wants to move it to the floor, so be it. But we are not going to sit back with the idea of people who want to play politics on the outside and play politics on the inside. I just expect more.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Of course, 130 of his Members voted against that bill; 130 of his Members rejected that bill. I am hard pressed to think that the majority leader believes that our "no" votes were political and his "no" votes were principled. That defies logic from my standpoint. The fact of the matter is that bill lost because the gentleman's Members didn't support it. The gentleman has 247 Members.

I do remember being majority leader. Very frankly, I remember getting 218 Democrats for almost every bill we brought to the floor. So we passed them with our votes.

If 130 of the gentleman's Members had not voted against their own bill, it would have passed. And there should be no, Madam Speaker, misrepresentation or misinformation about how seriously Mr. MALONEY cared about his amendment. There should be none whatsoever. In point of fact, it enjoyed ultimately the majority of support here on this floor.

I will tell the gentleman, I have been here for sometime. He is correct on that, and I do offer amendments from time to time to improve bills that, even as improved, I don't like. So, in the final analysis, although I have improved them and been successful in adopting an amendment, I still do not think the bills are appropriate to pass and go into law.

This conversation started with the fact that we need to be able to offer

ideas. Very frankly, I understand the gentleman's position.

Today, we just voted on two bills that aren't going anywhere, a sense of Congress that you are not going to bring to the floor. They have no chance of passage. What did you want to do? You wanted to play politics. I don't mean you personally, Madam Speaker, but it was a political effort solely to bring two bills to the floor to express some sense of Congress, both of which I voted against because I thought they were playing politics.

So the accusation somehow that we are playing politics because we offer amendments that we care deeply about, that we want to see no discrimination allowed in our bills and that we want to defeat those constraints on an executive order that says to people who do business with the Federal Government, you can't discriminate against people, I will tell my friend, yes, we are going to continue to try to do that. Now, of course, on this last bill, we were not allowed to do that. We were shut down and shut up and precluded from voting on that particular piece of legislation.

So, when I tell my friend that this session started with a pledge for open rules on appropriations bills, I understand the gentleman's problem. Frankly, we had structured rules when we were in charge as well. We had not made any great representation about open rules; therefore, we, too, wanted to get the business of the House done.

Yes, I remember well 2007 when we were confronted with a filibuster by amendment. At some point in time, after 10 bills had been very difficult to pass, on the last two bills, we did have structured rules.

I tell my friend that I hope that he will accord to Mr. MALONEY or others the sincerity of their objectives, notwithstanding the fact that their amendment is adopted and articulates what I think is proper policy for our country, that is, not to discriminate. Everybody in our country apparently doesn't believe that, but Mr. MALONEY does. And I want to make it very clear that he was very sincere in that amendment. Those of us who voted for it were very sincere in that amendment. It was not politics; it was values.

Moving on, I want to congratulate the majority leader on his work on Puerto Rico. That was a difficult issue for us both, a difficult issue for our caucuses, a difficult issue for the executive department. We worked together. We got a bill done that certainly was not our favorite.

The bill included a lot of stuff in there that we didn't like, but I will tell the gentleman that we didn't play politics on that. We only lost 24 votes on a bill that was largely constructed by the gentleman's side of the aisle in terms of some of the issues unrelated, per se, to restructuring of the debt, which was the intent of the bill.

So I want the majority leader to know—he and I have a good relationship. I have great respect for him—we

are going to intend to try to work together on issues like that that are difficult but are necessary for the American people.

Toward that end, can the gentleman tell me what the status of the Zika issue is with reference to getting resources as quickly as possible to confront this challenge to our country's health?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on the Puerto Rico crisis. It is something that we worked on together very early from all leaders' sides, making sure that we protected the taxpayers from a bailout, and I think we met all the criteria for helping Puerto Rico move forward and protecting the taxpayer.

The gentleman is correct on Zika. We want to make sure the funding is there. As the gentleman knows, there is currently funding, and, as the gentleman knows, we have passed a bill on Zika and we have named our conferees. It is my understanding that the Senate is just now naming their conferees, so I am very hopeful that we can get that conference done very quickly and a bill brought back to the floor.

As of now, I had met with the Director of the CDC the week when we departed before the district work period. There are enough resources currently, but we need to get our work done as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Obviously, this is an emergency confronting our country. Dr. Frieden of the CDC, Dr. Fauci of the NIH, and so many others have raised this as a critically important issue for us to confront and confront now.

So I would join the majority leader in whatever efforts are necessary to accelerate this process and give to the administration and our health officials the resources they need to protect the American people.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I rise to say that we have lost a great American, perhaps one of the most famous Americans in the world in Muhammad Ali.

Muhammad Ali was, for a portion of his life, reviled for the decisions he took. But through his life, he reflected a commitment to principle that all of us could well follow, an example of even in the light of extraordinary opprobrium from his fellow citizens who said, This is what I believe, this is where I stand, and I am prepared to take the consequences.

Many of us believe he was probably the greatest fighter that ever lived. As he fought so successfully in the ring, he fought successfully for his principles and his convictions.

□ 1315

I know that the American people and the House of Representatives would reflect the respect and affection for a great athlete and a great human being

and a great American. If my friend wanted to make a comment, I will yield to him.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank him for recognizing the life of Muhammad Ali. He touched so many of those who met him and those who did not, and there are so many stories out there of what he was able to do even privately on helping change people's lives and actually stand up for what he believed. I think so many times when you look at his life from where he rose and where he stayed rooted in his belief in this country, his belief in the courage to fight for what he believed in.

There was a quote he made. I just read it today. It was put up by Forbes as the quote of the week, but Muhammad Ali once said: "He who is not courageous enough to take risks will accomplish nothing in life."

I know they are going to honor his life today. He was one who took risks and had the courage to stand up when others didn't believe the same as he did.

One great foundation of this country provides the individuals the right to do that, to challenge others and to live a life that is very full. He lived his life to the fullest and reached many. In the athletic world, he reached the heights, and in reaching others, he did the same in his personal life as well.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 2016, TO MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, June 13, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ENDING THE INSANITY OF THE OBAMA-CLINTON-KERRY IRAN POLICY

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

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, sadly, insanity is the only word that I can use to describe the foolishness of the Obama-Clinton-Kerry engagement with the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In January, the Obama administration cut a \$1.7 billion check to the Government of Iran. On May 18, Iran's Guardian Council voted to send all of this money to Iran's military. Secretary of State Kerry was asked in January whether this money would be used to fund terrorism. He responded:

I think that some of it will wind up in the hands of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps or other entities, some of which are labeled terrorists.

This week, we can sadly confirm that this has indeed come to pass, that the entire \$1.7 billion from the U.S. taxpayers will now be used to fund Iran's military and terrorism apparatus. This is the same Iran that routinely chants "Death to America," threatens to wipe Israel off of the map, captures and humiliates our U.S. sailors, and brazenly fires missiles in close proximity to America's naval vessels, and is responsible for the killing of hundreds of American troops.

Madam Speaker, this is utter foolishness, and these policies must end.

ISRAEL'S EFFORTS IN CYBERSECURITY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, last month I had the opportunity to join my colleague on the Committee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), on a trip to Israel to learn about their efforts in cybersecurity.

As we all know, the security threats Israel faces are enormous, and they extend well into the cyber domain. Israel's response to attacks on her networks has been truly extraordinary, as Israel is now the second largest exporter of cybersecurity products and services, second only behind the United States. The development of this industry, led in large part by the Prime Minister, has been catalyzed by public-private partnerships such as the CyberSpark initiative, which brings together public servants, academic innovators, and business leaders in Be'er Sheva in the Negev Desert, their version of the Silicon Valley.

The United States and Israel already collaborate very closely on so many issues, and I strongly believe that the United States and Israel can learn from each other in this emerging field, both in terms of cutting-edge technologies and novel policy approaches. I look forward to working to develop these partnerships. I thank the Prime Minister and the government for a wonderful learning experience.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SERVICE ACADEMY STUDENT NOMINEES

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to extend heartfelt congratulations to Benjamin Wiggins of El Dorado, Kimberly Monterosso of Camden, Parker Ross of Hot Springs, Nicholas Amerson of Percy, and Krisanna Reynolds of Smackover. These star students from the Fourth District of

Arkansas will have the honor of attending the service academies this fall. Benjamin, Kimberly, and Parker will be headed to West Point; Nicholas and Krisanna to the Air Force Academy.

Arkansas has a history of academy alumni. These include General Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Allied Commander in the Pacific during World War II, and Brigadier General William O. Darby, leader of what would later become the Army Rangers. Their example is one of courage and excellence under any circumstances. With this rich tradition before them and through their own accomplishments, there is no doubt these students will do their very best, bringing honor to themselves, their families, and their State.

I wish them well in their service careers and success in whatever they pursue.

PLAYING GAMES WITH WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, at what point do we stop playing games with women's health?

Zika is becoming an epidemic, and American women across the country are helplessly watching as Congress refuses to act. Every day this disease spreads faster and impacts more men, women, and especially newborn babies.

It is unbelievable that so far the best response to stop the spread of this dangerous infection is to tell American women: Don't get pregnant.

That is unacceptable. We can do better.

Have Republicans learned nothing from the response of the Flint water crisis, where they focused on the price tag instead of on protecting Michigan's children from getting lead poisoning?

We cannot wait one more minute for Congress to act. We must do something now to prevent further spreading of the Zika virus. I am outraged we do not have a solution to something that can hurt an entire generation of our children.

Because of Zika's serious debilitating impacts, Americans are afraid to travel, Americans are afraid to go outside, and Americans are now terrified to grow their families.

I urge leadership to schedule a vote on H.R. 3299. This bill incentivizes the development of a vaccine to protect us from this disease.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DARLA SIDLES

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Darla Sidles, superintendent of Saguaro National Park, on her recent appointment to

oversee the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, and I thank her for her 7 years of service to the people of Arizona.

Under Darla's leadership, Saguaro National Park set record highs for attendance, attracting over 750,000 people last year. Her tenure saw the complete refurbishment of the Rincon Mountain Visitor Center and successful application of key resilient landscapes grants. She also spearheaded efforts to connect the park with local young and urban populations, helping expose them to the many treasures the park offers.

In addition to her role as director of one of southern Arizona's largest parks, she is a valued leader in our community who served for 4 years on the January 8 Memorial Foundation board.

I had the privilege to hike Saguaro National Park with Darla, pictured here, to talk about its value. We continue to work together on efforts to protect and improve this Tucson gem. We will be sad to lose her in August, and no doubt Darla's standout leadership of our park contributed to her appointment to oversee the third-most-visited national park in the country. I thank her for her service, and I wish her well in Colorado.

ILLEGAL ALIEN PROVISION IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my fierce opposition to the "illegal alien" provision that has been inserted into the legislative branch appropriations bill.

This partisan language will force the Library of Congress to keep using the term "illegal alien" even though the Library of Congress decided to remove that derogatory and totally inaccurate term from the Library's subject heading system.

"Illegal alien" is a form of dehumanizing rhetoric. The term has been used to justify continued discrimination against vulnerable migrants and minority communities.

The provision is politicizing what is supposed to be a bipartisan budget bill. This unprecedented interference by Congress will have huge ramifications. The Library of Congress sets the standard for subject headings used across America and internationally.

"Illegal alien" is inaccurate. The Library of Congress contains our most important records, and they should be accurate and reflect reality.

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. This month is set aside as a time for us to raise awareness of what Alzheimer's disease is, the devastating impact that this disease has on millions of people throughout our Nation, and what we can do to help fight this condition.

In Michigan alone, over 180,000 of our seniors are currently facing Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the State. These numbers are only expected to go up over the coming years. As a doctor from northern Michigan, I have seen firsthand the struggle that those living with Alzheimer's face.

Here in Congress, I have supported numerous efforts to increase Federal funding for Alzheimer's research as well as plans to offer a higher quality of care for Alzheimer's patients.

While we have made great progress in the research and treatment of Alzheimer's disease, it is my hope that we will all continue to work together toward ending this plight.

21ST CENTURY STEM FOR GIRLS AND UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES ACT

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of STEM education and the critical role science, technology, engineering, and mathematics play in our Nation's economic prosperity.

As our economy shifts toward STEM-oriented careers, we must ensure students have the opportunity to learn and succeed in these fields. That is why I introduced the 21st Century STEM For Girls and Underrepresented Minorities Act, H.R. 2773. I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this bill.

This legislation would help create programs and curriculum for girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue STEM careers. Just last week, I was reminded of the importance of STEM education while delivering the commencement address at Metro Early College High School, a STEM-focused high school in my Third Congressional District of Ohio.

I salute the graduates of the Metro Early College High School who achieved a 100 percent acceptance rate to college, and I commend their parents as well as the dedicated teachers and staff, including Principal Anthony Alston.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names of the 106 graduates of the Metro Early College High School graduating class.

METRO EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 2016, JUNE 10, 2016

Sundari Vudatala, Camryn Walker, Christopher Warren, Christian Wiget, Silas Young, Banan Zangana, Sophia Brown,

Simone Burden, Nicholas Burgett, De'Ciana Burnette, Seth Cabalquinto, Sydney Carroll, Anna Chin, Joseph Chiu, Spencer Churchill, Griffin Patterson, JaNai Rakes, Kennedy Reissland-Woods, Gus Roussi.

Michael Ruland, Mario Segovia, Sefora Seyoum, Riley Shaw, Wyatt Sheline, Adam Gill, Sarah Golding, Raquan Goss, Alexander Granato, Montgomery Gray, Connor Guarino, Kailyn Gullatt, McKenzie Hartman, Kelly Haubert, Jonah McKind, Eduardo Medina, Jen Miller, Jared Moehrman, Khalid Mohamed, Qiukui Moutvic, Yulia Mulugeta, Aida Ndiaye, Lan Nguyen.

Jennifer Kentner, Nathaniel Kolli, Renee Krajinak, Maria Krantz, Ethan Laver, Caleb Lehman, Rebecca Lipster, Samantha Loeffler, Karsten Look, Justin Loring, Matthew Lowe, Anna Lowery, Miles Marchese, Hannah Martin, Sara McClaskey, Maya McGeachy, Madison McGraw, Lila Henninger, Elaff Hounsee, Grant Hughes, Nathaniel Huller, Christopher Hulse, Ally Hutchison.

Hamdan Ismail, Cherie Johnson, Cierre Johnson, Aaron Joseph, Meghan O'Bryan, Robert O'Shaughnessy, Armando Olvera, Igbinoso Oriakhi, Muwahib Osman, Xzavier Pace, Teja Parasa, Grant Parks, Autumn Patterson, Emma Clark, Tamara Cole, Amina Cusmaan, Angela Dang, Timothy Davis, Rebecca Dye, Nimco Essa, Nahom Eyassu, Charles Gauthier, Aarti Singhal.

David Sipes, Curtis Snead, Pauline Sohn, Sally Squires, Kate Swigert, Abigail Thompson, Devon Tinker, Alicia Tong, Jolene Tran, Hafsa Abdullahi, Mohamed Abdullahi, Zahra Abu-Rayyan, Saido Ahmed, Maxim Antonyuk, Gary Augustin, Keevyn Baden-Winterwood, Kaila Berry, Silas Birdsell.

□ 1330

SAVANNAH PURPLE HEART VETERAN GETS HUMANITARIAN AWARD

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special constituent of mine, Tech Sergeant Enos Garvin.

On May 2, at a Chatham County Veterans Council meeting, Sergeant Garvin received a long overdue Humanitarian Service Medal for his service in Rwanda.

In 1994, Reverend Garvin, turned tech sergeant, volunteered with the Georgia Air National Guard and worked on flying missions to help Rwandan refugees, called Operation Support Hope. In these missions, Reverend Garvin flew supplies and food to many refugees in Rwanda who were staying in makeshift tent villages during one of the worst conflicts in Africa's history.

Sergeant Garvin's service to our Nation and for a better world do not end with his involvement in Rwanda. He is also a Purple Heart recipient because of his courageous service in Vietnam. He was shot three times in the leg while Viet Cong troops killed his guards in the middle of the night and launched a surprise attack on his unit.

I want to thank Tech Sergeant Garvin for his service and the United States Department of Defense for recognizing the remarkable service of Ser-

geant Garvin and the 156th Airlift Wing.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back on the House floor to pick up on an issue that concerns most every American that has gone to college, who is now in school, or beyond.

I remember a day 3 weeks ago at the Calaveras County Fair. The security guard at the gate greeted me.

He said: Congressman.

I said: Yes.

He said: I need your help.

I said: What can I do for you?

He said: Well, I had to go back to school to get the license and the education for this job. I now run the security program here. I will be over 70 years of age before I am able to pay off my student loan.

He was probably in his early fifties at that time.

I said: How can that be?

He said: The interest rate is killing me.

And, indeed, not only killing him, but all across this Nation, the issue of student debt is harming families, holding back the formation of families—not getting married because you have to pay off the debt, and who would want to marry that person with all that debt? I don't think so—buying houses, getting a car, carrying on in your life.

Student debt is an incredible burden on the American public. And not just the students but, in many cases, the parents of students.

Here is what has happened with student debt:

It is now over \$2.2 trillion. Probably today it is much larger than the debt on credit cards. The growth has been almost exponential. And we are continuing to see this rise. It is not over. Continuing the debt is part of America's reality.

Here are some astonishing facts about student debt:

Not only is it \$1.2 trillion, but it is continuing to increase at \$2,726.27 every second. So we are going to see this go way beyond \$1.2 trillion to, and probably approaching, nearly \$1.5 trillion by the end of this decade.

The number of borrowers and the average balance of their debt has grown by 70 percent between 2004 and 2012. That is more than 7 percent per year.

And finally, down here, we can say that the average student loan debt for graduate students is now over \$35,000 per student. This is an extraordinary burden.

Now, tell me, what family in America has not refinanced their home? I think we all have. Certainly, Patti and I have refinanced our home. And I suspect

most Americans, if they haven't yet refinanced, are watching the interest rates and looking for that moment when they, too, will refinance their home.

So the question for us today is: Why not refinance student loans just the same as we refinance our homes?

Well, the loans are owned by the Federal Government. So this is a question for us in Congress to say: Yes, let's do something to give the American economy a boost. Let's give something to those families, those young students that are out of school and those that are still in school—an opportunity to refinance their loans and to recalculate the interest on loans that they will be taking out in the months and years ahead.

Take a look at this. Undergraduate loans from the Federal Government are now 4.29 percent. If you are in the other programs, it may be 5 percent. And if you are in the graduate program, it is 6.84 percent.

The Federal Government can borrow money somewhere less than 2 percent, or right around 2 percent for 10 years. If you add another percent for administrative costs, we could refinance all that \$1.2 trillion of student loans down to 3.23 percent.

What a break that would give to students in school and out of school and those that are going to be borrowing money for the next school year, 3.2 percent versus 4.29 percent. Or, if you are a graduate student, 3.2 percent versus 6.84 percent—less than half the interest rate.

We can do it. We can do this. And when we do it, we can help those students that are now carrying that incredible burden of having to pay these extraordinary interest rates to the Federal Government, which is actually making a \$138 billion profit on the backs of students.

So I go back to that gentleman there at the Calaveras County Fair who now has a business, but also has a student loan that he took out to get the education he needed to start that business. I would go back to him and say: I will tell you what. Instead of a 6 percent or 7 percent loan, we can refinance your loan down to 3.23 percent.

And what does it mean to the individual student? It means a great deal.

So we have introduced H.R. 5274, the Student Loan Refinancing and Recalculation Act. It will do the following. It would set all student loan interest rates at 3.25 percent—new ones that come up, existing ones, graduate loans, low-income family loans, and the like.

If you happen to be a low-income family, and many of these students are—in fact, the great majority of low-income student are, in fact, taking out loans. For those borrowers, it will be thousands of dollars of interest saved, because we also calculate that the interest will not begin to accrue until after graduation.

Also, we know that the average savings for students will be over \$2,000 on their loans.

It also eliminates the origination fee. Why is the Federal Government charging an origination fee when a student actually goes to the financial office at the university and the paperwork is done by the university? Yet the Federal Government—your Federal Government—is sticking it one more way to the students by charging an origination fee.

So the new piece of legislation, H.R. 5274, the Student Loan Refinancing and Recalculation Act, is an enormous advantage to the American economy by allowing these students to hang on to a little bit more of their money and to engage in the economy: get married, get a car, buy a house.

I had an interesting conversation with the bankers that came into my office a while back. They said: The interest rate is not the only problem.

I said: Really? What is the rest of it?

They said: These students are carrying these loans on their assets or their liabilities, and when we look at their asset-liability, we see this enormous debt, and we cannot even offer them a loan.

He said: If you are able to reduce that—the interest rate and, therefore, the payments that are required—we will be better able to offer them a loan for a car or a house.

So let's do it. The Federal Government ought not be making \$138 billion profit on the backs of students. We can borrow money at less than 2 percent or right around 2 percent for 10 years. Let's refinance all of those \$1.2 trillion of loans down to 3.2 percent. And for the new loans that the students are going to be taking up this coming year, let's give them a break. Instead of 4, 5, or 6 percent, let's do 3.2 percent. It is just 1 percent more than the Federal Government can borrow money.

So keep in mind H.R. 5274, the Student Loan Refinancing and Recalculation Act. My colleagues, let's do it. Let's do it for the students—both new and existing students—and families that have taken out loans so that their children can get ahead, so that those students that have taken out that loan can have the burden reduced. Refinance your house, refinance your student loan.

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

GUANTANAMO BAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is an issue we have been talking about on the Republican side for quite a bit, and I think some of my Democratic friends realize how serious an issue this is because they care about our military members.

The President of the United States promised, ill-advisedly, before he was

ever elected, that he was going to close the Guantanamo Bay facility that housed the worst of the worst terrorists wanting to kill Americans and destroy our way of life. Well, he found out right after he took office that you just can't do that because it is going to put American lives at risk. There is a reason they are being held there. And it violates no rules of law when it comes to war, because war is a little different.

Since civilized society came along in the history of mankind, things improved for prisoners of war. Before there was a civilized society, when one group warred against another, they would either kill them or make them slaves. What occurred was pretty gruesome.

In civilized history, when one group says, "We are at war with this other group," then the other group either responds by defending themselves or they are overtaken by the evildoers—in this case, radical Islamists.

Since the history of more civilized warfare—if we can call it such, because war is truly hell—noble nations played by rules that said, if you capture someone who is part of the group at war with you, then you hold them as prisoners in a humane fashion until such time as the group of which they are a part agrees that they are no longer at war. If the war drags on 15, 20, 30, 50 years, it is not the fault of the country that captures people at war with them, because that country did not start the war.

In this case, the radical Islamists have had this small part of Islam since its beginning and felt like the way to be truly religiously Islamic is to kill anybody that stands in your way of having an international caliphate and forcing everyone in the world to bow before Allah and Islam, in the name of Islam.

□ 1345

It is not our fault if they will not say we are no longer at war with you, because once that happens, then you release those prisoners who were part of the group that was at war with you. And if some of them can be proven to be guilty of actual war crimes against humanity, then you take them to trial, and you try to convict them. And if you do, as we saw after World War II, if they are convicted and sentenced to death, that occurs. If they are sentenced to prison, that is on top of the years that we waited while their group continued to be at war with us. That is under the civilized rules of warfare.

Guantanamo Bay, I can say, having been there more than once, and also having toured many State and Federal prisons, has provided the most humane treatment I have ever seen a group of prisoners get.

For example, in a Texas prison, if you throw urine or feces on a guard, you will suffer consequences for that decision. I found out on one of my trips to Guantanamo Bay prison that when,

as often happens, an inmate figures out a way to throw urine or feces on one of our military member guards, that because we don't want to be perceived as having some mean-spirited prison, we take away a couple of their movie-watching hours during some day to teach them a lesson.

And there have been instances where, when they didn't like the movies being presented, perhaps they hadn't been screened properly enough, maybe some woman exposed a bare arm and that offended somebody, well, there was uproar, problems. But if somebody committed a really egregious crime of assaulting one of our guards, then they might actually lose some of their time outside for a day or two.

It bothered me greatly to find out that the guards were not allowed to even say anything when someone threw urine or feces on them who was an inmate at Guantanamo Bay; because one such United States military member, I think they said he was a minority member of our United States military, had feces thrown on him, and he angrily said a name, and he received an article 15 non-judicial punishment, and he was punished for simply saying something back after he had feces thrown on him.

Well, that ought to be the least of the problems. And I couldn't believe one of our military members who had been assaulted in such a despicable manner was the one punished for saying something back to the inmate that threw feces on him.

But the President is determined to follow through with this same kind of policy idea that he has had since the beginning, when he had his apology tour going throughout the Middle East, apologizing in Egypt, apologizing around the world for America, who has been the only country that I can find in history that has shed so much precious American blood, so much blood of our Americans for other people's freedom. We didn't owe anybody an apology, not for that.

And there is this mentality among some liberals like our President that the world will be so much safer and a so much better place to live if America were brought down and were not a superpower and you let other countries be superpowers, like, for example, Iran.

Let's give Iran \$100 billion, \$150 billion access to that, and let's let them become a superpower, and we will negotiate a deal that, hopefully, will prevent them from getting a nuclear weapon while President Obama is in office. And then who cares what happens after that; right?

But the deal that was negotiated pretty well assures that Iran will have nuclear weapons. It is just a matter of when. And now we know that Iran has repeatedly broken their agreement and we know that this administration, as we found out, this administration actually manipulated video to try to cover up just how bad the deal was that this State Department was negotiating.

I didn't really need to see the story to know this kind of stuff was going on. When I saw that Wendy Sherman was maybe chief negotiator, working with the Secretary of State, who was also part of the glorious deal that the Clinton administration, along with Madeleine Albright, negotiated with North Korea, basically—and this is my translation of the deal—but, okay.

We are going to make sure that you have nuclear power, and we will make sure you have got nuclear fuel, you have got everything you need to make a nuclear weapon so long as you will sign an agreement saying that you are not going to use it to create a nuclear weapon.

You can't help but think of all the snickering that went on in North Korea, especially by Kim Jong-il: Wow, all they want is my signature and they will give us what we need to make a nuclear weapon? Sure. Where do I sign?

I mean, it really reminded me of the story Jeff Foxworthy told about, before he made money as a comedian, he was down on his luck.

A guy shows up at the door, says, "I'm here to repossess your car."

"Oh, please don't take my car. If you take my car, I can't make it to any of my gigs. I can't make money, and then I have no chance of paying for the car. So please, don't take my car."

"I'm sorry, Mr. Foxworthy. I'm here, and I'm supposed to either leave with your car or with cash payment or with a check."

And Foxworthy basically said, "A check? You'll take a check? I didn't know you'd take a check."

"Yeah, how much do you want me to make it out for?"

"I'm glad to write you a check. Sure, you just tell me." And then he signs and gives the check and he keeps his car.

That had to be the kind of mentality.

You mean, you will give us everything we need in North Korea to have nuclear weapons, and all we have to do is sign and you're good with that? Wow. Okay. Let us sign.

So they signed. We make sure they have what they need for nuclear weapons in the name of giving them nuclear power, and sure enough—very expectedly by some of us because it was such a stupid thing to do, the Clinton administration, with Wendy Sherman right there in the negotiations—we gave them the ability to create nuclear weapons, which they have done.

The same way with Iran. Their leaders must have been laughing behind our backs, because we know what they were saying publicly while they were still continuing to say "death to America," still calling us the "Great Satan," still saying they weren't going to abide by any agreement, that the United States would never get them to do what we wanted them to.

Oh, so while we are telling the public we are not going to go along with any deal we sign, you are still willing to accept our signature on a deal? For sure,

we will sign, because even Allah allows us to sign something that is a lie if, in the end, it furthers his kingdom, in their way of thinking.

So if we had strong enough leadership in the United States Senate, what would happen would be there would be a call for a vote on the Iran treaty, which it is. It modifies other treaty provisions and, therefore, you can't do that unless it is a treaty, so it is a treaty. The Constitution says that requires two-thirds of the Senate to vote for the treaty in order for it to be ratified.

The Senate took up this Corker bill, that turned the Constitution upside down, and said, no, we are going to say it takes two-thirds to vote against a deal; otherwise, it goes forward. BOB CORKER is a really nice guy, but, my word, the damage that was done to the Middle East and to the world by the Senate taking an approach to the Iran treaty as if it wasn't really a treaty.

There is still time. Take the vote in the Senate. I know that 60 votes are required for cloture; but when HARRY REID felt like getting very liberal judges into Federal courts was more important than the cloture rule, he had 51 Democrats vote to set aside the cloture rule, and they put in the liberal judges they wanted over the Republican objection.

This Iran treaty is going to eventually bring so much death and destruction to not only the Middle East, but, as Netanyahu has warned us, they are not preparing those intercontinental ballistic missiles for Israel. Those are for us. They can already hit Israel. They are for us.

So what do we see in the news now, other than the fact that Iran—well, this article says: "Iran Spends \$1.7 Billion in U.S. Taxpayer Funds to Boost Its Military." And it says in this June 9 article from Free Beacon, by Adam Kredon:

"The State Department is staying silent after Iranian officials disclosed that the Islamic Republic spent a recent payment by the United States of \$1.7 billion in taxpayer funds to expand and build-up its military, according to comments provided to the Washington Free Beacon.

"The Obama administration earlier this year paid Iran \$1.7 billion from a U.S. taxpayer-funded account in order to settle decades-old legal disputes with the Islamic Republic."

Never mind that our American citizens that were taken hostage have never been allowed to collect properly on the damages done by this regime in Iran. Yes, it was Ayatollah Khomeini instead of Khamenei, but these same hoodlums that are running Iran, same type of thinking, were the ones this administration provided \$1.7 billion. Instead of taking care of the American citizens that this radical Islamist regime in Iran, after they attacked our Embassy, took our hostages, held them for over a year, and we pay them?

It is consistent, I understand, with the apology mentality that leaders in

this country have. Maybe the world will be so much better if we are not a superpower, we cut our military to pre-World War II levels, which is happening, and then we give Iran, that hates us, says very clearly they are going to destroy us and our way of life and our freedoms, we give them \$1.7 billion to build up their military while we are breaking down ours.

I keep going back to the comment by a gentleman, African, named Ebenezer from Togo, when I was over there with the Mercy Ship, provided incredible health care to the people of Togo, Lome, there in West Africa. And at the end of my week there, he and other Africans—these were not African Americans. These were Africans. But they also happened to be fellow Christians.

After a lovely meeting with them, Ebenezer spoke, and he said: Look. Basically, he said: We were so excited when you elected your first African American—or "Black President," I believe he said—but since then, we have seen America get weaker and weaker. And the reason we all wanted to meet with you is because, you know, we're Christians. We know where we're going when we die. But our only hope in this life for a peaceful life is if America is strong, because as America gets weaker, we suffer more.

We have seen that around the world. I have been to Nigeria and wept with mothers whose children were kidnapped by radical Islamists. They know that, as America has not responded to the radical Islam in Nigeria and helped them as we could, they have suffered mightily.

□ 1400

Yet, this administration, from what has come out of Nigeria, has said: Look, we will help you a little more. We will really be able to help you with Boko Haram, but you have to start paying for abortions, and you have to start having same-sex marriage. We don't care if it violates your religious convictions because that is what we want you to do.

They are suffering there. They are suffering in all parts of Africa, many parts of Africa, because this administration has not been the force for good; it has been a force for weakness.

Now this story from The Washington Post, Adam Goldman and Missy Ryan, June 8: "At least 12 released Guantanamo detainees implicated in attacks on Americans."

The article says: "The Obama administration believes that at least 12 detainees"—and this is the Obama administration themselves. This isn't LOUIE GOHMERT. This is "the Obama administration believes that at least 12 detainees released from the prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, have launched attacks against U.S. or allied forces in Afghanistan, killing about a half-dozen Americans, according to current and former U.S. officials."

It goes on to explain how these former Guantanamo Bay detainees

have been killing Americans in Afghanistan. This is no surprise to some of us who have been saying—when these people were involved in plotting and killing Americans before they were detained, and they have even made statements in detention that they can't wait to get out so they can kill more Americans, at some point even if they say, Okay, I will sign where you want me to, just let me go, who is surprised when they go back on their word like North Korea, go back on their word like the radical Islamist leaders in Iran as distinguished with so many Iranians who want to be rid of the radical Islamist leaders? But who can be surprised that they would actually go back to killing Americans?

That is why so many of us have been saying—a majority in this House—we are not going to let you close Guantanamo. We have made it against the law for him to release people unless certain things were done. And he violated that—the President did—when he made the deal for what is apparently a United States Army deserter, it certainly appears, and he let five of the worst murderers go without following the law that was set out for the President. Now it has been substantiated. We know people that have been released from Guantanamo have been killing Americans.

So one thing we know also is when a nation's enemies see that that nation's strongest ally is pulling away from that enemy, it is provocative. They act against that nation. So when that nation is Israel, and the appearance to the world is that the United States is pulling back from our close alliance and friendship with Israel, is it any wonder that Israel's biggest and most hateful enemies would be moving against Israel?

Terrorists have, once again, been inspired to go on killing sprees in Israel despite the Israelis doing everything they can to stop the carnage. As Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, I believe he even said it in this Chamber as he stood here facing Moses, our greatest known lawgiver of all time, standing, by the way—and I mentioned this to Prime Minister Netanyahu as he came down the aisle in May of 2011: Don't forget, while you are standing, speaking to us, our national motto will be right above your head.

He started to look up, and then he didn't even have to look up because he obviously knew what was up there. He looked me in the eye and said: I had already thought about that.

So as he stood here, In God We Trust above his head, looking at the greatest lawgiver in the history of mankind, Moses—most of us think he had 10 good commandments. I think our Supreme Court would probably say maybe five or six. But he warned us what was happening in the realm of radical Islam, what would be happening to Israel, and what would be happening to what they call the Great Satan, America. People in this administration did not listen.

Americans have spoken out loudly during the primary season about this idea of refugees who cannot be properly vetted, because we don't know really who they are and where they are coming from. As FBI Director Comey testified in front of our Judiciary Committee:

We will vet them, but we have got nothing to vet with. At least in Iraq, we had Iraq's records on who had criminal convictions, who had arrests, and who had things in their record. We got no records from Syria and some of these other places. We don't know who they are. We don't know how criminal they are. We don't know how radical Islamist they are.

So many have been warning, and the American people have been warning through the primary season, and this article substantiates, from June 10, "Refugees Angry Over Skimpy Ramadan Meals Set Shelter on Fire, Police Say."

This is from FOX News. It says: "A pair of North African refugees reportedly set a German shelter on fire Tuesday because they were angry the special Ramadan meals there weren't up to snuff.

"Investigators told the BBC that the men—who were not fasting at the shelter in Dusseldorf—had complained their lunch portions were too small."

Since they weren't observing the fast, they wanted more food.

"The fire burned the facility to the ground, causing \$11 million in damages."

The 26-year-old North African told reporters:

We had to do it. We had to burn it down so things would change.

So the question remains as more and more refugees are brought into this country against the will of the majority of the American people: How many facilities are going to be burned in America? How many more Americans are going to be killed on our own soil because the State Department and the Homeland Security Department are not properly vetting?

Our friend—and, in my mind, hero—Phil Haney, who worked for the Department of Homeland Security, had thousands of entries that Janet Napolitano said: We tried to connect the dots.

They deleted thousands of those dots. Why? Because this administration apparently doesn't want the public to know or the next administration to find out that many of the people they consult with and consort with have ties to terrorists. They deleted so many thousands of the dots in our system.

We are at risk, and the FBI director—I respect him—James Comey, said Tuesday: "The Islamic State group is currently the main threat facing the United States, both in its efforts to recruit fighters to join its members overseas and to have others carry out violence in America."

He said: "The Islamic State group poses a third potential threat: a 'terrorist diaspora' that he said will eventually flow out of Syria and Iraq and

end up in Western Europe, where members will have easy access to the United States.

"There's three prongs to this ISIL threat,' Comey said. 'The recruitment to travel, the recruitment to violence in place, and then what you saw a preview of in Brussels and in Paris—hardened fighters coming out, looking to kill people.'

"He said officials are 'laser-focused on that.'"

We know some officials like him are focused on that, but we also know there are others in the administration who are meeting with people that the Justice Department under President Bush made very clear in their pleadings were coconspirators in support for terrorism. That included the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR.

Then we hear about our friends at the Council on American-Islamic Relations when we see the article that just this week CAIR is joking around about medicating Americans against Islamophobia.

So that article from Virginia Hale, 9 June, Breitbart, talks about the jokes by the "Muslim Brotherhood-linked Council on American-Islamic Relations advises that anyone who harbors 'intolerance' towards Muslims, or who believes large numbers of the religion's adherents could pose a danger to the U.S., to take anti-Islamophobia medication for their 'unthinking bigotry.'"

Is it really bigotry when you are not prejudiced against Muslims, you have many Muslim friends, but you know there is a part of Islamists and there is a part of Muslims who are radical Islamists who want to kill you, destroy your country, destroy Christianity, and destroy Jews—kill all of them?

Is it really bigotry to say that we would really like to stop them before they destroy America, kill all Americans, kill all Christians in the world, and kill all Jews in the world, that we would really like to stop that? Is that really bigotry?

Because I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that what that is—if you are an American—is love of country. We have had Americans—and I hope and pray still—well, no. I know we have Americans who still have what Jesus, who laid down His life for us, said is the greatest love anyone could ever have, that someone would lay down their life for others. He knew what that was. He did it. We have had so many Americans do that.

But because of the lunacy that is occurring now in the administration, in the State Department, in homeland security, and in our military, Americans are being killed and are going to be killed.

If that is not enough, this article from TownHall, Matt Vespa, June 3: "Syrian Refugees Pushed Sweden's Welfare State to the Brink of Collapse."

Very interesting. Osama bin Laden had an interesting statement at one time about how very cheaply they were

able to kill 3,000 Americans on 9/11, but that the best part even beyond killing 3,000 Americans was that they cost us billions and maybe trillions of dollars with a very, very small investment to killing Americans on 9/11, and that if they will keep having projects like that, they can break us financially.

It appears that with decisions in this administration, they are on their way to doing that.

If that is not enough, this administration had the VA announce that the Department of Veterans Affairs has now proposed covering transition-related surgeries for transgender veterans in the near future under a proposed rule change. I know that the people making this decision don't want more veterans killing themselves. But as Dr. Paul McHugh, the former head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins, now retired, was still working with them—but one transgender gentleman that had had the sex change in his forties had told me Dr. McHugh knows more about transgender than anybody.

Dr. McHugh has not made that claim. He is a very humble gentleman. He is a brilliant man. He cites in his article printed in *The Wall Street Journal* about a 2011 study at the Karolinska Institutet in Sweden produced the most illuminating results yet regarding the transgendered evidence that should give advocates pause. He is talking about advocates for transgender agenda that is even being pushed here in Congress.

□ 1415

And he says: “The long-term study—up to 30 years—followed 324 people who had sex-reassignment surgery. The study revealed that beginning about 10 years after having the surgery, the transgendered began to experience increasing mental difficulties. Most shockingly, their suicide mortality rose almost 20-fold above the comparable nontransgender population. This disturbing result has as yet no explanation but probably reflects the growing sense of isolation reported by the aging transgendered after surgery. The high suicide rate certainly challenges the surgery prescription.”

So for those in the VA who think a sex change operation is a good idea, Mr. Speaker, I hope they will look at the number of veterans that are killing themselves—higher rates than any time in previous eras of American history—and they will look at how many veterans are dying without the treatment they need, the veterans that are in long timelines to get the treatment they need to stay alive, and those who are dying waiting for the treatment they need.

Do you really want to have 20 times more veterans killing themselves? Is that where you want the VA money being spent, so that we can have 20 times the suicide rate that we currently have?

“Forbid it, Almighty God,” as Patrick Henry once said.

And now the administration wants to take away parents' choices of decisions for their kids, wants to take our choices away that the First Amendment assures us that we have the right to freedom of religion. There is no right to freedom from religion, but there is a right of freedom of religion; and those rights are being taken away, even as they were from the Little Sisters of the Poor.

Do we want to allow these rights to continue to be taken at the cost of American lives, as we have seen resulting from people released at Guantanamo Bay, resulting from the ridiculous rules that are given to our military members? They are told they can't fire on people unless they are fired at and they can be assured no civilian will get hit.

The rules of engagement are ridiculous under this administration. So many rules are costing American lives. It is time to bring it all home and to understand the words of Ebenezer in Africa that, when America gets weaker, people around the world suffer. They understand that around the world. Freedom-loving people understand around the world when America gets weaker, they suffer.

America has been a gift to the world. Mr. Speaker, you know it, I know it, and I hope and pray more in the administration will realize it before it is too late.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DUFFY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 14 on account of the birth of his child.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 13, 2016, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner*, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown,

Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. “Buddy” Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins.

Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. “Rick” Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Warren Davidson, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. “Chuck” Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry.

Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Cresent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Trent Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger.

Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Darin LaHood, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Matsui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty

McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Moolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse.

Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee*, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff.

Aaron Schock*, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trott, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5658. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps

for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants — Cross-Border Application of the Margin Requirements (RIN: 3038-AC97) received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5659. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Risk-Based Capital (RIN: 3133-AD77) received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5660. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 16-015, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); and 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5661. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Country Reports on Terrorism 2015", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5662. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending March 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 S. tat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5663. A letter from the Chairman, Capitol Police Board, transmitting the Board's 2015 Year in Review which provides a synopsis of the Board's many short- and long-term initiatives and highlights the achievements of the Board, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1901 note; Public Law 108-7, Sec. 1014(d)(1); (117 Stat. 361); to the Committee on House Administration.

5664. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB — Cosentino v. Commissioner [T.C. Memo. 2014-186] received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5665. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Certain Transfers of Property to Regulated Investment Companies [RICs] and Real Estate Investment Trusts [REITs] [TD 9770] (RIN: 1545-BN39) received June 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3636. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow labor organizations and management organizations to receive the results of visa petitions about which such organizations have submitted advisory opinions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114-614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5169. A bill to strengthen

welfare research and evaluation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-615, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5170. A bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our Nation's social programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON. Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5050. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-617, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4612. A bill to ensure economic stability, accountability, and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on midnight rules during a President's final days in office, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-618, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4612 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5169 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 5445. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the rules with respect to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5446. A bill to require the Attorney General to review foreign forms of identification, including consular identification cards and foreign passports without a valid visa, to establish a valid and secure form of identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5447. A bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5448. A bill to expand the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program to include members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty and the families of such members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5449. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to create a commission to provide adequate representation to defendants

in Federal criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5450. A bill to establish an American Savings Account Fund and create a retirement savings plan available to all employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 5451. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to exempt certain recipients of Department of Agriculture conservation assistance from certain reporting requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5453. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish an advisory opinion process for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 5454. A bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5455. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to separate the market monitoring functions of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection from the Bureau's supervisory functions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. ROBY):

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress opposing the President's proposed Coastal Climate Resilience Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BRAT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H. Res. 776. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of November as "U.S. Navy Aircraft Carrier Month", in celebration of the accomplishments and contributions of United States Navy aircraft carriers in defending the freedom of the United States, protecting the security of the Nation and its allies, responding to crisis and spurring technological innovation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 5445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—power to lay and collect taxes

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 5446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—Business/Labor Regulation—The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 5448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 5451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 5452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Con-

gress shall have power to regulate the regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 228: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 239: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 335: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 379: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 499: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 670: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 704: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 759: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 836: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 842: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 923: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 953: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 1211: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1221: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 1391: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 1603: Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 1608: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 1784: Mr. BLUM.
 H.R. 1877: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1958: Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1959: Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1988: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 2058: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2090: Mr. KIND and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 2114: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2205: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 2290: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 2327: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 2450: Mr. TONKO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2726: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2799: Ms. ESTY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2804: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2867: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 2911: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 2980: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2992: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 3065: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 3094: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 3099: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 3159: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 3185: Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. TIPTON and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

- H.R. 3308: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 3323: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 3384: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3471: Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 3643: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 3666: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 3683: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
- H.R. 3684: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 3706: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3742: Mr. MARINO and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 3765: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 3884: Mr. ISSA and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 3885: Mr. ISSA and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 3929: Mr. HANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 3964: Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 3965: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 4006: Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 4007: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 4087: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 4150: Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 4184: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 4247: Mr. REED, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 4257: Mr. ROTHFUS.
- H.R. 4352: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 4365: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 4452: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H.R. 4514: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 4538: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 4542: Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 4592: Mr. COLE and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
- H.R. 4616: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 4625: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KATKO.
- H.R. 4632: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 4640: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 4681: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 4715: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 4731: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 4764: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H.R. 4773: Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 4816: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
- H.R. 4817: Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 4829: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 4887: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 4956: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 5025: Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 5044: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
- H.R. 5047: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 5082: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 5091: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 5137: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 5143: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HILL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 5165: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 5166: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ZINKE.
- H.R. 5168: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 5172: Mr. MCHENRY.
- H.R. 5182: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 5183: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 5210: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 5230: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 5254: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 5259: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 5275: Mr. GRIFFITH.
- H.R. 5276: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 5283: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 5292: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 5312: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 5334: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 5364: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 5386: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 5408: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 5423: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 5425: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 5426: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. GROTHMAN.
- H. Res. 14: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. ESHOO.
- H. Res. 220: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COFFMAN.
- H. Res. 494: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H. Res. 549: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H. Res. 591: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H. Res. 642: Mr. HARPER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H. Res. 729: Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H. Res. 740: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GIBBS.
- H. Res. 750: Mr. JOYCE and Mrs. LOWEY.
- H. Res. 754: Mr. POCAN.
- H. Res. 766: Mr. FARR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H. Res. 769: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH.