



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016

No. 94

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 14, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the 1996 welfare reform law imposed new limitations on able-bodied adults without dependents, known as ABAWDs, receiving food assistance through the SNAP program. These 18- to 49-year-olds who do not have children or serve as caretakers to other individuals have access to SNAP for only 3 months in any 3-year period when they are not employed at least half time or are in a work training program.

It is important to note that the law doesn't require States to offer job training programs—most do not—and SNAP recipients have their benefits cut off after 3 months even if they are searching for work or are working less than 20 hours per week.

So who are the ABAWDs?

While some on the other side of the aisle tend to stereotype these vulnerable adults, the truth of the matter is there is no one face to the ABAWD population. This is a very diverse group. About 45 percent are women. Close to one-third are over 40 years old. Many have limited educational experiences, with more than 80 percent having no more than a high school education or a GED. Some have mental health issues, difficult histories of substance abuse, or are ex-offenders who have nowhere else to turn, and as many as 100,000 are veterans.

These childless adults on SNAP are extremely poor and often experience chronic homelessness. They often turn to SNAP as a safety net when they lose their jobs, when their hours at work get cut, or when their wages are so low they are unable to make ends meet. Most childless adults on SNAP who are able to work do. At least 25 percent of these households work while receiving SNAP, and about 75 percent work in the year before or after receiving benefits. While many struggle with job insecurity, among those households that worked in a typical month while receiving SNAP or at some point during the following year, about half worked full time for 6 months or more in the year after they were on the program.

Because childless adults receive only limited government assistance, access to SNAP becomes a critical lifeline to these Americans who are living in poverty. After these vulnerable adults leave the SNAP program, research suggests that many continue to face incredible hardship. While some continue to struggle to find jobs, former SNAP

recipients who work tend to earn low wages that keep them in poverty. They struggle to get the healthy food they need. Often, they must eat less or skip a meal entirely because they simply have no money with which to purchase food.

A provision in the 1996 welfare law allows States to suspend the 3-month limit in areas with high and sustained unemployment. In the aftermath of the Great Recession, Democratic and Republican Governors requested and received waivers from the 3-month limit, and the limit has not been in effect in most States during the past several years. But as the economy continues to recover, fewer areas qualify for waivers despite the fact that many of these vulnerable Americans still struggle to find long-term, stable jobs. As these waivers expire this year, it is expected that more than 500,000 and as many as 1 million of our poorest neighbors will be cut off from SNAP. Thousands already began losing their benefits on April 1 as 23 States began implementing the time limits for the first time since before the recession.

These waivers are providing support as they were intended to: helping our communities overcome hardship and providing a lifeline to vulnerable adults who are unable to find work during difficult times. So I am greatly disappointed by the proposals offered by Speaker RYAN to eliminate the ability of States to request these waivers during times of economic hardship.

Mr. Speaker, cutting off food assistance for vulnerable adults who are unable to make ends meet is a rotten thing to do, and it only makes hunger worse in our communities. How does making hunger worse make it easier to get a job? Every single congressional district is home to Americans who are struggling with hunger. The hardships they face are exactly why such cuts are so cruel. These proposals are mean-spirited, political documents that are

□ 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.

H3757

based on the false narrative that people don't want to work.

If my Republican friends were serious about getting people back to work and responsibly moving those who can work off of public assistance, their budgets would reflect that, but they don't. Republicans have offered no guarantees that vulnerable Americans will have access to job training programs that will get them back to work. Many job training programs are already stretched incredibly thin. If Republicans were serious, they would increase job training funding so that more Americans could get the help they need to get back on their feet. And, at every turn, they have resisted calls to increase the minimum wage. Work ought to pay in this country.

I sometimes wonder if my friends on the other side of the aisle have ever met working people who are living in poverty and who rely on SNAP for access to food. The truth is their neatly packaged rhetoric doesn't match the reality of those who are working to make ends meet.

We must reject harmful attempts to limit SNAP participation for our vulnerable neighbors and, instead, work on solutions to end hunger now.

SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 of last year, I came to this floor to speak on behalf of the Syrian people. I called for stronger leadership from our Commander in Chief, President Barack Obama, in the Syrian conflict. Specifically, I urged the President to establish no-fly zones to protect innocent lives. At that time, 200,000 Syrians had already died.

The administration has failed to act, and, today, Syria remains in crisis. The number of Syrians killed through the civil war has now doubled to 400,000. Many of these casualties are civilians: women, children, doctors, and teachers. So, Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor again to say that this slaughter of innocent human life must end, and it will not end unless the United States takes the lead fearlessly and immediately.

I meet regularly with Syrian Americans who live in my congressional district in Charleston, West Virginia. They have told me the stories of their friends and families in the city of Aleppo, which is a financial and cultural center in Syria. Aleppo is now on fire and under siege. Just last week, a civilian bus was the victim of an airstrike where 10 were killed, including three women and two children.

Sadly, this type of violence is a daily occurrence in Aleppo and elsewhere in Syria. Hospitals, markets, schools, bus stations, warehouses: none of these places are off limits for bombings and destruction. If America does not take immediate actions to end the current

humanitarian crisis, thousands more will die, and we will look back on this period of history knowing that America failed both the Syrian people and the cause of freedom.

We must move quickly to protect the innocent civilians who are under attack. This means America must use its influence to stop the current flurry of airstrikes on civilian areas, and Russia must be part of this solution. If America fails to lead in negotiating a cease-fire immediately, the catastrophic losses of life will continue.

We must accomplish a longer term cessation of hostilities, and we must allow the Syrian people free movement so that the innocent are able to escape harm's way. A no-fly zone must be established so that Syria is able to heal into a place that promotes justice and freedom for all citizens.

Does this photo of Syria look familiar? You may remember seeing similar destruction in Bosnia almost 20 years ago. This is Bosnia. The war in Bosnia in the mid-1990s provides a thought-provoking blueprint as we search for solutions in Syria. With the disintegration of Yugoslavia in 1992, the region devolved into an ethnic civil war—first in Croatia, then in Bosnia. Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic began instituting a policy of ethnic cleansing by which whole populations were forced from their homes and were killed.

For 4 years, the United States remained passive in the conflict, but in the summer of 1995, under President Bill Clinton, America took decisive military action with a series of airstrikes that brought Milosevic to the bargaining table, that forced peace, and that, ultimately, removed Milosevic from power. Today, Bosnia and Croatia are flourishing countries and are top destinations for many international tourists. Here is Bosnia today.

We must apply these lessons of the war in Bosnia to the current conflict in Syria. The United States must take decisive leadership in returning long-term stability to Syria. Unless America and our allies are willing to use force, Russian and Syrian leaders will not respect us or have reason to negotiate peace.

To enable the citizens of Syria to live free from fear and to thrive, we must do at least three things: establish safe zones along Syria's border with Turkey; ramp up our efforts to train Syrian opposition forces who have proven they are not extremists; and help Syria institute a new coalition government. Peace in Syria is impossible while Assad remains in control. He has proven this point time and again by his reckless and evil use of chemical weapons and other cruel tools of war on his own people.

America cannot address the humanitarian crisis and restore long-term stability to Syria on our own. We must engage with our partners around the world who share a mutual interest in

the cause of freedom. But, no matter what, President Barack Obama must act now, or even more lives could be lost. I encourage my colleagues in this chamber to join me in this call to action.

ORLANDO SHOOTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we should all be concerned with the killing of innocents. Let's start right here in America where we are under attack.

We are all still reeling from the horrific violence in Orlando—49 killed, more than 50 wounded. It is the worst mass shooting in American history. The killer was someone who, in his own words, identified with ISIS, a madman's fury directed at the GLBT community, who were slaughtered in a place of comfort, release, and joy. It was especially jarring because this has been an unprecedented period of progress for the GLBT issues on every front. New landmarks have been achieved.

While this outrage is tragic, horrifying, and frustrating, it is important that people understand that the advocates of GLBT equality and of a rational approach to gun safety are not going to stop in their efforts for reform. The unprecedented outpouring of support in the wake of Orlando ought to be a source of comfort and strength for the GLBT community as people everywhere reaffirm their support and stand in solidarity for full equality. Our Pride Parade in Portland this weekend is going to be larger and more enthusiastic than ever.

The equality tide is not going to turn, and the silly bathroom police in North Carolina is not where America is going or even where North Carolina will be in the future. While it seems gun violence continues unchecked by sensible gun safety laws, that tide, too, is poised to turn. We know what to do. No one needs an assault rifle to hunt; although it is very efficient to slaughter little children in school or people in a nightclub.

There are dozens of simple steps that can be taken to protect Americans, steps which are, in fact, supported broadly by the public, not just by the majority of Americans but by most gun owners themselves. We should start with universal background checks for all gun purchases. Someone on the terrorist watch list should not be able to purchase a gun; no fly, no buy. If we can personalize our cell phones so that others can't use them, we ought to be able to make smart guns so that others cannot use guns unauthorized.

□ 1015

When somebody fails a background check, that ought to be reported to the authorities, who it was, and why.

We can repeal the inane prohibition on gun safety research that stops us

from treating the epidemic of gun violence like we would any other public health crisis. It is interesting that even the author of this misguided policy 20 years ago now realizes it was a mistake, and he has changed his mind and wants to overturn it.

Just like automobile safety, we can take dozens of small steps to reduce gun violence. Not eliminate it altogether, but we don't stop treating cancer just because some people die; so it is with our commitment to gun safety. If we can stop a few tragic acts, it is worth it to reduce the number of attacks and save lives.

We are poised for one of the most consequential elections in anybody's memory. Let's make it count. We have an opportunity to stand in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in the LGBT community. We can join with President Obama and Secretary Clinton for enlightened national leadership, stand with the LGBT community committed to making this tragedy a turning point. This is the year to deliver on full LGBT equality and commonsense gun safety.

ACADEMY APPOINTEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize a group of remarkable young people from Pinellas County, Florida, who have excelled among their peers and answered the call to duty to serve their fellow Americans. These young men and women have tested and proven themselves academically, athletically, and physically, and have demonstrated the leadership skills necessary to now be offered appointments to one of our United States Service Academies.

It is an honor to recognize these young men and women from Florida's 13th Congressional District today.

Receiving appointments to attend the U.S. Military Academy at West Point are:

Elizabeth Brown-Worthington of Gulfport, Florida, a graduate of Boca Ciega High School;

Andrew Buck of Tierra Verde, Florida, a graduate of Saint Petersburg Catholic High School;

Sean McClair of Seminole, Florida, a graduate of Osceola Fundamental High School and the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School;

Tyler Mitchiner of Clearwater, Florida, a graduate of Palm Harbor University and the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School;

William Moorhead of Clearwater, Florida, a graduate of Clearwater Central Catholic High School;

Patrick Prior of Saint Petersburg, Florida, a graduate of Osceola Fundamental High School;

John Rusnak of Seminole, Florida, a graduate of Saint Petersburg Catholic High School.

Receiving appointments from Pinellas County to attend the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis are:

Connor Price of Safety Harbor, Florida, a graduate of Palm Harbor University High School and the U.S. Naval Academy Preparatory School;

Jared Price of Safety Harbor, Florida, a graduate of Palm Harbor University High School and the U.S. Naval Academy Preparatory School;

Zack Quilty of Saint Petersburg, Florida, a graduate of Jesuit High School; and

Ethan Singer of Clearwater, Florida, a graduate of Countryside High School.

Receiving appointments to attend the U.S. Air Force Academy from Pinellas County, Florida are:

Brian Brown of Safety Harbor, Florida, a graduate of Countryside High School;

Dalton Collins of Largo, Florida, a graduate of Admiral Farragut Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy Preparatory School;

Joseph Gannaio of Clearwater, Florida, a graduate of Calvary Christian High School;

Thomas "Trey" Walker of Saint Petersburg, Florida, a graduate of Saint Petersburg High School.

Receiving appointments to attend the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy from Pinellas County, Florida, are:

Jackson Misner of Tampa, Florida, a graduate of H.B. Plant High School; and

Sofia Tucker of Navarre, Florida, a graduate of Navarre High School.

Finally, receiving an appointment to attend the U.S. Coast Guard Academy is Olivia Suski of Seminole, Florida, a graduate of Seminole High School and the Marion Military Institute.

These future cadets and midshipmen that we recognize today will be the future leaders of our military forces and our Merchant Marine. I wish them Godspeed in the challenges of their summer training and the academic years to follow.

These young people represent the best of America, and we each look forward to witnessing their future success and their service to country.

We, the House of Representatives, can have great confidence in our Nation's future as we entrust it to these appointees and those of my colleagues here in Congress.

ORLANDO MASSACRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, this is what our moments of silence have brought us:

A silent nightclub. The only sound is the frantic ringing of cell phones that would never be answered and silent bodies where there should be life, love, and pride. And, here, a silent Congress.

Mere words cannot express the depth of my rage and grief. Forty-nine lives lost in the middle of Pride Month when they should have been safe and celebrated. Forty-nine families devastated by the loss of their loved ones. Forty-

nine phones ringing and ringing and ringing.

There were also frantic texts, like Eddie Justice's final message to his mother: "Mommy, I love you. He's coming. I'm gonna die."

If you can hear these words without your heart breaking, if you can think of those little children gunned down in Newtown without breathing, if you can think of empty pews in Charleston without mourning, then truly you have lost your souls.

Hateful people like to compare LGBT equality to the sin-filled Biblical cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, but we here in Congress are the real Sodom and Gomorrah.

Are there not 218 Members here to stand against this bloody tide?

I ask you today: How many lives must be destroyed before Congress acts?

Nine lives? Charleston showed us nine is not enough.

Thirteen lives? Columbine showed us that 13 was not enough.

Certainly, 27 small children killed in their classrooms in Newtown? No, not enough.

The 32 lives lost at Virginia Tech, again, not enough lives. The more than 33,000 Americans killed each year by guns, not enough.

Now 49 people have been mowed down and murdered in Orlando, yet even this historic tragedy, the biggest mass murder since 9/11, hasn't been deemed big enough, horrific enough, or insidious enough to break the weak-kneed, spineless, silent Members of Congress.

Congress is happy to debate for hours about bathrooms, but bring up the gun violence killing of thousands? Absolutely not.

Radical Islam or homegrown American homophobia or a toxic stew of both may have inspired the Orlando shooter. No doubt we will learn about his disgusting motivations in the coming weeks.

But there are simple actions we can take right now, actions that would have reduced the deaths in Orlando as well as in Aurora, Newtown, San Bernardino, and at Umpqua Community College. All these killers use AR-15s. All of them used weapons of mass destruction.

First, let's make sure every gun purchase requires a background check rather than just 60 percent of gun purchases.

Why have we created a separate market for criminals, domestic abusers, and mentally ill?

Let's ban assault weapons that have time and time again caused mass bloodshed. The American people are too familiar with the AR-15, a weapon designed to hunt Americans in their most vulnerable places: the classroom, the movie theater, the nightclub.

Whether the would-be killers are Islamic extremists or American White supremacists or disgruntled coworkers, banning assault weapons would prevent mass bloodshed on the scale we saw

last weekend in Orlando. Motive doesn't matter without the means.

Finally, we must lift the ban on gun violence research. Our best minds should have access to gun violence statistics and be encouraged to study ways to stem the tide of violence. The Second Amendment cannot be abridged by basic scientific studies.

Would these policies stop all gun violence? Of course not.

But I am repulsed by the moments of silence that just are for show. No other industrialized country has such blood-soaked streets. By remaining silent, we are complicit in these crimes.

To the Latino and LGBT communities that are dealing with this unimaginable tragedy, I mourn with you and stand with you against this tide of hatred.

To my colleagues, I plead with you, please, stop the idolatry of weapons of death.

REMEMBERING THOSE LOST IN THE JUNE 11TH SHOOTING IN ORLANDO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in praying for the victims and the impacted families from Saturday's terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida.

This terrorist attack serves as a reminder that we must do everything possible to defeat those who inspire hate and we must eradicate ISIS before other incidents occur.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years alone, 73 American lives have been taken by acts of terrorism here at home, in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the first duty of American leadership is the safety of our citizens and our families. When American leadership fails, our citizens pay a heavy price.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FARM CREDIT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the farm credit, which was signed into law through the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916 and was created to be a source of competitive credit for those who live and work in rural America.

Today, the farm credit system plays a vital role in the success of our rural communities throughout our 50 States and in Puerto Rico, providing more than \$237 billion in loans to more than 500,000 customers.

Now, while the farm credit system has a national footprint, its leaders are local. There are nearly 75 independently owned and operated farm credit organizations across the Nation, acting as cooperatives, owned by its customers with a deep understanding of agriculture in their area.

Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania, my home State,

and I can tell you that the farm credit system has played a major role in helping farm families survive and thrive through the use of financing, the construction of new buildings, the purchase of land, the pursuit of agribusiness opportunities, and the purchase of new equipment to remain competitive.

The farm credit system has also been vital to helping new farmers in Pennsylvania hit the ground running and to start to grow their new businesses.

Mr. Speaker, American agriculture is responsible for feeding our local communities, our Nation, and the world as a whole. It is my hope that the farm credit system will assist our farms for generations to come.

AL RIDDLEY'S PRAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Al Riddley of Springfield, Illinois, who is giving this afternoon's opening prayer.

This tradition of a congressional prayer dates back all the way to the Continental Congress in 1774. It has guided the House of Representatives through trying and through difficult times. That is why I can think of no better person to lead us in prayer this afternoon.

Al has dedicated his life to helping others and improving our communities in Illinois. Throughout his entire professional career, he has extended a helping hand to the most vulnerable, especially our friends and our neighbors in need.

Al serves on the Governor's Commission on the Elimination of Poverty. As the recent past executive director of the Illinois Coalition for Community Services, he has worked to empower volunteers through education and grassroots organizing.

As a minister, Al gives the best sermons I have ever heard. He can move congregations to tears. He can give them a good laugh. And I can guarantee you that if you hear him, there is never a congregation that doesn't walk away feeling inspired to make a difference in the lives of their neighbors.

That is why it makes me proud to say that Al Riddley is going to be giving the opening prayer later this afternoon, and I am honored to have him here with us today.

TRUTH ABOUT THE BABY BODY PARTS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring attention to the research that the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives is conducting. On April 20 of this year, Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives Chairman MARSHA

BLACKBURN held a hearing on the pricing of fetal tissue and found broad consensus among witnesses that Federal law may have been violated when abortion clinics profited from the sale of baby body parts and the privacy of women may have been violated in the process.

Let's take a look at what the panel found. First, and possibly the most shocking, is a Web site where one procurement business, whose name has been redacted, has set up an online order form. From this Web site, a user can select what type of parts they want: baby brains, baby tongue, scalp, reproductive organs. The quantity is then selected of the gestational period chosen. The user even has shipping options.

This is truly appalling. This is online shopping for baby parts, and this procurement business has made it as easy as possible.

□ 1030

But these procurement businesses are not doing this by themselves. They are only the middlemen in a transaction between the supplier—or abortion clinic—and the end user.

As seen on exhibit B2, this procurement business markets itself in its brochure to abortion clinics as a way for the clinics to make additional income by allowing the procurement business technicians to collect tissues and organs from aborted babies immediately after an abortion is completed. The brochure uses the words "financially profitable," "fiscally rewards," and "financial benefit to your clinic."

The Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives' investigation revealed that the procurement business technician performs every conceivable task in the harvesting process immediately after an abortion. For this, the procurement business is charged a fee by the clinic, even though the clinics are not incurring any additional costs in the process, thus they are making money off of this horrific act.

It is important to note at this point that the underlying statute allowing for the donation of fetal tissue assumes the tissue would be for transplantations and research and would not be sold. Further, in 1993, former Democrat Congressman Henry Waxman, who wrote the restrictions into law, stated on the House floor: "This amendment would enact the most important safeguards to prevent any sale of fetal tissue for any purpose, not just the purpose of research." He went on and said: "It would be abhorrent to allow for the sale of fetal tissue and a market to be created for that sale."

So what have these clinics done? Well, just the opposite, it would seem. This shows an abortion clinic charged the middleman \$11,365 for harvested baby parts or what they call POCs, products of conception, and blood. Exhibit D2 shows the abortion clinic charged the middleman again, this

time \$9,060, for harvested baby parts and blood even though the clinic did not incur any additional expense in the harvesting process.

This is the very market Congressman Waxman called abhorrent, and he was right. It is abhorrent. How callous does one have to be to rob a baby of life and then charge others for the pieces of the corpse? This is beyond disturbing.

Just as disturbing, the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives also found that women's privacy rights appear to have been violated in the process. After the online order form comes to the procurement company from a researcher, it goes to the procurement company's technician, who is embedded in the abortion clinic.

The technician then, without their consent, reviews the woman's medical records to see if their baby's age and gender match that day's order. If so, the technician then goes to the woman, befriends her, and coerces her to give consent by lying to her—and this is a Planned Parenthood consent form—claiming that blood from pregnant women and tissue that had been aborted have been used to treat and find a cure—find a cure—for such diseases as diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, cancer, and AIDS. As we know, this is not true.

From there, the procurement technician dissects the aborted baby in order to harvest the specific organs that were ordered and ships them off. The Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives' investigation into this issue is already illustrating that the clinics are turning the sale of baby body parts into a business, and they are making a profit doing so.

No woman should be treated this way. No woman should have her private medical records given to a for-profit company so they can use her for financial gain. These practices are deplorable, and they must end.

WE ARE ALL MOURNING THE SENSELESS VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, regardless of our party affiliation or our congressional district, we are all mourning the senseless violence and loss of life in Orlando.

As we learn the names and the stories of each victim, our focus now turns to how we respond, how we prevent another act of terror and hate, another tragedy to which this country has become far too accustomed.

We face a multitude of shortcomings that this Nation must account for: access to guns designed to maximize death and destruction as well as the very real threat that violent extremism and homegrown terrorism pose to American lives. Two debates, it is worth noting, that this body has repeatedly failed to take up.

In the days and weeks ahead, these issues deserve and demand our attention. But as we wrestle with the means by which terror was expressed, we cannot ignore the specific target it sought: the LGBT community.

We often use words like "indiscriminate" when we talk about gun violence, referring to the terrifying randomness these tragedies can reflect, the sense that it could happen anywhere, anytime, to any of us. We cannot use the term "indiscriminate" here. While the details are still coming to light, all signs point to a crime motivated by hateful prejudice against a specific subset of our population.

It comes at a particularly difficult time. This month is LGBT Pride Month, 30 days to celebrate what it means to be an LGBT American, to be true to yourself, to remember the blood, sweat, and tears that activists and advocates have shed for generations demanding better of their country.

On Saturday afternoon, I walked through the streets of Boston for our Commonwealth's annual Pride Parade. It is one of my favorite events of the year—the celebration, jubilation, camaraderie, and energy that takes the city by storm. The first year I participated, I had the honor of marching with my predecessor, Congressman Barney Frank. The year after that, I walked with my former college roommate, Jason Collins, who had recently come out as the first gay professional athlete in a major U.S. sport.

Standing next to Congressman Frank and Jason, I saw not only what their presence meant to that sea of supporters surrounding us, but what those supporters mean to them: an incredible wave of love and acceptance that they had to fight a lifetime to see—a statement of support from community and country that most of us get to take for granted.

This past Saturday was no different. Love and tolerance emanated from every sidewalk, every storefront, and every street. Yet less than 24 hours later, we woke up on Sunday to the devastating images of the Pulse nightclub: families and friends searching for loved ones; heroes carrying injured victims in their arms to a nearby hospital; strangers waiting in line for hours to donate blood; a community far too accustomed to violence and hate forced to confront a painful truth—that for all of our recent strides and successes, this country continues to give discrimination against the LGBT community a home.

While this body stands firmly united in heartbreak and horror over what transpired on Sunday morning, we cannot ignore the example that our actions—or inactions—have helped set. Our Nation was founded on a sacred promise of equal treatment under the law; yet, even today, we still fall short.

When we allow some Americans to be fired from their job because of who they love, when we deny access to pub-

lic accommodations because of who you are, when we fail to end legalized discrimination in businesses and hospitals and homeless shelters, when we set policies that treat an entire community as less worthy of our protection, then we cannot be surprised when that prejudice takes root across the country and rears its head with gruesome, gut-wrenching consequences.

Bigotry begets violence. This is a lesson our country has learned time after time at tremendous human cost. Today, if we are serious about responding to hate, then we have to dismantle the policies within our Federal Government that give it cover.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Farm Credit System. Established by Congress in 1916, Farm Credit's mission is to provide a reliable source of credit for United States farmers.

At the time of Farm Credit's creation, credit was virtually unaffordable or inaccessible in rural areas. Over the next 100 years, Farm Credit helped our Nation's farmers survive the Great Depression, feed a country during World War II, and survive nearly two decades of a farm crisis.

Today Farm Credit provides more than one-third of the credit needed by those living and working in rural America. In my home State of Florida, Farm Credit is the largest single lender to agriculture. It is made up of people like a good friend of mine, Al Bellotto, a World War II hero who survived Iwo Jima and Okinawa, came back home and served for 35 years as the chairman of the Farm Credit of Central Florida and is now a chairman emeritus and member of Florida's Agricultural Hall of Fame. It is people like him who make sure that Farm Credit is dedicated to the people and to the business of agriculture, the heart and lifeblood of the United States.

It is my hope that the Farm Credit System will continue to support our Nation's great farmers, that our agricultural industry will thrive, and in 100 years a future Representative of central Florida will be on this floor celebrating Farm Credit's 200th anniversary.

Happy anniversary, Farm Credit.

TRAGEDY HAS ONCE AGAIN STRUCK OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this week tragedy once again struck our Nation when the deadliest mass shooting in American history occurred in an LGBT nightclub in Orlando early Sunday

morning, leaving 49 people dead and more than 50 wounded. Our hearts go out to the victims and their families. So many young people in the prime of their lives were senselessly murdered.

It is hard to make sense of it all, but there are three aspects of this tragedy that I want to address today:

First, the fact that the shooter pledged allegiance to ISIS is deeply disturbing. We need to follow every lead and find out if he did, indeed, have any connection to ISIS or any other terrorist group. We must pursue those who may have inspired him, trained him, or assisted him in his deadly act, and we must take action to prevent others from being radicalized and turned into deadly killing machines.

Second, we must acknowledge that this was a hate crime targeted at the LGBT community. The killer didn't pick his target randomly. He sought out gay, young men in a club environment where they felt safe, where they felt a sense of community and acceptance, and he sought to shatter their world and terrorize and intimidate the LGBT community.

I have worked with my friends in the LGBT community for a very long time, and one thing I am sure of is that they will not be intimidated; they will not be beaten down; they will not be forced into hiding; they will not be silenced. The community is strong, it is united, and it is unashamed. The LGBT community will come together to honor the dead and then will keep educating, keep advocating, keep mobilizing for a more fair, a more just society where no one has to live in fear because of who they are or whom they love.

Third, it is clear that far fewer people would have been killed or wounded if the attacker had not had access to a deadly assault weapon. Once again, the necessity of controlling access to military-style assault weapons, whose only purpose is to kill large numbers of people as quickly and efficiently as possible, is made tragically clear.

Our refusal to ban assault weapons makes this House complicit in this and every other mass murder that we now see on a regular basis. This Chamber is drenched in blood. We must cleanse it. We must pass the long-pending legislation to reinstitute the assault weapon ban. We ban machine guns, and we had an assault weapon ban not that long ago, so it is not a radical proposal. It is not counter to the Second Amendment. It is just common sense. And yet, President George W. Bush let the ban expire, and Republicans in Congress have acted repeatedly to prevent even our consideration of renewing the ban.

Every Member of Congress who has refused to support renewing the ban should be forced to answer to their constituents, to their country, and to the countless victims and their families who have suffered so much heartbreak due to gun violence.

How can you allow such carnage to go unchecked? How can you do nothing in the face of so much pain? Why won't

you stand up to the NRA and at least take the basic step to prevent mass murder? Why won't you ban people on the terrorist watch list from purchasing assault weapons? If someone is too dangerous to permit to fly, certainly he or she is too dangerous to permit to buy assault weapons.

And yet this Congress has done nothing except hold repeated moments of silence. That is not enough. This silence, combined with this inaction, makes hypocrites of us all. The American people are baffled by our silence. They demand more. They demand action, action to combat hate, to protect the LGBT community, and to control access to deadly weapons to prevent murderers and lunatics from getting assault weapons.

If the leadership of this Congress won't take action, then it ought to be replaced by a leadership that will.

□ 1045

A DEDICATED EDUCATOR TO RETIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Minnesota State Colleges and Universities chancellor Steven Rosenstone's upcoming retirement, and I thank him for his years of serving our State's higher education system.

Steven has dedicated his entire life to education, which began when he received his own degree from Washington University and a master's degree from the University of California, Berkeley. From there, he went on to teach political science at Yale University, and later at the University of Michigan.

In 1996, Steven came to Minnesota to serve as the dean of the College of Liberal Arts, where his hard work and vision ultimately led him to being named the chancellor of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities in February of 2011. During his time as the head of Minnesota's State schools, Steven implemented numerous policies that ensured a better and more affordable education for Minnesotans.

Thank you, Steven, for dedicating your life to helping others pursue their goals through education. We wish you a happy and restful retirement.

THE PRIDE OF MINNEAPOLIS TURNS 150

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 150th birthday of a fantastic Minnesota company, General Mills.

In 1866, Cadwallader Washburn started a mill that would eventually become General Mills. Located on the mighty Mississippi, the mill was the largest mill west of the Mississippi, causing the locals to name it "the pride of Minneapolis."

Throughout the years, the company flourished, even through the hardest of times. During the Great Depression, while many other companies went

under, General Mills thrived, creating popular products like Kix and Bisquick.

General Mills not only succeeded during these times, but extended a helping hand when it was needed. During World War II, 9 out of 10 employees worked on projects so vital to the war effort that armed guards patrolled the company.

Today, General Mills successfully markets many popular brands like Betty Crocker and Haagen-Dazs, creating jobs and making a major contribution to the great State of Minnesota and this country.

I would like to thank General Mills for feeding the Nation, and I wish them a happy 150th birthday. Here's to 150 more years of success.

HONORING ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY'S PRESIDENT EARL POTTER

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of St. Cloud State University president, Earl Potter, who was tragically killed in a car accident last night.

Earl was one of Minnesota's best and brightest educators, and he dedicated his entire life to this Nation's students, most recently serving Minnesota's Sixth District at St. Cloud State University. He brought innovation and positive change to St. Cloud State University over the past decade, preparing his students for life after college.

Not only was Earl Potter committed to the students within the St. Cloud community, but he dedicated his time and energy to serving the greater St. Cloud community and Minnesota as a whole. He served on the St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, United Way of Central Minnesota Board of Directors, Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation, and the Minnesota National Guard Senior Advisory Task Force, among many others.

Earl's service extended well beyond the borders of our great State of Minnesota as well as with his service on nearly a dozen national academic boards. He was passionate about the universities he represented, the students he served, and the communities in which he lived.

We have suffered a huge loss in the St. Cloud community, and my deepest condolences go out to Earl's wife Christine, their children and grandchildren, and their loved ones across the country. The work that Earl has done for our community will be his living legacy.

REMEMBERING THE ORLANDO SHOOTING VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, Stanley Almodovar, III. Amanda Alvear. Antonio Davon Brown. Darryl Roman Burt, II. Angel L. Candelario-Padro. Luis Daniel Conde. Cory James Connell. Tevin Eugene Crosby. Deonka

Deidra Drayton. Leroy Valentin Fernandez. Simon Adrian Carrillo Fernandez. Mercedes Marisol Flores. Peter O. Gonzalez-Cruz. Juan Ramon Guerrero. Paul Terrell Henry. Frank Hernandez. Miguel Angel Honorato. Javier Jorge-Reyes. Jason Benjamin Josaphat. Eddie Jamoldroy Justice. Anthony Luis Laureanodisla. Christopher Andrew Leinonen. Alejandro Barrios Martinez. Juan Chevez-Martinez. Brenda Lee Marquez McCool. Gilberto Ramon Silva Menendez. Oscar A. Aracena-Montero. Kimberly Morris. Akyra Monet Murray. Luis Omar Ocasio-Capo. Geraldo A. Ortiz-Jimenez. Eric Ivan Ortiz-Rivera. Joel Rayon Paniagua. Jean Carlos Mendez Perez. Enrique L. Rios, Jr. Jean C. Nives Rodriguez. Xavier Emmanuel Serrano Rosado. Christopher Joseph Sanfeliz. Yilmarty Rodriguez Solivan. Edward Sotomayor, Jr. Shane Evan Tomlinson. Martin Benitez Torres. Jonathan Antonio Camuy Vega.

We will never forget. And while we mourn your loss, your memory will inspire us to fight for change.

TIME FOR ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because thoughts and prayers are not enough. It is time for action.

The hateful terrorist attack targeting America's LGBT community in Orlando is another reminder to come together and work across party lines to root out terrorism, prevent gun violence, and put an end to bigotry of all kinds. An attack on one American is an attack on all of us.

We cannot allow partisanship to define this debate. We must take decisive and united actions to ensure that nothing like the attacks on Orlando, Paris, Newtown, or San Bernardino ever happen again.

Congress should immediately move forward and pass the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act. This commonsense bill would prohibit suspected terrorists from possessing guns or explosives. Keeping dangerous weapons out of the hands of people who wish to do our country harm is a solution that we should all be able to get behind.

The hateful attack in Orlando also reminds us once more of the growing threat of ISIS-inspired radical Islamic terrorist on U.S. soil is real and cannot be ignored or downplayed.

Congress must reassert leadership in the fight against ISIS by passing legislation to hold the President accountable for developing a comprehensive plan to destroy ISIS.

Through congressional oversight hearings, we must also ensure that Federal agencies and local law enforcement are effectively communicating with each other to identify international and homegrown terror threats through both traditional security approaches and social media.

Internationally, Congress must act to cut off sources of funding to other radical Islamic terror groups by restoring crippling sanctions on Iran. The recent agreement, which, frankly, shipped billions of dollars to the world's largest state sponsor of terror while helping finance organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah, is simply unacceptable.

At home, we cannot allow the tired, partisan bickering to distract us from the difficult but necessary work of preventing gun violence. We need to bridge the partisan divide and put the best interests of our country before politics.

A good first step is the legislation that I helped introduce with former Congresswoman Gabby Giffords to require universal background checks on firearm purchases. The vast majority of the American people support this commonsense idea, and it is past time Congress moves forward with this proposal that will keep more people safe.

We also need to improve communications so that local law enforcement is notified when someone attempts to purchase a gun and fails a required background check. My colleague, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY, introduced a commonsense bill to make this fix, which I strongly support.

Other important efforts to prevent gun violence include my bill with Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL to prevent domestic abusers from being able to purchase weapons. This proposal would help, again, prohibit firearm trafficking used to evade background checks, and also, a long-overdue increase in mental health resources.

In short, there are numerous commonsense proposals, Mr. Speaker, that will keep guns out of the hands of those that should not have them while protecting our Second Amendment rights. It is time that we take action.

Mr. Speaker, there is no quick and easy solution to all the problems underscored by the Orlando terrorist attack, but if we are able to set aside partisan differences and unite in the best interests of our Nation, we can make serious strides in the ongoing efforts to keep Americans safe and prevent future atrocities.

WE ARE ALL ORLANDO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I went down to the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village in New York City, where the modern gay rights movement really began.

I went there to leave some flowers in honor of those members of the LGBT community who lost their lives in the massacre—the worst mass shooting in American history—at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, Florida.

While I stood there in solidarity with a somber crowd of allies and members

of the LGBT community, it occurred to me that, just as the events at Stonewall were a turning point in the gay rights movement, this horrific attack in Orlando may serve as a turning point of its own because it is time for all of us to stand up together and say: Enough. We will not be silent. This madness must end.

And make no mistake, it is utter madness that a man with a history of domestic violence, a man who had been investigated by the FBI for his possible ties to terror, could buy an assault weapon as easily as he could buy an aspirin.

In the Pulse massacre, this man armed with an AR-15 military-type assault rifle, a weapon that he bought legally, killed 49 people and injured 50 more.

□ 1100

Earlier, at an elementary school in Connecticut, another madman with an AR-15-style assault weapon killed 26 children and their teachers. And in a theater in Aurora, Colorado, one man with one AR-15 assault weapon killed 12 and wounded 70.

In each of these mass casualty events, it took one gun and one man to brutally take so many innocent lives. In each case, the gun was an assault weapon.

Assault weapons are designed to do one thing very well, and that is to kill people very rapidly. They aren't used for hunting. They aren't used for self-defense. They are used as weapons of war.

So why is it so easy for people to purchase them and hurt others?

That is why, in 1994, three United States Presidents—President Ford, President Carter, and President Reagan—all signed a letter to the House of Representatives calling for a Federal ban on military-style assault weapons. I will place their meaningful letter into the RECORD.

MAY 3, 1994.

TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing to urge your support for a ban on the domestic manufacture of military-style assault weapons. This is a matter of vital importance to the public safety. Although assault weapons account for less than 1% of the guns in circulation, they account for nearly 10% of the guns traced to crime.

Every major law enforcement organization in America and dozens of leading labor, medical, religious, civil rights and civic groups support such a ban. Most importantly, poll after poll shows that the American public overwhelmingly support a ban on assault weapons. A 1993 CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll found that 77% of Americans support a ban on the manufacture, sale, and possession of semiautomatic assault guns, such as the AK-47.

The 1989 import ban resulted in an impressive 40% drop in imported assault weapons traced to crime between 1989 and 1991, but the killing continues. Last year, a killer armed with two TEC9s killed eight people at a San Francisco law firm and wounded several others. During the past five years, more than 40 law enforcement officers have been killed or wounded in the line of duty by an assault weapon.

While we recognize that assault weapon legislation will not stop all assault weapon crime, statistics prove that we can dry up the supply of these guns, making them less accessible to criminals. We urge you to listen to the American public and to the law enforcement community and support a ban on the further manufacture of these weapons.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.
JIMMY CARTER.
RONALD REAGAN.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. That same year, I voted for a Federal Assault Weapons Ban signed into law by President Clinton that also banned massacre-sized magazines. Unfortunately, this ban expired in 2004, and Congress, under pressure from the NRA, has since refused to reauthorize it, even when facts show that reauthorizing it would save lives.

It should come as no surprise that, of the 10 mass shooting incidents in the United States, 7 of them involved the use of an assault-style rifle.

That is why I fully and wholeheartedly support the commonsense proposal to reinstate a Federal ban on the sale and manufacture of assault weapons and massacre-sized magazines, and that is why so many Members of Congress have introduced—on both sides of the aisle—commonsense gun reform bills.

And let's be clear. These measures are not some kind of assault on Second Amendment freedoms for hunters or those who wish to have a gun for self-protection. The assault ban is a limited, commonsense measure to help keep people safe.

It is time for us to stand up together and to pass these commonsense bills because this time #WeAreAllOrlando.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE AND IMPACT OF SMALL BUSINESSES ON OUR NATION'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance and the impact that small businesses have on our Nation's economy.

Last month, we celebrated National Small Business Week in order to recognize the hard work and dedication of the estimated 28 million small-business owners who provided 48 percent of the private sector job workforce here in the United States while also representing 99.7 percent of all businesses with employees.

It is without a doubt that small businesses are the backbone of our Nation's economy. I greatly appreciate each and every small-business owner across this country who devotes their time, their passion, and their financial resources to ensure that small businesses are successful. For these individuals, Small Business Week is every week of the year.

As a former small-business owner of 20 years, I understand what it takes to

build a successful small business while ensuring that our customers receive the products and service they expect and our employees are provided for.

It wasn't always easy as a small-business owner, but having the opportunity to employ hundreds of employees over the years is an experience I would never trade.

Over the last 17 months, I have had the great privilege of touring numerous small businesses within my district, where I have had the opportunity to speak to the employees that see firsthand what business does as it contributes to our economy.

From the small-business barber shop to a tortilla chip factory, it has always amazed me to see the enthusiasm that exists when the small-business owners work side-by-side with their employees. It is for this reason that small businesses are the backbone of our economy.

It is my honor to recognize outstanding individuals who received the award on May 4 in Las Vegas during the 2016 SBA Small Business Award luncheon. These individuals serve their community as a current small-business owner or provide services for small businesses.

Receiving the Small Business Person of the Year Award was Bradley Burdsall, owner of six restaurants in southern Nevada named The Egg Works and the Egg & I, with his newest location just recently opening in Nevada's Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. Burdsall's company has seen tremendous growth and expansion over the past 18 years, including being featured in USA Today and on the Food Network. I congratulate Bradley Burdsall on being awarded the 2016 SBA Small Business of the Year for Nevada.

Receiving the Veteran Owned Business of the Year award was Robert D. Daniel, the owner of PrideStaff Las Vegas. Prior to starting the PrideStaff Las Vegas location, Mr. Daniel spent 30 years in the field of employee management, including holding executive positions with IBM, Fuji USA, Western Electronics, and MicronPC.

With this valuable managerial experience along with his service in the United States Air Force and as a Vietnam veteran, Mr. Daniel has built a company that greatly benefits southern Nevada by providing businesses with temporary employees. I congratulate Robert D. Daniel on being awarded the 2016 SBA Veteran Owned Business of the Year for Nevada.

Receiving the Small Business Advocate Lifetime Achievement Award was Bob Cushman, who has volunteered his time as a SCORE Las Vegas counselor and a mentor since 1998. With decades of experience, Mr. Cushman has used his invaluable knowledge to counsel 3,000 small businesses in southern Nevada.

Mr. Cushman's dedication to the small business community has been a valuable asset to southern Nevada, so I

congratulate Mr. Cushman on being awarded the 2016 SBA Small Business Advocate Lifetime Achievement Award.

Receiving the Women's Business Advocate of the Year was Leanna Jenkins, director of the Nevada Women's Business Center. Ms. Jenkins has spent years working in the small business community to provide small-business owners with the educational and financial resources necessary to succeed, especially for women- and minority-owned businesses.

Ms. Jenkins has made a tremendous impact within the small-business community of southern Nevada, so I congratulate Ms. Leanna Jenkins for being awarded the 2016 SBA Women's Business Advocate of the Year Award for Nevada.

Again, I would like to thank these award winners and all small-business owners for what they do on a daily basis to provide their employees with a job, their customers with a great product or service, and contribute to the American economy. Small businesses are the true economic engines of this country.

YOU ARE NOT ALONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always a preeminent privilege to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I never take for granted the opportunity that has been afforded me by my constituents, as their representative, to be here and stand and speak on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that this day is Flag Day. It is the day that the flag was adopted, June 14, 1777, and I am honored tonight to make additional comments about Flag Day. But this is a day that we honor the flag of the United States of America.

On this day when we will honor the flag of the United States of America, this evening, after the first votes, we will also bring to the floor the LGBTQ Pride Month resolution. We are bringing this resolution to the floor, notwithstanding things that have occurred, because we would not want the dastardly deeds of one to prevent us from commemorating the accomplishments of the many.

The resolution will be brought to the floor, and those Members of Congress who consider themselves allies of the LGBTQ community, please come. This will afford you an opportunity to speak of your concern and to express your love for the LGBTQ community. Allies of the community should come to the floor. This will be a great opportunity, and we ask that you preface your statements, let your preamble be "you are not alone."

This is an opportunity for those of us who are allies of the community to make it clear, perspicuously so, that this community is not alone; that they

have friends; that they have people who will stand with them, even in the darkest hour; even when they walk through the valley of the shadow of death, there are friends who will stand with them. They are not alone. Come to the floor, if you choose, and make your statements known.

I do this because I understand that this opportunity to stand here is not something that I enjoy because I am so smart. There are people who lived and some who died so that I might stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America on this day.

And because they did, it is worthy of mentioning that there were people other than African Americans who participated in my liberation. Schwerner and Goodman died fighting for the rights of African Americans. They were not Black.

John Shillady died in Austin, Texas, a field marshal for the NAACP. He was not Black.

When Rosa Parks went to jail, Virginia Durr and her husband, attorney Clifford Durr, along with Mr. Nixon, who was the then-president of the NAACP, posted her bail. Mr. Nixon was African American; the Durrs were not.

So it is important for those of us who have benefited from the goodness, the goodwill of others, to pay that debt we owe. This is an opportunity to make another installment on the debt that we owe as a result of others standing up for us. We were not alone, and the LGBTQ community should not be alone and is not alone.

So, tonight, we invite Members to come to the floor and to preface your statements with "you are not alone" and to let people know that you stand with the community in this time of great sadness, of great sadness.

But, also, speak of some of the good things that have occurred. We can talk of how the Supreme Court has made a significant difference, not only for this time but for all time, for people, because the Constitution of the United States was not written for Democrats or Republicans. It wasn't written for conservatives or liberals. It wasn't written for people of a certain hue. It wasn't written for people of a certain religion. It was written for the people of the United States of America, and that includes the LGBTQ community.

I thank you for the time. This is a to-be-continued moment. First hour after votes, to be continued.

God bless you, and God bless the United States of America. And I pledge allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, with liberty and justice for all, and that includes the LGBTQ community.

CI REALIGNMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, when most folks hear or think about the In-

ternal Revenue Service, I am sure they probably think about the April 15 deadline. Maybe they even think about the prospects of an audit, or, in most cases, I imagine people are thinking about and wondering, you know, when is their tax refund going to be delivered?

□ 1115

Or perhaps their minds might jump to the scandals that have plagued the IRS, from the targeting of conservative groups to the IRS' failures to keep track of employee emails. Whatever the case, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe most people would immediately associate the IRS as a Federal law enforcement agency. However, the IRS is, in fact, home to our Nation's sixth largest law enforcement agency. It is called the IRS Criminal Investigation, or CI, for short.

CI was originally known as the IRS Intelligence division, and it was formed in 1919 to combat widespread corruption and organized crime. A great example of that from the early days is the investigation and conviction of Al Capone.

Now, today, CI is solely responsible for the enforcement of criminal violations of our Nation's tax laws and shares jurisdiction over violations of money laundering and bank secrecy laws. In addition, CI has also become an indispensable tool used in the investigation of terror financing cases and works jointly with many of our other Federal law enforcement agencies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was a United States attorney for a number of years, and I have had the privilege of working with many CI special agents and personally know the value of their unmatched financial investigatory abilities.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the IRS' mismanagement of CI and their inability to prioritize CI's needs has caused a troubling drop in the number of CI special agents and staff. This, in turn, has led to a reduction in the number of CI's investigations and convictions at a time when offenses such as identity theft, money laundering, tax fraud, and terror financing are all on the rise.

These resource decisions, along with an organizational and reporting structure at the IRS that is poorly suited to oversee a Federal law enforcement agency, have demonstrated that the IRS is ill-equipped to effectively support and manage CI.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, we need to be placing a premium on the world-class financial investigations CI carries out each day. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have recently introduced the CI Realignment Act. This legislation, which I am pleased is supported by the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, will create a new Bureau of Criminal Investigation within the Department of the Treasury by transferring CI out of the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, this legislation is about law enforcement. It is about the dedicated personnel at CI

that work in offices across the country and, indeed, across the world.

While this House will continue to have discussions and consider necessary reforms and legislation to right the ship over at the IRS, the CI Realignment Act is concerned with creating a clear distinction between the civil IRS function and the Federal law enforcement agency charged with criminal enforcement of our Nation's laws.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, my legislation will remove CI from the bureaucracy of the scandal-ridden IRS and allow for an increased focus on law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the IRS urgently needs to address their shortfalls in many areas, from consumer service to data protection. Let's make certain that they do not further impede the critical work of our Nation's top financial investigators while they try to figure out how to run the IRS.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY UNITED STATES ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on this day 241 years ago, the Congress adopted the American Continental Army. This Congress resolved to raise six companies of expert riflemen and to march and join the Army near Boston.

Our Army was born in war, and to this day, it has continued its service in the defense of American liberty. Our six companies have grown to over 1 million strong. Our All-Volunteer force continues to be the example around the world, producing an image of American idealism and vision and a culture of soldiers that fight for country, the Constitution, and their fellow man.

General George Washington, during one of the Army's first battles at the 1775 Siege of Boston, articulated how I feel about the Army: "Your exertions in the cause of freedom, guided by wisdom and animated by zeal and courage, have gained you the love and confidence of your grateful countrymen; and they look to you, who are experienced veterans, and trust that you will still be the guardians of America."

These past 241 years have tried and tested our Army, from the fields of France to the deserts of Iraq and the mountains of Afghanistan. Today our soldiers are deployed in over 140 countries. Representing Fort Hood, I am aware that Fort Hood soldiers are deployed in Afghanistan and Korea in the defense of our American security. Every day I am reminded of what our men and women in uniform and their families do to protect what we hold special.

With all the focus on weapons, programs, and initiatives, it is easy to forget that the Army is about people. Looking to God, I am reminded of Isaiah 6:8: "Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, 'Whom shall I send? And

who will go for us?' And I said, 'Here am I. Send me.'"

On this 241st year of our Army's founding, I want to be one of the first to wish our United States Army the best and to say thank you and happy birthday. If you see a soldier anywhere today, wish the Army a happy birthday.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Al Riddley, The Springs of Bonita Church, Bonita Springs, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, grant us the wisdom and vision to comprehend the common belief that all people shall know peace as well as justice, righteousness, freedom, and security, with equity for every culture, color, and commitment.

Remind us of the past victories while recognizing the present challenges so as to strengthen our future as a country.

Lord, on this Flag Day, as it is honored and displayed around the world, may we take pride as Americans in being reminded of the significance of our democracy.

Give guidance to us as we are diligent in our responsibilities as citizens to guarantee that freedom is enjoyed by all who claim this country as home.

In our Allegiance, we witness to "one nation under God" as a promise of what others in this world can yet become. For this, we Americans stand together today, proud and strong, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANGEVIN 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND AL RIDDLEY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, during morning-hour debate, I spoke about Al Riddley, who is from Springfield, Illinois, which is my hometown. He also is my brother-in-law. My sister from Springfield, Illinois, Lynn Callahan Riddley is also here. I want to welcome them to the Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for your courteousness to my sister and brother-in-law. I am grateful to you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE FATHER OF FLAG DAY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the father of Flag Day, Illinois' own Dr. Bernard Cigrand, on its 100th anniversary.

An immigrant and a teacher, Dr. Cigrand believed his students needed a symbol to instill a sense of national identity. He first celebrated our flag's birthday with his students on June 14, 1885, 108 years after its official adoption by Congress.

Thus began his life's work to create a National Flag Day. He wrote articles for magazines and newspapers. He gave lectures and wrote a book on the flag's importance. Soon, schools caught on, and more than 100,000 children participated in an Illinois celebration in 1894. Eventually, Dr. Cigrand moved to Batavia, Illinois, opened a dental practice and remained passionate in his efforts.

Finally, in 1916, President Wilson called for a nationwide observance. Seventeen years after Dr. Cigrand's 1932 passing, President Truman signed a law cementing June 14 as National Flag Day.

This 14th of June, the 14th Congressional District of Illinois celebrates Dr. Cigrand's dedication to our Nation's symbol, which gives hope and moves hearts throughout the world.

ORLANDO NIGHTCLUB SHOOTING

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events over the weekend in Or-

lando defy comprehension. There is no way that reason can underlie this staggering loss of life, for the act itself flies in the face of reason.

My thoughts and prayers are with those who lost their lives and their families, and my thoughts and prayers are with those who were injured and are recovering from their wounds. This attack is the truest example of senseless violence and pure evil.

Today, we mourn as a Nation because we will not allow hate to invade our own hearts and minds. America is better than that.

But tomorrow, tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and in the days and months to come, we can do something. We must do something. We must ensure that our LGBT brothers and sisters are welcomed by their communities, not subjected to discrimination. We must ensure that access to deadly weapons are sensibly controlled, and we must ensure that Congress no longer sits idly by while hate and violence continue to take innocent lives.

But, today, Mr. Speaker, we pray for Orlando, though we know our prayers, our thoughts, our moments of silence, they are not enough.

NAVAL STATION AT GUANTANAMO BAY

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, last week, The Washington Post reported that at least 12 former Guantanamo detainees, after being released, had gone on to lead and participate in attacks against Americans and allied forces in Afghanistan. And most troubling, Mr. Speaker, the report noted that these attacks cost American lives.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration's plan to shutter our detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and accelerate the transfer of detainees to foreign nations or even the United States is both misguided and extremely dangerous.

I am committed to preventing the closure of Guantanamo and the further transfer of detainees. Mr. Speaker, even one detainee returning to the battlefield is too many.

This administration needs to acknowledge the reality of the threat posed by these detainees and abandon their ill-advised attempt to close Guantanamo Bay.

KEEP DANGEROUS WEAPONS OUT OF THE HANDS OF SUSPECTED TERRORISTS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are broken, and we are angry. The deadliest mass shooting in our history, 49 young lives ended in a place that served as a refuge from hate, a place of love and safety and community.

Mr. Speaker, when faced with terror and hatred, our Nation is tested. This House of Representatives is tested. And we are failing that test.

Shame on us if we cannot close the loophole that lets people on the terrorist watch list buy AR-15s. I am so tired of the House majority's pitiful excuses. Why does this majority allow suspected terrorists to buy guns? Why does this majority refuse to close the terrorist loophole and strengthen background checks? Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of this institution.

Let us vote today. Let us vote to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of suspected terrorists. Let us vote so everyone can see where we stand and who we stand with.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with every American who rightly believes that if you are on the terrorist watch list, you can't buy weapons that can be used in the next mass shooting. That is where I stand, Mr. Speaker.

Where do you stand?

GOD BLESS THE FLAG AND VETERANS WHO CARRY IT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, our veterans face many challenges when they return home from war, both physical and psychological. All too often, the latter is overlooked. An estimated 22 veterans per day take their own life, many of them struggling with post-traumatic stress disorder.

One Michigan veteran, Marty Wills, is embarking on an incredible journey to raise awareness about PTSD and mental health issues. Carrying an American flag, he is walking more than 1,000 miles from his home in Michigan to North Carolina. Last week, he went through several cities in my district, including Jonesville, Hillsdale, Hudson, Adrian, and Blissfield.

On Flag Day, as we commemorate Old Glory and the freedom and liberty she represents, let's also remember the brave men and women who fight in harm's way in defense of those freedoms. And when they get home, let's do everything we can to get our veterans the help they need for wounds, both seen and unseen.

ORLANDO TRAGEDY

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of those whose lives were lost in my home State at Pulse nightclub in Orlando. Floridians, Americans, and people around the world are in mourning today, grieving for those young lives lost and for their families.

When will this body finally say "enough"? Gun violence is a public health crisis, and we must do better.

No one needs an AR-15 assault rifle. This was the weapon of war that was used in Newtown, Aurora, and San Bernardino. We need to reinstate the assault weapon ban to reduce the chances that we have more tragedies.

People on the terrorist watch list should not be able to get a gun. This is common sense, but the majority continues to block this critical security measure.

I also rise to commend our law enforcement and healthcare professionals whose lifesaving work is ongoing. Acts of love like these will always conquer hate. They always have.

The American people will continue to stand with our LGBTQ and Latino brothers and sisters, and we will work that much harder and that much smarter and that much faster to ensure their safety and equal rights in their communities.

Love will win. Hate will be defeated.

FLAG DAY AND COLLIN COUNTY FLAG CEREMONY

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in honor of Flag Day, a special day when we reflect on what our American flag stands for and how blessed we are to live in this great Nation that celebrates freedom.

I believe this reflection is particularly important given this weekend's ISIS-inspired terrorist attack. There are those who seek to destroy our way of life, and we must actively defend our freedom.

So, as our American flag waives proudly today and we reflect on its symbol of hope, I invite Collin County folks to join me this Saturday for a special event that I will be hosting—the inaugural "Honor our Stars and Stripes" flag retirement ceremony. I hope you will join me for this unique program that honors our flag and our country's unique founding.

God bless America. I salute you.

CLOSE THE DEADLY LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues and so many Americans, I am horrified by the brutal act of terror that killed 49 people, including Tevin Crosby, a 25-year-old man from my district, and that wounded so many others in Orlando. I stand with the loved ones of those lost and with the LGBT community that has suffered this unimaginable act of violence.

You know, as our country works to heal from this latest deadliest mass shooting ever, Congress has got to do its job. We can act on this floor to protect American citizens by making sure that, if an individual is on the terrorist watch list, they cannot fly on a plane.

For God's sake, they should not be able to go and buy a weapon. The shooter in Orlando had been on the terror watch list and was able to go buy three weapons, including an AR-15.

Congressman PETER KING of New York's bill would stop this. I join with him, and I ask all Members of Congress, please, let's not let this moment pass. Let's take action.

WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the service of two men from western North Carolina: John Queen, III, and Don Smart. Recently, they were inducted into the Western North Carolina Agricultural Hall of Fame.

As those plaques were put on the wall, it really didn't share the entire story, the entire story of who they are and how they serve their communities so well, not only in Haywood County but throughout all of western North Carolina.

These two men, whether it was with the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, both on the local and national level, or whether it was with different associations of growers and farmers and the Farm Bureau, as is the case with Don Smart, served their community and have made their community better.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only acknowledge their service but also to acknowledge their friendship because they have helped me understand the agriculture community in a way that profoundly can only be done by those who are in it.

So, with this, we honor them today and their induction into the Western North Carolina Agricultural Hall of Fame.

□ 1215

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a call to action. Over 200 years ago, when our Constitution was authored, it ignored the backbone of the American people: women, African Americans, Latinos, and even White men who did not own property.

However, the beauty of our Constitution and our democracy is our ability to change. The power to amend the United States Constitution is the power to protect and reflect the will of the people.

Our forefathers could not anticipate the introduction of assault rifles into the United States. They could not anticipate that 32,000 Americans per year

would lose their lives at the hands of gun violence.

It is now time to act, to do the job that we were elected to do by the people of this great Nation. Since its inception, we have amended our Constitution 27 times. It is time for us once again to lead the world and put an end to these horrendous attacks and violence that we have witnessed. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to act.

100TH BIRTHDAY FOR BOEING

(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 July 15, the Boeing Company will mark their 100th birthday, a remarkable achievement for its employees, subcontractors, and entire community. Boeing opened facilities in North Charleston, South Carolina, creating over 8,000 jobs directly and giving back to the community as a partner, such as sponsoring the Heritage Golf Classic at Hilton Head Island.

The impact of Boeing extends beyond their facility. Many of their subcontractors are located in the Second Congressional District, including Zeus of Orangeburg and Aiken, Prysmian of Lexington, Thermal Engineering of Columbia, and AGY of Aiken. Governor Nikki Haley and the General Assembly, led by House Speaker Jay Lucas and Senate President Hugh Leatherman, have recognized the important milestone by proclaiming June 1 as Boeing Impact Day across South Carolina.

Congratulations to the chairman, president, and CEO of the Boeing Company, Dennis Muilenburg; vice chairman Raymond Conner; and the executive vice president, Leanne Caret. Thank you to all of the many dedicated team members of Boeing South Carolina, especially the newly selected vice president, Joan Robinson-Berry, and Beverly Wyse, who leads the Shared Services Group. Best wishes for your continued success creating jobs.

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

REMEMBERING AMIN DAVID

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend, a role model, a mentor, Mr. Amin David. He passed away in his home on May 21 of this year at the age of 83. He was an immigrant from Mexico, and his life quickly became the epitome of the American Dream. He came here to California, ended up being an entrepreneur and owning businesses and being such an integral part of Orange County, California.

He founded, with others, in 1978, a group called Los Amigos of Orange County, whose motto was "We love to help"—"Nos gusta ayudar." And help they did, no matter what. Whoever came before their Wednesday morning meeting every week would get help.

He also helped a marginalized community. In a very volatile time in Orange County, the change of diversity was happening. He sat on the Orange County Human Relations Commission and on the Anaheim Planning Commission, and he was an active member of the police chief's advisory council and helped to foster dialogue between the police and our community.

He fought for marginalized communities and called out prejudices like Islamophobia and anti-Semitism. He is survived by his wife and his four children. I am proud to have called him a friend.

CONDEMNING THE HATEFUL ATTACKS IN ORLANDO

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the horrific terrorist attack in Orlando. This tragedy is a strike at every single American, regardless of your age, race, gender, sexual orientation, location, or religious beliefs. Our hearts go out to the wounded and their families, but most especially to the families and loved ones of all who were killed.

There is no room for hate in America, and this ugly crime is the result of a coward following his own hate. It doesn't matter what the source of that hate was. It was and is an affront to God himself.

In moments like this, it is my hope that we can come together as a nation and as a people instead of turning against one another. If we allow these attacks to pull us further apart, then we have done exactly what the attacker intended to achieve.

So I hope every American will join me in condemning these hateful attacks and pledge to stand together in support of those who tragically lost their lives.

IT IS TIME TO ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, if I could every minute of the day offer to those in Orlando who had to experience the most horrific terroristic mass shooting in the United States, I would do so every minute of the day. I would also do so, however, for others who have suffered at the hands of those who have used guns violently and used guns illegally, for I am not ashamed to be someone who understands the First Amendment, the Second Amendment, and all amendments, to stand and say

that it is immoral that this Congress does not act to move forward on securing the American people.

It is important to know that assault weapons, guns have been used in mass shootings: San Bernardino; Chattanooga, Tennessee; Charleston, South Carolina; Garland, Texas; Oak Creek, Wisconsin; and Fort Hood, Texas. Mother Emanuel, of course, is Charleston, and then, of course, Newtown, where babies were murdered and slaughtered.

This was a hateful crime, and more than one in three hate crimes end in violence. It was Hispanics. It was the LGBTQ community. Tell it what it is: hatefulness, terrorism. Pass the assault weapons ban now. No fly, no buy now. Time to act. It is immoral for us not to act.

THE ORLANDO ATTACK WAS AN ACT OF HATE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. This past weekend, our Nation suffered a terrible attack in an Orlando nightclub. This was an act of terror. This was an act of hate. This was an unacceptable, unfathomable tragedy.

Our neighbors in Orlando remain in our thoughts and prayers. As we mourn the tragic loss of life, we must stay laser-focused on rooting out radicals in our Nation who heed the call to radical jihad and aim to harm our friends, neighbors, and families.

We must provide law enforcement and intelligence officers the tools they need within constitutional restraints to prevent the spread of incitement to violence and to hunt down the radicals. Protecting our homeland should never be taken for granted.

In light of this tragedy, we must unite and stand firm against the evil in the world. Orlando, we are here for you.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF HUGH McMILLAN

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, Friday is a big day in my neck of the woods. It is the day we are going to celebrate the 90th birthday of Hugh McMillan. Hugh is an absolute icon of our region and is the definition of a servant.

He served our country in the military and in the intelligence community, and he served our community as the unofficial mayor of the Key Peninsula. That is evidenced through his service in the Lions Club, who each year puts on a Citizen of the Year ceremony to honor those who make the Key Peninsula a better and stronger place. In fact, he served the community so well, he was given the Service Above Self Award

from the Gig Harbor Rotary Club. Having a group of Rotarians honor a Lions Club member is a big deal.

Beyond that service to community, though, he is also a servant when it comes to our kids. He served on the board of the Communities In Schools group in the Peninsula School District and on the Peninsula Schools Education Foundation board. He writes a Kids' Corner column in the Peninsula Gateway. Anytime there is a kid in our neck of the woods doing something cool, Hugh McMillan is there with a camera to take their picture and make them feel special.

I am just very grateful for all he does on behalf of kids and on behalf of our community and our country, and I am proud to call him a friend.

A DAUGHTER WILL NOT BE WITH HER FATHER THIS FATHER'S DAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a Texas father wrote me this week:

"I heard your statements . . . about removing the so-called judge in the Stanford swimmer's rape case. I do hope you pursue this all the way to his elimination.

"As the father of a daughter that was raped a number of years ago while she was jogging at night near a college campus in Texas, I would even consider the death penalty for the perpetrator. Why? Because that is what happened to my daughter. The feeling of violation and uncleanness caused her to take her own life in later years. The judge does not know the meaning of rape and the effects it has on a female."

Mr. Speaker, the father is correct. Rape victims live lives of quiet hopelessness and despair. That is why the weak-kneed judges like the one in California need to be removed.

Sunday is Father's Day, and I will be with my 4 kids and 11 grandkids. The father I referenced here will not be with his daughter. We must deliver justice for rape victims, daughters, and families because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in America.

And that is just the way it is.

HONORING LEON LEGGETT AND HERBERT ROGERS

(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 in honor of Leon Leggett and Herbert Rogers, two distinguished American veterans who served in the Korean war from 1950 to 1953.

On June 25, the American Legion's Post 9 in the First Congressional District of Georgia will present both men with South Korea's Ambassador of Peace Medal.

South Korea offers the Peace Medal to all U.S. servicemen and -women who served in the Korean war as an expression of gratitude for their service. During the Korean war, nearly 40,000 Americans sacrificed their lives and over 100,000 were wounded. This reward is certainly well deserved by Mr. Leggett and Mr. Rogers.

Making the ceremony even more unique is that Mr. Rogers and Mr. Leggett will be only the third and fourth people from the American Legion Post 9 who have been awarded the Peace Medal. I am proud to recognize these two veterans from the First Congressional District of Georgia, and I thank them for their service to the United States.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 781

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Davidson.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Davidson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5053, PREVENTING IRS ABUSE AND PROTECTING FREE SPEECH ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5293, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 778 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 778

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5053) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from requiring that the identity of contributors to 501(c) organizations be included in annual returns. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-58 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally

divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 3. Section 10002 of H.R. 5293 shall be considered to be a spending reduction account for purposes of section 3(d) of House Resolution 5.

SEC. 4. (a) During consideration of H.R. 5293, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to an amendment between the Houses.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 5293, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for H.R. 5053, the Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, and H.R. 5293, the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. House Resolution 778 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 5053 and a general debate rule for H.R. 5293.

The resolution provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means for H.R. 5053, and 1 hour equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations for H.R. 5293. The resolution also provides for a motion to recommit for H.R. 5053, with or without

instructions. In addition, the rule includes provisions related to budget enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation. Under current law, 501(c) nonprofit organizations are required to collect personally identifiable information on what are known as substantial donors and report that information to the IRS. Substantial donors are defined as individuals who donate \$5,000 or more to an organization during the course of the calendar year.

Normally, that information is reported by 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organizations. However, the IRS expanded the substantial reporting requirement to all tax-exempt organizations through the use of Form 990.

The security of personal information of American taxpayers is vital. The IRS doesn't normally make this information public, yet there have been instances involving IRS employees improperly accessing this information and even releasing it to the public. One particular instance saw the National Organization for Marriage have its donor list information publicly disclosed in 2012.

In California, Mr. Speaker, the State attorney general wanted to require that the information reported is made public, which prompted a lawsuit. In April of this year, the U.S. district court ruled that requiring an organization to disclose its donor list is unconstitutional.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may make the accusation that this bill will allow for a flood of foreign money into our elections. Mr. Speaker, this argument rings hollow for two reasons.

First, we have laws on the books to specifically protect against that very thing. It is called the Bank Secrecy Act. Federal regulations under that law require every bank to file information with the Treasury Department and report any suspicious transactions relevant to a possible violation of law or regulation. H.R. 5053 does not change the Bank Secrecy Act or those regulations in any way.

Second, and more importantly, the IRS doesn't even have authority to share this information with the two organizations that enforce campaign finance laws: the Federal Election Commission and the Department of Justice. So only in limited circumstances in which there is already evidence of a criminal act can these tax privacy laws allow the IRS to share this information. The problem is the IRS doesn't share this information anyway. It is up to the Federal Election Commission and the Justice Department to enforce those laws, and they do so already.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the district court ruling because American citizens have a right under the First Amendment to free speech and free association. The IRS has demonstrated in the past that many of their employees do not adequately protect personally iden-

tifiable information of American taxpayers. Individuals should not be forced to disclose how much of their hard-earned money and to whom they donate to charity.

Even the Director of Exempt Organizations at the Internal Revenue Service has publicly stated that the IRS is considering removing Schedule B themselves. Let me repeat that. This is a democratically appointed Director of Exempt Organizations at the Internal Revenue Service. This individual said that the IRS is considering removing Schedule B themselves. That is exactly what this bill does. That makes this a bipartisan bill.

I hope my colleagues will support this measure. It makes sense.

The second underlying bill is the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2017. The legislation includes \$517 billion for our national security, a slight increase over last year's enacted level.

The legislation includes \$58.6 billion in funding to fight the global war on terror, which includes funding for our forces in the field as well as support to key allies to resist aggression from nation-states and terrorist groups.

The bill includes a small 2.1 percent pay raise for our military, which is more than the 1.6 percent requested by the administration, and it includes \$34 billion for the Defense Health Program to provide care for our troops, their families, and retired members of the armed services.

Important investments in cancer research, traumatic brain injury, psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach as well as sexual assault prevention programs are also included in this bill.

A well-equipped, well-trained, effective military providing for the common defense of our Nation is our most basic constitutional responsibility. This bill helps preserve our military as the most capable and superior armed force in the world, while providing funds necessary to fight America's enemies abroad.

While there will be amendments offered by colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the days to come, Mr. Speaker, the rule here today is only for general debate of the overall bill. I look forward to continuing the debate on these policies with our House colleagues, and I urge support for the underlying bills.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of the rule and the underlying bills that the rule would allow to be considered, I do want to take a moment to reflect on what happened yesterday here in the House of Representatives.

In the aftermath of this terrible tragedy in Orlando, the Speaker of the House asked for a moment of silence to pray for the victims: those who lost their lives, those who were injured, and their families. We stood here and, for 10 seconds, had a moment of silence.

One of our leaders, Mr. CLYBURN, sought to get the Speaker's attention to ask a question. Basically, the question was: Is that it? What about legislation? What about action to prevent these types of tragedies from happening in the future? He was gavelled down.

There was a lot of outrage here on the House floor, and I think justifiably so. We have been on this floor calling for moments of silence after terrible tragedies like the one in Orlando again and again and again. It is not enough. Surely, this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, can come together and do more than just have a moment of silence.

Mr. CLYBURN was asking about whether or not we could bring to the floor the bill that basically says that, if you are a suspected terrorist and you are on the FBI's no-fly list, then you ought not to be able to go into a gun store and buy a weapon of war, could that come up for a debate and could we have a vote on that.

He was also going to raise the issue about whether or not we can revisit legislation that would call for a ban on assault weapons. The weapon that this killer used was an assault weapon, and it was perfectly legal for him to buy. Is it worth a discussion as to whether or not we ought to place limits on the purchase of such weapons?

He was also going to raise the issue about whether or not we could pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, a bill that would prevent criminals who have been convicted of misdemeanor assaults against a victim based on his or her race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability from causing further harm with a gun.

This is common sense, and both parties need to come together and take action. For the life of me, I can't understand why there is a hesitancy by the leadership of this House to grapple with some of these issues. It is just not enough to come here after terrible tragedies like the one in Orlando, where 49 people lost their lives and 53 were wounded, and just have a moment of silence. It is becoming an empty gesture. We need to follow it up with action.

The American people, I don't care what their political ideology or political party may be, want us to do something. Instead, all we can do is have a moment of silence. I would just say to my colleagues: It is not enough. It is time for action.

Mr. Speaker, getting to this rule, I rise in strong opposition to the rule, which provides for consideration of H.R. 5053, the so-called Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, under a completely closed process. No amendments can be made in order.

The rule also provides for general debate of H.R. 5293, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2017, and we expect the Rules Committee to report a structured rule later today for consideration of amendments to that legislation.

When Speaker RYAN was elected to preside over the House, he made a promise to return to regular order. He promised to fix this broken House by making changes to the process by which the House does business. He promised to “open up the process,” to “let people participate.” He said it would be a “relief” to the American people if we were to get our act together.

Well, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are light-years away from regular order and have yet to get our act together. We are here on the floor of this House considering another two pieces of legislation under rules that violate the Speaker’s promise of an open process for both the majority and the minority.

□ 1245

This week, the Republican leadership has chosen to shut down the appropriations process even further, with the majority on the Rules Committee indicating that they will issue a structured rule for consideration of amendments to the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill.

Now I am saddened by the recent events that have led to the shutdown of the appropriations process, and by the fact that my conservative Republican colleagues voted down their own appropriations bill because it included an amendment to protect LGBT rights, which was adopted during consideration of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill a few weeks ago.

But I shouldn’t be surprised. Last summer, the appropriations process was upended because some of my conservative colleagues refused to vote for legislation that banned the display of the Confederate flag. So this is just more of the same dysfunction and misplaced priorities from this Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have yet to issue a single open rule this Congress, and we are now beginning a process that further restricts what little opportunity we once had to offer amendments under a modified-open appropriations process.

And let me say a few words about the Department of Defense Appropriations Act bill that we are set to consider this week.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I oppose and I have been deeply troubled by these endless wars, by continuing to send tens of billions of dollars each year to fund U.S. military operations and wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, and elsewhere.

In the cases of Afghanistan, and especially Iraq and Syria, I believe that this Congress has failed in its most sol-

emn constitutional duty to debate and approve an authorization for the use of military force. I believe that without Congress approving an AUMF, our troops should not be there, quite frankly.

For me, this is not just a matter of principle, it is a matter of the Constitution of the United States and the role and responsibility of the United States Congress. It is also the duty that we owe every single one of our men and women in uniform, to either formally authorize their mission, or to bring them back home to the comfort and security of their families.

Over the years, we have had a few debates on this serious issue, and often those opposed to bringing forward an AUMF will argue that we can’t put in jeopardy the support of our troops.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for those Members who are concerned about cutting off funds for our troops, they must stand up and be counted and oppose this rule and the underlying Defense Appropriations bill.

H.R. 5293 cuts the funds in the overseas contingency operations account so badly that it is estimated that all funds for all U.S. military engagements in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere will run out on or around the end of next April.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that the defense authorization bill actually sets a date for this national security disaster: April 30, 2017. And while the authors of the Defense Appropriations bill are too coy to name a date, the amount of money is so limited that it is guaranteed to run out just about this time.

Now the Republican leadership is gambling that the next President and the next Congress will pass a supplemental appropriations bill to fund all these wars through the remainder of fiscal year 2017, just scarcely 2 months after being sworn into office.

Even I, as someone who does not support these wars, can see that this is crazy.

How can anyone stand up and say that they support the troops, and then support a bill that knowingly, deliberately, willfully cuts them off at the knees at the beginning of next year? And why did the Republican majority, with eyes wide open, take such a calculated move?

Well, they did it to pump up the funding of some of their favorite pet projects in the defense base budget. They stole \$15.17 billion of OCO funds—that is nearly 27 percent of the OCO budget—funds that were supposed to fund our troops, their equipment, and their supplies for an entire fiscal year, and boosted the base budget.

To take this hypocrisy another step further, the rule that we are debating right now forbids any amendments from being offered that would take money from the base budget and put it back into OCO, not even to fund our troops for 5 months until the end of the fiscal year.

This is ludicrous. This is a disgrace. And this is just one more dishonorable act perpetrated by this Congress against our men and women in uniform. We won’t formally authorize their missions overseas, and now we are not going to fund them for an entire year.

Now, the last piece of irony to this disgusting set of gimmicks is that this type of prohibition in a rule is rarely, if ever, seen.

Why, you ask, Mr. Speaker?

Well, because that type of guidance is generally outlined in a budget resolution.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution that the Republican leadership hasn’t brought to the House floor this year because it can’t get a consensus out of its cantankerous caucus, and can’t corral enough votes to even pass a budget resolution.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. We need to bring forward an AUMF for Iraq and Syria, and if we continue to fail to do so, then we should bring our troops home. If the Members of this House can sit here safe and sound, then so should our troops. And we should stop purposely robbing the funding for our troops and using that money for their pet projects and weapons systems in the base budget.

Lastly, let me just say a few words about the other bill that we are considering this week, to constrain the Internal Revenue Service’s ability to enforce our tax laws and reduce transparency.

H.R. 5053 removes one of the only tools available to ensuring that foreign money is not illegally spent by tax-exempt groups in our elections, and I strongly oppose this most recent effort to unleash a new flood of unlimited, anonymous, unaccountable money into our political system.

My colleague mentioned that this was about people being able to give freely to charitable organizations. The charitable organizations that they are referring to are groups like Crossroads GPS, Americans for Prosperity, American Future Fund, funded by—these are the groups headed by Karl Rove and the Koch brothers.

The Koch brothers sent a nice letter to all of us asking us to support this legislation with one goal in mind, to basically keep the American people in the dark. They don’t want you to know all the money that is being pumped in to influence our elections and who is giving that money. They want to keep the American people in the dark.

I think the one lesson on both the Democratic side and the Republican side during this Presidential campaign that is clear, people want us to open up the process. They think this process has been corrupted by money. And rather than opening up the process, this is shutting the process down, shutting transparency, and I think that goes against what both Democrats and Republicans want.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Really quickly, on the IRS bill, it is already the interpretation of the Federal district court that these contributions should not be made public; that donor lists should not be made public because people have a right to free association and free speech. These are constitutional rights. So to argue that this information that is not allowed to be made public is somehow going to lead to a flood of foreign money, is nonsense.

Also, again, I will reiterate that the Bank Secrecy Act is in place to make sure that that does not happen. So I just wanted to quickly dispel with that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), who is a distinguished member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 5293, the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, and to recognize the hard work that the House Appropriations Committee's Defense Subcommittee has put into this bill.

I would also like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and all the members of the subcommittee and the Rules Committee for their work on this bill.

This legislation represents an opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to work together to provide our Armed Forces the resources they need to keep our country and Americans safe. We ask the courageous men and women who volunteer in our Armed Forces to confront global terrorism, and we must give them the tools to do so.

This year's Defense Appropriations bill, H.R. 5293, funds the programs that are not only essential to our national security, but critical to the welfare of our military personnel.

The Ohio Replacement Program is set to become the most dominant leg of our nuclear triad and is vital to our nuclear deterrence. This bill progresses that project.

Townsend Bombing Range is being expanded to accommodate the needs of the new fifth generation fighters coming online, and offers a unique training aspect for those planes located on the East Coast. This bill helps to clear up ongoing airspace concerns.

The A-10s, the most lethal close air support aircraft in the Air Force's inventory, will continue to be funded, ensuring our warfighters get the close-in air operations they need.

Cyber is, and will continue to be, a major issue for our military, and I commend the committee's focus on establishing cyber protection teams and partnerships with public universities.

End-strength has been another recurring issue, and this bill provides the necessary funding to reduce the strain on the men and women who serve.

Warfighters have also relied on the Joint Surveillance Target Attack

Radar Systems, or JSTARS, for up-to-date information on enemy movements, and this bill ensures our legacy fleet can continue to fly until the Air Force completes this recapitalization program.

Lastly, this bill also provides support to the Army's combat aviation brigades through additional AH-64 Apache helicopters, and the Air Force's airlift capacity is strengthened under the engine enhancement programs for C-130s.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the Defense Appropriations Committee have, again, done a tremendous job on making the difficult decisions to prioritize what is most needed for our Armed Forces. I commend the subcommittee on their work.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by a number of reform organizations that are organized to protect the public from the big money and from foreign donations, from the League of Women Voters, to Public Citizen, to Common Cause, to the Campaign Legal Center, the Center for Responsive Politics, Brennan Center for Justice, and so on. There are many more.

I want to submit for the RECORD the letter they sent to every Member of Congress saying, vote "no" on the Roskam bill, and vote against opening loopholes for foreign money.

These organizations believe that we are opening a loophole for more foreign money into our political system. And if that is what you want, then support the bill. I personally do not, and ask that that be part of the RECORD.

REFORM GROUPS URGE NO VOTE ON ROSKAM BILL, H.R. 5053—VOTE AGAINST OPENING LOOPHOLE FOR FOREIGN MONEY

June 13, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Our organizations strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 5053, Representative Peter Roskam's bill that would eliminate the requirement for 501(c) groups to disclose their donors to the IRS.

Our organizations include the Brennan Center for Justice, Campaign Legal Center, Center for Responsive Politics, Common Cause, CREW, Democracy 21, Every Voice, Issue One, League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Sunlight Foundation, The Rootstrickers Project at Demand Progress and Represent.Us.

The Roskam bill would open the door wide for secret money from foreign donors to be illegally laundered into federal elections through 501(c)(4) and other 501(c) groups. Foreign money cannot be legally spent in U.S. elections, but it can be given to 501(c) groups and they can spend money in our elections. These groups are not required to disclose their donors publicly, but they are required to make non-public disclosure of their donors to the IRS.

This disclosure to the IRS is the only protection citizens have to prevent 501(c)(4) and other 501(c) groups being used to illegally spend foreign money in our elections. The fact that 501(c) groups are required to disclose their donors to the IRS means the groups know that donor information is available as an accountability check against illegal conduct.

If donor disclosure to the IRS by 501(c) groups is eliminated, however, as the Ros-

kam bill would do, no one will be in a position to determine if a 501(c) group illegally spent foreign money in our elections—other than the group and foreign donor involved. Any check will be gone and there will be no way to hold a group and foreign donor accountable for illegally spending foreign money in U.S. elections.

House members should vote against eliminating the existing check against foreign countries, foreign companies and foreign individuals spending money illegally to influence our elections.

We strongly urge you vote to protect the integrity of U.S. elections by voting against H.R. 5053.

Brennan Center for Justice, Campaign Legal Center, Center for Responsive Politics, Common Cause, CREW, Democracy 21, Every Voice, Issue One, League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Sunlight Foundation, The Rootstrickers Project at Demand Progress, Represent.Us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

It is unconscionable that the majority in this House has repeatedly refused to even debate closing such a glaring loophole, which continues to allow suspected terrorists to legally buy firearms.

The country can simply not wait any longer for this Congress to act. And if my friends want to vote against it, then they can vote against it. But denying the ability of this legislation to come to the floor, I think, is just wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today and ask that we defeat the previous question.

The IRS portion of this bill that is included in the rule, the debate regarding that, is nothing more than a political messaging debate, and it is politically charged, and it really has no place on this floor today, given the seriousness of this underlying issue that the gentleman from Massachusetts just spoke about.

The American people don't need more partisan politics. The American people need a Congress that will stand up and take action to help keep Americans safe from a number of things, one of the most important of which is gun violence in their neighborhoods and in their communities.

Thirty people are killed every day by someone using a gun in our country. In

the 3 years since Sandy Hook, there have been over 1,000 mass shootings, and more than 34,000 people have been killed by someone using a gun.

Every time these tragedies take place, the response from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle is the same. Thoughts and prayers are sent and moments of silence are held, but no real action is taken.

In the 3 years since Sandy Hook, we have held 30 moments of silence after a terrible tragedy such as the one that just occurred in Orlando.

□ 1300

But we haven't taken a single vote on legislation that would help keep guns out of dangerous hands.

One of the simplest solutions we have put forward to help keep Americans safe is legislation to prohibit those on the FBI's terrorist watch list from being able to legally purchase firearms.

Today, individuals on the FBI's terrorist watch list can go into a gun store anywhere in the United States of America and buy a firearm of their choosing legally. As a matter of fact, since this watch list has been established, over 2,000 individuals on the terrorist watch list have gone into gun stores across the country and legally purchased firearms. I think that is wrong. It is dangerous, it is unacceptable, and it makes our country less safe.

I have bipartisan legislation that I have offered with my Republican friend and colleague, PETER KING from New York, that would prohibit those on the terrorist watch list from being able to purchase a firearm legally in our country.

The American people are overwhelmingly in support of this, and if House Republicans agree that suspected terrorists shouldn't be able to legally buy guns, then let's take a vote. Vote it up or down, but give the American people the right to have this measure voted on.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON). The gentleman was a colonel in the United States Army, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and a great American.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. STIVERS, for yielding time. I also greatly appreciate his work on the committee and his service to our Nation. We appreciate the sacrifices that he has rendered on our behalf and also from his family.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House Defense Appropriations bill, a very important piece of legislation that provides the resources for our servicemen and -women to defend this cherished way of life and to protect our people. We are reminded of that after this devastating terrorist attack this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, dating back to the founding, we had a principle by which

we rally our national security, and that is peace through strength; that is, we look to deter potential adversaries, always prepared, in the event that deterrence fails, to fight and prevail to win and to protect our people.

As part of this concept of deterrence, it is critically important at this juncture, in my view, that we provide the resources necessary to revitalize our Armed Forces. We are coming through a very long period of focus on counter-insurgency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Much needs to be done. I think this bill does quite a bit on that score.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on it. I also want to express my gratitude for them to include the bill that I authored that deals with end strength of our Armed Forces. This is the POSTURE Act. It is supported by 52 of my colleagues. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. In fact, I authored it with Chairman TURNER, MIKE TURNER from the House Armed Services Committee, and Representative TIM WALZ, the highest ranking enlisted man to ever serve in this Chamber, a Democrat from Minnesota.

This bill effectively stops the drawdown that is planned over the next 2 years. Right now we have end strength numbers that essentially match where we were on September 11, 2001. If the administration's plan is allowed to go into effect, we are looking at handing out approximately 70,000 pink slips between now and 2018, bringing down the size of our Armed Forces.

Now is not the time to be doing that, as we deal with Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and certainly the Islamic State. We have lots of challenges out there, and if we are going to reassert peace through strength, strengthening the hand of our diplomats, I think it is critically important that we don't continue on that drawdown of our land forces and of our forces in the Department of Defense.

So I appreciate the leadership's including this bill that I have authored with my colleagues in the House Defense Appropriations bill. It was critical that it come with the resources, because you just can't increase end strength. It has to come with the money to do that. This committee did that, and I appreciate that.

I also want to say there are important provisions in here to reassure our allies, the European Reassurance Initiative. It is funded here along with the Global Response Force, and a pay raise for our servicemen and -women. They richly deserve this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say how important it is that we bring forward all these initiatives: preserving our end strength, reassuring our allies,

and ensuring that the Global Response Force has proper funding. All of these, Mr. Speaker, are going to help strengthen the hand of diplomats.

When you look at our strengths, they are instantiated in our founding documents. On our best day, other countries want to be like us. It is the freedom and it is the prosperity that comes from arraying power the way that we do. Of course, all of this is relying on the principle of deterrence. This bill is very important toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague and friend, Mr. STIVERS, yielding time. I urge my colleagues to support the House Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there are 1,000 reasons to be opposed to this rule. One is that it brings forward two bills that are deeply flawed.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD The New York Times editorial against the Roskam bill, "Dark Money and an I.R.S. Blindfold."

[From the New York Times Editorial, Apr. 28, 2016]

DARK MONEY AND AN I.R.S. BLINDFOLD
(By the Editorial Board)

It is plainly illegal for foreigners to contribute to American political campaigns. But reform groups are warning that the ban would be gravely undermined by a little-noticed bill advanced Thursday by Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee.

It would alter the current tax code provision that, while permitting the identity of donors to 501(c) "social welfare" groups to be kept firmly secret from the public, requires that the donors be privately identified to Internal Revenue Service officials responsible for enforcing the law. Politically oriented groups claiming dubious exemptions as "social welfare" nonprofits have proliferated in recent elections, allowing donors—including publicity-shy campaign backers—to work from the shadows.

Under the proposal, the I.R.S. would no longer be told the identities of contributors to these nonprofits. Watchdog groups warn in a letter to the House that this would "open the door wide for secret, unaccountable money from foreign governments, foreign corporations and foreign individuals to be illegally laundered into federal elections." The letter, signed by the Brennan Center for Justice, the Campaign Legal Center, Democracy 21 and five other groups, stressed that the disclosure requirement is one of the few ways of guarding against foreigners influencing American elections.

Representative Peter Roskam, the bill's sponsor, dismissed the reform groups' warning, saying the I.R.S. "has a miserable track record when it comes to safeguarding sensitive data" and a history of targeting conservative nonprofits that are critical of administration policies. His office insisted that ending the disclosure requirement would not affect the foreign-donation ban, but the reform groups sensibly ask who else could monitor what has become a runaway system of big-money stealth politicking.

Claiming a “social welfare” tax exemption has become a tool for powerful political operatives like Karl Rove, the Republican campaign guru. His Crossroads GPS group, which has 501(c) status, has spent \$330 million on ads and candidates since it was created in 2010. Other political groups, including the Democrats’ Priorities USA Action, which aided in President Obama’s re-election campaign, have followed suit in claiming “social welfare” status. In the last four years, more than \$500 million in secretive election contributions has been netted by those using the ploy.

Amid fierce Republican criticism, the I.R.S. has grown ever more gun-shy about enforcement, with Tea Party and other right-wing groups accusing tax officials of bias in daring to investigate conservative “social welfare” claims. As I.R.S. wariness grows, so does the attraction of 501(c)s for donors more interested in stealth politicking than charity work. Enabling foreigners to join this dark money debacle would be disastrous.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will read the opening paragraph: “It is plainly illegal for foreigners to contribute to American political campaigns. But reform groups are warning that the ban would be gravely undermined by a little-noticed bill”—which is this bill—“advanced Thursday by Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee.”

This is basically saying that this opens up a loophole that, quite frankly, can be very, very dangerous. So I urge my colleagues that if this rule gets passed, that they would vote against this bill.

Again, as I mentioned on the Defense Appropriations bill, it is a bill that is based on budget gimmicks, and it is also a bill that continues to fund endless wars without having any authorization from this Congress. We have not voted on an AUMF for the most recent war in Iraq and in Syria. I find it unconscionable that we have no problem just putting these wars on automatic pilot and having our brave men and women in uniform in harm’s way, and we don’t even have the guts to debate it.

We have tried and tried and tried and tried on various bills—on authorization bills and on appropriations bills—to be able to have that debate. There is always an excuse—oh, it is a different committee jurisdiction; oh, we have to give it more than 10 minutes; oh, we have to do this, we have to do that—but this is our constitutional responsibility. We have time to vote on all these other bills that, quite frankly, are going nowhere that are political messaging pieces written at the National Republican Congressional Committee, but we can’t find the time to debate these wars to clarify what our mission is—these wars that our brave men and women in uniform have been put in harm’s way to deal with?

Come on. At some point, we have to find the courage to debate this. If people think these wars are the right way to go or they want to expand Presidential authority, then that is how you do it. If people like me think our military footprint is too big in the Middle

East and that we need to have a more clearly defined mission about what we are doing, then that is the forum in which we restrain these wars.

But to do nothing—to do nothing—is cowardly. It is just wrong. I am hoping in the amendment process that we will have the opportunity to debate some of these issues. But if history is any indication, the answer is probably not.

Finally, I am urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question. Quite frankly, instead of these flawed bills, we should be debating how to prevent more tragedies like the one that took place in Orlando.

If we defeat the previous question, we will bring up a bill that is a bipartisan bill that would simply say that, if you are on an FBI watch list so you are unable to fly, then you should be unable to buy a gun at a gun store. It is that simple.

I don’t quite understand why that is such a big deal. If the FBI believes that you are potentially dangerous so that they will not allow you to fly on an airplane, then how in the world can we allow that person to go into a gun store and buy a gun? And not just any gun; they can buy an assault weapon. It is crazy.

We have tried, on numerous occasions, to bring this issue to the floor, and House Republicans have voted 11 times—11 times—to block the bipartisan No Fly, No Buy legislation that was originally authored by my Republican colleague, Congressman PETER KING.

Since taking control of the House in 2011, my Republican friends have drastically cut the resources available for law enforcement, slashing the COPS program, which includes COPS hiring, COPS technology, interoperability, et cetera, by 64 percent. We need to respond to these terrible tragedies and make sure that our communities have what they need to keep people safe.

According to the Government Accountability Office, as my colleague from California (Mr. THOMPSON) pointed out, more than 2,000 suspects on the FBI’s terrorist watch list have successfully purchased weapons in the United States—more than 2,000. These are people who can’t fly on airplanes because they are suspected of being terrorists, but they can go in and buy a firearm. More than 90 percent of all suspected terrorists who attempted to purchase guns in the last 11 years walked away with the weapon they wanted, with just 190 rejected, despite their ominous history.

This legislation that we want to bring to the floor—just so there is no misunderstanding here—was originally crafted in 2007 and endorsed by President Bush’s Justice Department. It has bipartisan support in the House and is supported by prominent Republicans and counterterrorism and law enforcement experts. Yet we can’t find the time to bring it to the floor. All we can do in the aftermath of terrible massacres like the one in Orlando is come

to the floor and have a moment of silence for 10 seconds, and that is it. That is our obligation.

It is awful that we can’t deal in a responsible way with legislation like the bills that I have mentioned here. I think the American people—and this goes beyond political affiliation—are getting sick of our inaction on this stuff. I should just say, if my friends are afraid of the NRA, according to a 2012 poll, 71 percent of current or former NRA members and 80 percent of other gun owners support preventing people on a terrorist watch list from purchasing guns.

I don’t know what it is going to take, but I will tell you this: the outrage is already beyond description here on the House floor of people who are simply tired of our inaction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat the previous question so we can actually have a debate and vote on something that might save some lives, and also vote against the rule.

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

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

The gentleman makes an impassioned argument, but today’s rule is about two bills. It is about a bill that will prevent IRS abuse and make sure that our citizens have a right to free speech and free association that they are guaranteed under the First Amendment of the Constitution.

I thought it was really interesting that he read a portion of The New York Times editorial that is very clear to say that reform groups claim that this bill does X. The editorial writer did not make the claim that it happened or that it will happen; he made the claim that reform groups claim it will happen because the editorial writer can’t verify the validity of it, and it is simply not true.

The Bank Secrecy Act will make sure, as it does today, that foreign money is kept out of our elections. The Federal Election Commission, which is responsible for enforcing our election laws, will continue to enforce our election laws.

□ 1315

In fact, no one knows what Schedule B is used for. Today it has no real purpose. The IRS’ Director of Exempt Organizations has publicly stated that they are considering doing away with Schedule B themselves. That is all the first bill does.

The second bill we are talking about is providing for funding for our troops. It is the DOD authorization for funding for 2017. The gentleman talks about some other issues, but if we don’t fund it, we are the ones doing nothing. If we don’t fund our troops, we are the ones doing nothing. We have an obligation to fund our troops to provide for the common defense. We need to make sure we do that. That is what this bill does, and I want to make sure we do that.

I do want to make a quick comment on process because the gentleman is apparently outraged about process. In this session of Congress, the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, the majority has allowed 1,269 amendments on the House floor in this Congress. That is as of May—halfway through this year. In the 113th Congress, the majority allowed 1,545 amendments to be considered. When the gentleman from Massachusetts was in the majority in the 111th Congress, his party only allowed 778 amendments during the entire 111th Congress. The gentleman's claims ring a little hollow. Maybe where you stand depends on where you sit.

I will say that these are important bills. The rule will make sure that we can fully fund our national defense and make sure that we look out for the constitutional rights of our citizens. Those are two very important things. I don't argue with the gentleman that there may be other things we want to talk about, but those things are important, and that is what today is about, that is what this 1 hour of debate is about, and that is what the 2 hours the rule provides are about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 778 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against or-

dering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5049.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 171, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—236

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

NAYS—171

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Norcross
Aguilar	Fudge	O'Rourke
Ashford	Gallego	Pallone
Beatty	Garamendi	Pascrell
Becerra	Graham	Payne
Bera	Grayson	Pelosi
Beyer	Green, Al	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Peters
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Bonamici	Hahn	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Polis
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Rangel
Bustos	Honda	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richmond
Capps	Huffman	Royal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jeffries	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kuster	Serrano
Clyburn	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Connolly	Lee	Sinema
Conyers	Levin	Sires
Cooper	Lewis	Slaughter
Costa	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Loeb sack	Speier
Crowley	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Takano
Cummings	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Titus
DeFazio	Lynch	Tonko
DeGette	Maloney, Carolyn	Torres
Delaney	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
DeLauro	Matsui	Van Hollen
DelBene	McCollum	Vargas
DeSaulnier	McGovern	Veasey
Deutch	McNerney	Vela
Doggett	Meeks	Velázquez
Doyle, Michael F.	Moore	Visclosky
Duckworth	Moulton	Walz
Edwards	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Ellison	Nadler	Schultz
Engel	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	Neal	Welch
Esty	Nolan	Yarmuth
Foster		

NOT VOTING—27

Bass	Goodlatte	Lawrence
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Lipinski
Comstock	Grijalva	McDermott
Dingell	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Duffy	Hinojosa	Rokita
Farr	Hunter	Sanford
Fattah	Kirkpatrick	Takai
Forbes	Labrador	Waters, Maxine
Gabbard	Larson (CT)	Wilson (FL)

□ 1337

Messrs. RYAN of Ohio, SERRANO, SIREs, and TAKANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JOYCE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 299, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

AYES—239

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

NOES—179

Adams	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Bass	Becerra

Bera	Garamendi	Neal
Beyer	Graham	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Norcross
Blumenauer	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Pallone
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	Pascrell
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Peters
Butterfield	Higgins	Peterson
Capps	Himes	Pingree
Capuano	Honda	Pocan
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Polis
Carney	Huffman	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Quigley
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Royal-Allard
Cicilline	Jones	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rush
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clyburn	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Connolly	Kind	Schakowsky
Conyers	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cooper	Kuster	Schrader
Costa	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cuellar	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Levin	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeFazio	Lipinski	Slaughter
DeGette	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Speier
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lowe y	Takano
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Lynch	Titus
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Carolyn	Tonko
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Edwards	Matsui	Van Hollen
Ellison	McCollum	Vargas
Engel	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Esty	Meeks	Velázquez
Farr	Moore	Visclosky
Foster	Moulton	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Gabbard	Nadler	Schultz
Gallego	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
		Welch
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Takai
Dingell	Hinojosa	Torres
Duffy	Lawrence	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	McDermott	Wilson (FL)
Forbes	Meng	
Goodlatte	Sanford	

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted:

No on rollcall No. 299.

No on rollcall No. 300.

NSF MAJOR RESEARCH FACILITY REFORM ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5049) to provide for improved management and oversight of major multi-user research facilities funded by the National Science Foundation, to

ensure transparency and accountability of construction and management costs, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 9, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—412

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Hanna
Adams	Courtney	Hardy
Aderholt	Cramer	Harper
Aguiar	Crawford	Harris
Allen	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Amodel	Crowley	Hastings
Ashford	Cuellar	Heck (NV)
Babin	Culberson	Hensarling
Barletta	Cummings	Hice, Jody B.
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Higgins
Barton	Davidson	Hill
Bass	Davis (CA)	Himes
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Holding
Becerra	Davis, Rodney	Honda
Benishek	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bera	DeGette	Hudson
Beyer	Delaney	Huelskamp
Billirakis	DeLauro	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hunter
Black	DeSantis	Hurd (TX)
Blackburn	DeSaulnier	Hurt (VA)
Blum	DesJarlais	Israel
Blumenauer	Deutsch	Issa
Bonamici	Diaz-Balart	Jackson Lee
Bost	Doggett	Jeffries
Boustany	Dold	Jenkins (KS)
Boyle, Brendan	Donovan	Jenkins (WV)
F.	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	F.	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Brooks (AL)	Edwards	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Ellison	Joyce
Brown (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Kaptur
Brownley (CA)	Emmer (MN)	Katko
Buchanan	Engel	Keating
Buck	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Bucshon	Esty	Kelly (MS)
Bustos	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Butterfield	Farr	Kennedy
Byrne	Fincher	Kilde
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Capps	Fleischmann	Kind
Capuano	Fleming	King (IA)
Cardenas	Flores	King (NY)
Carney	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Carson (IN)	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Carter (GA)	Fox	Kline
Carter (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Knight
Cartwright	Franks (AZ)	Kuster
Castor (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Castro (TX)	Fudge	LaHood
Chabot	Gabbard	LaMalfa
Chaffetz	Galleo	Lamborn
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Lance
Cicilline	Garrett	Langevin
Clark (MA)	Gibbs	Larsen (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Clawson (FL)	Gosar	Latta
Clay	Gowdy	Lawrence
Cleaver	Graham	Lee
Clyburn	Granger	Levin
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Lewis
Cohen	Graves (LA)	Lieu, Ted
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Collins (GA)	Grayson	LoBiondo
Collins (NY)	Green, Al	Loebsack
Comstock	Green, Gene	Lofgren
Conaway	Griffith	Long
Connolly	Grijalva	Loudermilk
Conyers	Guinta	Love
Cook	Guthrie	Lowenthal
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Lowe
Costa	Hahn	Lucas

Luetkemeyer	Peterson	Sires
Lujan Grisham	Pingree	Slaughter
(NM)	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
Luján, Ben Ray	Pitts	Smith (NE)
(NM)	Pocan	Smith (NJ)
Lummis	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Lynch	Poliquin	Smith (WA)
MacArthur	Polis	Speier
Maloney,	Pompeo	Stefanik
Carolyn	Posey	Stewart
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Stivers
Marchant	Price, Tom	Swalwell (CA)
Marino	Quigley	Takano
Matsui	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy	Ratcliffe	Thompson (MS)
McCaul	Reed	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Reichert	Thornberry
McCollum	Renacci	Tiberi
McDermott	Ribble	Tipton
McGovern	Rice (NY)	Titus
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Tonko
McKinley	Richmond	Torres
McMorris	Rigell	Trott
Rodgers	Roby	Tsongas
McNeerney	Roe (TN)	Turner
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Van Hollen
Meeks	Rokita	Vargas
Messer	Rooney (FL)	Veasey
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Vela
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Velázquez
Miller (MI)	Ross	Visclosky
Moolenaar	Rothfus	Wagner
Mooney (WV)	Rouzer	Walberg
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Walden
Moulton	Royce	Walker
Mullin	Ruiz	Walorski
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Walters, Mimi
Murphy (PA)	Rush	Walz
Nadler	Russell	Wasserman
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Neal	Salmon	Watson Coleman
Neugebauer	Sánchez, Linda	Weber (TX)
Newhouse	T.	Webster (FL)
Noem	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Nolan	Sarbanes	Wenstrup
Norcross	Scalise	Westerman
Nugent	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
Nunes	Schiff	Whitfield
O'Rourke	Schrader	Williams
Olson	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Wittman
Pallone	Scott, Austin	Womack
Palmer	Scott, David	Woodall
Pascrell	Serrano	Yarmuth
Paulsen	Sessions	Yoder
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Yoho
Pearce	Sherman	Young (AK)
Pelosi	Shimkus	Young (IA)
Perlmutter	Shuster	Young (IN)
Perry	Simpson	Zeldin
Peters	Sinema	Zinke

NAYS—9

Amash	Grothman	Mulvaney
Burgess	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	Massie	Stutzman

NOT VOTING—13

Dingell	Heck (WA)	Takai
Duffy	Herrera Beutler	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Hinojosa	Wilson (FL)
Forbes	Meng	
Goodlatte	Sanford	

□ 1351

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND ON H.R. 5053, PREVENTING IRS ABUSE AND PROTECTING FREE SPEECH ACT

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question on adoption of the motion to re-

commit to H.R. 5053 be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

PREVENTING IRS ABUSE AND PROTECTING FREE SPEECH ACT

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 778, I call up the bill (H.R. 5053) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from requiring that the identity of contributors to 501(c) organizations be included in annual returns, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 778, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-58, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5053

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON REQUIRING THAT IDENTITY OF CONTRIBUTORS TO 501(C) ORGANIZATIONS BE INCLUDED IN ANNUAL RETURNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following:

“(n) IDENTIFYING INFORMATION OF DONORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the Secretary may not require the name, address, or other identifying information of any contributor to any organization described in section 501(c) of any amount of any contribution, grant, bequest, devise, or gift of money or property.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply—

“(i) to any disclosure required by subsection (a)(2), and

“(ii) with respect to any a contribution, grant, bequest, devise, or gift of money or property made by an officer or director of the organization (or an individual having powers or responsibilities similar to those of officers or directors) or any covered employee.

“(B) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘covered employee’ means any employee (including any former employee) of the organization if the employee is one of the 5 highest compensated employees of the organization for the taxable year.

“(C) COMPENSATION FROM RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Compensation of a covered employee by the organization shall include any compensation paid with respect to employment of such employee by any related person or governmental entity.

“(ii) RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—A person or governmental entity shall be treated as related to the organization if such person or governmental entity—

“(I) controls, or is controlled by, the organization.”

“(II) is controlled by one or more persons that control the organization.”

“(III) is a supported organization (as defined in section 509(f)(3)) during the taxable year with respect to the organization.”

“(IV) is a supporting organization described in section 509(a)(3) during the taxable year with respect to the organization, or

“(V) in the case of an organization that is a voluntary employees’ beneficiary association described in section 501(c)(9), establishes, maintains, or makes contributions to such voluntary employees’ beneficiary association.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6033(b)(5) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “all”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “to the extent not prohibited by subsection (n).”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be filed for taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5053, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Over the past several years, the American people have come to learn just how reckless and untrustworthy the IRS can be with their sensitive taxpayer information.

Most concerning of all is that this Federal agency, which holds immense power to disrupt the lives of taxpayers, has directly exploited sensitive taxpayer information for political purposes.

We have responsibility to taxpayers to make sure this is never allowed to happen again. That is why we fought hard to push forward a ban on IRS political targeting as part of the PATH Act. And last December, that ban was signed into law for the very first time.

But we still have more work to do to clean up the IRS and hold it more accountable to the taxpayers it serves. The Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act continues this critical effort.

This important bill, authored by Congressman ROSKAM, would prohibit the IRS from collecting the identity of people who donate to tax-exempt organizations. During our committee’s IRS political targeting investigation, we learned that the IRS not only singled

out certain organizations for heightened security, but in some cases, it even demanded they turn over a list of all their donors. These invasions of privacy are completely unacceptable.

The bill before us today makes much needed steps to protect taxpayer identities and ease the compliance burden on tax-exempt organizations. Most importantly, this bill helps ensure that Americans can never again be singled out by the IRS for their political beliefs.

I am grateful to Chairman ROSKAM for his leadership and diligence on this important issue, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) be permitted to control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Republican majority believes the more hidden money in politics, the better. Freedom of speech, they say, requires more and more dark money or that democracy requires the ability of a few key people to write a check of \$100 million without anyone knowing who signed the check or, as a Koch brothers executive claimed, Americans have the right to “anonymous free speech.”

This bill now would help extend that anonymity to foreign individuals and governments who contribute in violation of our laws.

We have a crisis in our campaign system, a crisis. Tens of millions of dollars are being spent without full disclosure. So our constituents know and can make their own judgments about who is influencing our elections. To make matters worse, many of the organizations now doing the spending are organized under our Tax Code as groups allegedly engaged in social welfare activities.

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, political spending by such tax-exempt groups at this point in the current election cycle is five times the amount spent at the same point during the 2012 cycle. Spending during the 2012 Presidential election cycle by 501(c)(4)s and 501(c)(6)s soared to more than \$300 million, up from \$100 million in 2008 and just \$6 million in 2004, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. And the three largest 501(c)(4) spenders from the 2012 cycle, representing fully 51 percent of the total, have special meaning to this House majority.

□ 1400

They include Karl Rove’s Crossroads GPS, which spent \$71 million; Americans for Prosperity of the Koch brothers spent \$36 million; and the American Future Fund, also the Koch brothers, spent \$25 million.

It is little wonder that the Koch brothers sent a letter to the Committee on Ways and Means Republicans the morning our committee marked up this bill in April, urging support of this legislation. It seeks to codify the secrecy around donations to social welfare organizations for political purposes.

So Republicans are here today to continue their attack on the IRS as they drive, really, to further undermine our campaign finance system.

This legislation removes the last safeguard against foreign governments and foreign individuals from influencing our elections. Currently, foreign money cannot legally be given or spent in our elections, and a real protection we have against the use of foreign money by politically active social welfare organizations is that they must disclose their donors to the IRS.

This requirement means that tax exempt 501(c)(4) groups know they can be held accountable if they illegally spend foreign money in Federal elections.

Thirteen key campaign finance and government transparency groups, including Democracy 21 and Common Cause, have written to Congress strongly opposing this bill. In their letter, they state: “The . . . bill would open the door wide for secret money from foreign donors to be illegally laundered into Federal elections through 501(c)(4) and other 501(c) groups . . . House Members should vote against eliminating the existing check against foreign countries, foreign companies, and foreign individuals spending money illegally to influence our elections.”

This legislation would eliminate that protection. The administration opposes this bill. In its Statement of Administration Policy, it states: “By permanently preventing the IRS from requiring reporting of donor information by 501(c) organizations, H.R. 5053 would constrain the IRS in enforcing tax laws and reduce the transparency of private foundations.”

Therefore, I strongly urge a “no” vote.

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

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

I want to thank Chairman BRADY for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. Just to put this into context, let’s focus in on what we are really talking about. Every year, tax exempt 501(c) organizations fill out a form 990, and they send it to the IRS. So far, so good. It makes all the sense in the world. Public information. It is supposed to be public, and the public is able to review that.

Under current law—actually, it is a rule; it is not a statute, it is a rule—501(c) organizations have to fill out Schedule B. Okay, what is Schedule B? Schedule B is donor information. This donor information is submitted to the IRS. But here is the problem, Mr. Speaker. The IRS Commissioner has

said: We don't think we need this actually. The person who is in charge of the tax exempt unit at the IRS has publicly said they are reviewing this.

If all the other claims were true—I mean, I got carpal tunnel syndrome writing down all these things: hidden money, crisis in campaigns, codify secrecy, last safeguard against foreign influence. Put up the ramparts, Mr. Speaker. If all that was true, then why would the IRS Commissioner be saying these things, that they don't think they need Schedule B?

And further, why wouldn't the White House just declaratively say they are going to veto it? But did you notice something, Mr. Speaker? The White House didn't say they would veto it. Why? This is a pretty good idea. Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle at this point aren't persuaded that it is a good idea, but just because they are slow to the game doesn't mean it is not a good idea.

So why is this a good idea? Here is why. The IRS in the past has demonstrated they have leaked this information. When did they do it? They leaked it in the case of the National Organization for Marriage, a group that was advocating for traditional marriage. They filed their Schedule Bs. Lo and behold, an IRS employee leaked it. Out it goes. You can imagine the donor harassment, the hassle, and so forth. So the IRS' hands in the past, Mr. Speaker, are not exactly clean when it comes to holding this information close. The National Governors Association also was similarly situated. All right, that is the first reason.

The second reason is the IRS acknowledges that they don't need this to administer the Tax Code. They don't need it. What is their job? Their job is to administer the Tax Code. They don't need it to administer the Tax Code.

Finally, we on the Subcommittee on Oversight and those of us on the Committee on Ways and Means know all too well that the IRS is very poorly equipped right now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with cybersecurity issues and identity theft issues.

So my final point is this: the IRS has demonstrated an inability to hold this information in the past. They have demonstrated an inability to hold it in the future. And they don't need it. So if they don't need it, let's not give it to them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on why this is a bad idea. We have seen in recent years a proliferation of political groups claiming tax exempt social welfare. You know how many groups in the past 5 years have claimed that? That is the status as a means to hide the identities of their donors. Can't put it any more elementary than that.

Now, that is the very law my friend from Illinois—and I mean that seri-

ously—the very law that he is talking about. These groups offer a back door into unrestricted spending on political speech, often in the form of advertising meant to influence elections. I don't think we would disagree on that point.

H.R. 5053 would make it easier for super-PACs to spend money anonymously in support of their preferred candidates or political party. That is H.R. 5053. The bill before us today would make it easier for groups to operate in the shadows, groups like Americans for Prosperity and American Future Fund, which together spent more than \$61 million in just one election in 2012 yet still claim tax exempt status.

Now, I believe we need better transparency and accountability in our system. Disclosure of donors to the IRS is a minimum safeguard and a practical tool for auditing. Furthermore, requiring disclosure of donors is one of the only safeguards we have against foreign money influencing our elections.

That is why so many good government groups have spoken out against this legislation, groups that promote transparency in our political system, like the Sunlight Foundation and the League of Women Voters. This bill would make it easier, Mr. Speaker, for anonymous donors to funnel dark money into groups that spend unlimited sums of money to influence elections. This flies in the face of our democratic principles. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

This isn't about the IRS. This is about hiding who contributes and how much. The IRS isn't for sale, but there are many buyers out there, Mr. Speaker, who want to remain unknown. You and I, the sponsor of this bill, we don't have that luxury. We have to put down everything when someone contributes to us. You know it, and I know it. I believe the PACs should have to do that, too. Why in God's name you don't think so, I have no idea.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, one quick point. The gentleman said that it was a practical tool for auditing, and yet there was a lawsuit recently where the attorney general of California tried to disclose the Schedule B information. The Federal judge who struck down the public disclosure pointed out that it had not been used in a single concrete instance, not one. And, in fact, the folks in California had not had this information submitted for 10 years before they even noticed that it was missing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud my colleague, Chairman ROSKAM, for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is an important piece of legislation, Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act.

Back in 2012, when I was the Chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, I started this investigation into the IRS'

unconstitutional targeting of conservative groups for their political beliefs. We passed some legislation back then to improve transparency and accountability at the IRS, but I can tell you much more needs to be done, and this is part of that effort to continue to hold this agency accountable.

Taxpayers deserve to know whether the IRS is violating their privacy. Chairman ROSKAM's bill furthers that effort by preventing the IRS from targeting nonprofits by prohibiting the agency from collecting the identity of donors who contribute to these organizations. We know that the IRS can impose an audit at any time, but there is no need for the IRS to just collect all this information when they can't even do some of the things they are supposed to be doing with the resources they have.

This bill is a step toward restoring individual privacy that the IRS has been exploiting and abusing, and I think the American people have had enough. Passing this bill would dramatically reduce the information that the IRS has the legal ability to demand, lessening that chance, that potential for abuse.

Specifically, the bill would limit the Secretary of the Treasury from requiring the name, address, or other identifying information of any contributor, regardless of the nature or size of the contribution, with two exceptions.

We know the IRS still operates under the shadow of a scandal in which it admitted to targeting organizations based on their political beliefs. We have to get to the bottom of this. This agency has to be reined in. We need to strengthen the laws that protect American citizens' privacy. This investigation is still ongoing. I can tell you, the IRS still refuses to admit that some of its employees engaged in intentional wrongdoing.

To successfully carry out its mission, the IRS must be viewed by the American people as an unbiased arbiter of the law. It cannot do that without coming clean. H.R. 5053 is a necessary step to require more accountability and transparency at the IRS. I urge my colleagues to support us in passing this critical bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a truly distinguished member of our committee.

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

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, if you are frustrated, if you are down and out, if you lack self-esteem, if you really want to get a good shot in the arm, kick the IRS. I am telling you, I have been down here 46 years. It always works. It always works.

But to take away an institution that depends on the voluntary contribution of taxpayers, to take away the image of trying to do the right thing for the American people because we have had some severe setbacks, whether under

Democrats or Republicans, is just the wrong thing to do.

□ 1415

I remember the days when people would say: Get some good grades and live a good life and do the right thing and you can run for public office.

I like to believe that not every Republican kid comes from a rich family. I like to believe that they have the same aspirations, no matter what the political party is.

But today, in communities throughout these great United States, if somebody says they want to serve in the local, State, or Federal Government, what is the first thing you ask? How much money do you have? And then, you contribute that to the negative ads, where an Independent listens to Republicans and the Democrats, and are they turned off?

But assuming that some foreigner wants to interfere with a local election, that should bring Democrats and Republicans together. We can fuss with each other, but we certainly don't like foreigners to interfere with our foreign policy.

Recently we have had some people come right here to the well from foreign governments and criticize our President. Criticism is one thing, but financing a political party or a political candidate is repugnant to everything that we stand for.

If you really want to accumulate hundreds of millions of dollars to support an individual, why in the heck would you not want your name to be known?

To say that the IRS cannot collect information is opening the door to a terrible thing that can happen to our country. If you want to break all of the laws which put caps on how much you are spending, then use a charitable organization and say: Hey, it is listed not as political, but I can get away with it.

It is the wrong thing to do, not for Republicans, but for Americans.

You know, people try to get even. To the victor belongs the spoils. So this time, it is Obama, and he is leaving. But I really think that the principle of having people go into public service is being shattered by this type of thing, where foreigners and rich people can make contributions and not be proud enough to state it.

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

The gentleman from New York asked a provocative question. Here is why you don't want this type of capacity in the hands of the IRS, I would say, and it is this reason: there is a fundamental lack of trust. The IRS has run roughshod over people's freedoms in the past.

The Commissioner himself has said: I don't need this information. We don't need this information. There are other entities—that is, the Federal Election Commission, the Bank Secrecy Act, and so forth—that are in place that are protections against foreign influence. But, basically, the IRS—and based on

the work that the committee has done—I would argue, we have seen where the IRS has not treated these things well.

So go back to a case that is famous, a case from years ago, a case during the civil rights movement, where the NAACP was told: You have to disclose your donor information.

How absurd. How ridiculous. How unconstitutional, in fact, that was. We are not at the same threshold, I would submit, as the NAACP case, but I would suggest that there is something untoward about an agency here—the Internal Revenue Service—that has what? Power to take things away, power to put people in prison. And you are giving them information that they have squandered and abused in that past.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSKAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Let me make it perfectly clear. If the IRS had leaked information or had not done their job, they should not only be investigated, they should go to trial, and those who violate the law ought to be convicted and serve time for it.

You don't just take away the opportunity for somebody. I am not suggesting that you don't have rich people or foreign governments that are not nice people, but we should not provide a vehicle for them to influence our elections.

Just because the Commissioner says, I don't need additional responsibility, I don't care whether he is appointed by a Democrat or a Republican, it is not for Commissioners to say what is good for this country. It is for this House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. ROSKAM. Reclaiming my time, I agree.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) to give us more insight.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act.

As we debate this legislation, I think back to June of 2013, when victims of the IRS targeting testified before our Ways and Means Committee, including someone from my own State, a fellow Tennessean, Kevin Kookogey, who is the founder of Linchpins of Liberty.

This legislation protects groups like Kevin's from further IRS abuse by repealing the so-called Schedule B requirement that compels tax exempt organizations to turn over names, addresses, and other personal identifiable information of their donors.

Now, we know this information has been misused before and that the IRS, as has already been said, doesn't use this information to determine a tax exempt status anyway.

So why in a free country would these groups need to turn over such personal information in the first place?

We should all be asking ourselves that question. This information is not

needed, and it will protect those who choose to give to those organizations without having their information misused.

Let's fix this problem today. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 5053.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this House, the Republican leadership has failed to provide sufficient investment in major emergencies facing Americans. They have refused to address the horrible epidemic of gun violence that plagues communities like mine and provides extremists an easy tool to kill dozens of people in minutes.

Further, the Republican leadership has refused to give sufficient funds to combat the Zika virus, risking the health and well-being of Americans. They have refused to raise the minimum wage to help working families improve their quality of life and have advanced efforts to reduce access to school meals for low-income children.

Yet, today, the priority of Republican leadership is a bill to blindfold the Internal Revenue Service to large donors to any 501(c) organizations except under very narrow circumstances, opening the floodgates for unlimited, anonymous donations, possibly from foreign sources.

The confidential disclosure of donors provides an important check on secret money from foreign governments or individuals that could be funneled into our elections. This is not a freedom of speech issue. This is not a fight for American freedom. This is a fight to protect the secret efforts to funnel so much money into certain coffers to undermine the integrity of our election system.

I strongly oppose this bill and hope the Republican leadership will focus on addressing the true emergencies facing American families, such as gun violence, hunger, poverty, and health. These are real deal issues.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act.

The IRS requires tax exempt organizations to report sensitive information about their donors, but, frankly, the information is unnecessary.

There are numerous examples of the IRS targeting political groups, which demonstrates that the IRS is incapable of using this information for legitimate purposes. Even the IRS itself has indicated it is considering eliminating this requirement. By eliminating the IRS' power to inquire into the membership of private citizen groups, taxpayers' identities will be protected and the IRS will be prevented from improperly targeting certain organizations.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5053 to hold the IRS

accountable and act in the best interest of the American taxpayer.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of our committee and chairman of our Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is, first, important to clarify this legislation impacts tax exempt organizations under the Tax Code, section 501(c). Many of these tax exempt organizations we recognize as charities, like United Way and so forth, foundations. Social welfare organizations, they come in any variety.

A social welfare organization, typically when we think social welfare, it means, essentially, organizations that are promoting the common good and the general welfare of the people of a community. Social welfare organizations.

What the problem, then, here is that we have seen so many social welfare organizations, the 501(c)(4)s, become not promoters of social good, but some of the biggest campaign spenders in our election process. They use the loopholes in the Tax Code to be able to collect a whole bunch of money that usually Americans think goes to do social welfare and instead is now being used to drive our campaigns.

So this is now the problem with this particular legislation. This legislation says: You know what? Those organizations right now have to document who is giving them money, who is contributing the dollars to them, if it is bigger than a \$5,000 contribution.

This bill says no longer would any of those 501(c) organizations, those tax exempt organizations, have to file the name of the contributor.

At a time, right now, when so many Americans have become skeptical about our government's ability to promote the interests of our citizens first, at a time when so many believe our government is driven by special interests, we should be asking for more openness in our government, not less in how we do business. Secret money is hijacking our American democracy.

This bill would prohibit the disclosure of substantial contributions and promote special interest secrecy.

What do I mean by that? This bill becomes a license to secretly influence our elections.

How? A foreign government doesn't like where American policy is going, so guess what? They want to influence who gets elected.

What do they do? They don't make a contribution to a candidate because they can't under the law.

What did they do? They now give to one of these social welfare organizations and let them use the money to politic in our campaigns.

And guess what? If this bill becomes law, you will never know the name of that foreign government or foreign government official who makes that

contribution. It can be a \$5,000 contribution. It can be a \$5 billion contribution. You never have to report it if you are one of these tax exempt organizations.

What else? Say there are drug traffickers who don't like that we may be getting tough on our drug laws. They don't like it. They want to elect people who won't be so tough. Because a drug trafficker won't give it directly to a candidate, they give it to one of these social welfare organizations. The social welfare organization, under this bill, won't have to report the contribution, the name of the contributor. If that drug trafficker gives \$5,000 or \$5 billion, it is never disclosed.

Who else? We are right now fighting ISIS. Say ISIS wants to make sure somebody gets elected to be the next President or a Member of Congress. They don't like somebody else. How do they influence our elections? They get one of their wealthy contributors to give money to one of these tax exempt organizations. And guess what? That ISIS contributor never gets disclosed.

Since when do Americans want us to have a system in our elections where contributions can be made to influence our elections if we don't know who is doing it?

If you don't believe it is true that that is going on, let me give you this statistic that will blow your mind. Four years ago, in our last Presidential election, the parties—the Democrat Party and the Republican Party combined, the parties that we know are there for politics—spent a quarter of a billion dollars in the 2012 elections.

Guess how much these social welfare organizations spent in that same election? More than the two parties combined.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1430

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, the parties spent \$255 million in 2012 politicking because that is what they are there to do. They have a partisan position, so they are using their money that people contribute to politick.

And by the way, when you make a contribution, you have got to report it when you make a contribution to that political party.

\$257 million in 2012 was spent by these social welfare organizations on politicking, and under this bill, if it becomes law, guess what? Those contributors won't have to be identified; and so whatever your motives, you get to influence our elections without the American people—who can't do the same thing, because if they give a contribution, they have got to disclose it—without the American people knowing who you are.

I don't believe that is where this country wants to go. And I don't care under what good-government kind of

window you try to frame this, what you are doing is you are opening the door for secret money to influence our elections—as if it isn't bad enough how much our elections are influenced by people who have wealth and do much more than the average American can ever do.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not a time to do that. Let's vote for openness. And if you vote for openness, you have to vote against this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, did you notice something? Every one of the examples of the previous speakers were hypothetical, every one of them, drug dealers, drug traffickers, an ISIS strategy, as if ISIS is sitting around not cutting people's heads off and writing checks. How absurd.

The notion that there is no documentation is a false claim. Of course people have to have documentation. Of course all of these organizations have to document. They have to maintain records. They are subject to audit. They are subject to investigation.

But here is the point. We have been able to demonstrate actual harm to actual people who are actually subject to a capricious and vicious attack by their own government. That is the Internal Revenue Service, who turned their stare at them and intimidated them. That is a fact.

This House voted on the criminal referral of Lois Lerner. This House has investigated, time and time and time again, to the point where our friends on the other side of the aisle have basically begged for mercy, said: Do we have to talk about the IRS anymore?

Well, yes, we do because this is the group that has been the bad actor, Mr. Speaker, in the past. Let's realize who we are talking about.

Now, I think it is very, very important for us to recognize that we have an opportunity to do something, and that is this: let's follow the lead of Commissioner Koskinen. If the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service thought, wow, ISIS is coming in here and they are coming over the ramparts and they are going to completely flood us, and we have got to watch out for ISIS and drug traffickers, why would Commissioner Koskinen say this: "On your 990, you list donors"—and we are not about to try to change that. "As a general matter, who gives to you should not matter as to what you're about to do."

In other words, these things that the other side is saying are illegal, they are illegal. There is nothing in this that changes that.

But there is a plot trap in their logic, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: the IRS, by their own admission, is not going through this on a systematic basis. They acknowledge that. They are not going through these Schedule B's on a systematic basis. They are not investigating them.

So what happens?

They are prohibited under the law, Mr. Speaker, from disclosing this information, under section 6103, that makes that disclosure a crime. Oh, it makes it a crime—unless they do it to some conservative group and it happens to be an accident.

To give us more insight on this, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I walked in and was hearing the gentleman from California talking about all these foreign donations, and I thought for sure he was talking about the Clinton Foundation donations from foreign governments, that there is a big question about their influence on policy and appointments and other things. That is why I was glad the gentleman clarified the topic at hand here.

What we are doing here, really, is protecting the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of speech. That is a very bedrock of our democratic society. As Benjamin Franklin once wrote: "Whoever would overthrow the Liberty of a Nation, must begin by subduing the Freedom of Speech."

See, American citizens should not be targeted by their own government for exercising their rights, their free speech, which is exactly why we are here today; because, under the Obama administration, the IRS has all too often targeted groups based on their political affiliation.

I don't care whether you are liberal, conservative, or somewhere in between, you shouldn't have your government targeting you, through the IRS, based on your political views. And they even disclosed the identities of supporters of these organizations.

This commonsense bill would protect the First Amendment by prohibiting the IRS from collecting sensitive information about citizens who support nonprofit organizations like charities, like education organizations, trade associations, and more.

This would, of course, apply to future administrations, too, and will simply serve to strengthen our constitutional right to free speech, no matter what party occupies the White House.

Even some IRS officials have admitted they don't need this information to enforce the Tax Code, though I imagine they did find it useful when they "accidentally" leaked at least one conservative organization's list of supporters to another nonprofit that, in turn, made that list public.

This bill would take away this power from the agency completely. That will greatly reduce the chance this could happen again. Doing so would protect taxpayers' identities and sensitive information, and help prevent the IRS from going after certain organizations because they don't agree with that organization's mission.

So I urge support of this thoughtful legislation. Let's prevent taxpayers, protect them, and prevent abuse of taxpayers, and protect their free speech rights under the Constitution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, can I ask how much time is available? How much time do we have, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to my friend from Illinois and some of his comments, and my friend from Oregon.

The Clinton Foundation, great that you raise that because, see, the Clinton Foundation has raised a lot of questions in the minds of some. At least, some are trying to politicize it, whether you agree or don't agree with the money that came, because some money did come from foreign sources.

This bill would terminate the need for the Clinton Foundation to report any sources of its income. So, if you are concerned that the Clinton Foundation has gotten some contributions from foreign sources, this bill makes it worse because, under this legislation, the Clinton Foundation wouldn't have to report any of those contributions anymore. And so that is the craziness of this legislation.

It is not speculation to say what will happen. We have gone from virtually zero spending by social welfare organizations that are tax exempt for political purposes to, now, these social welfare organizations spending more than the political parties spend together.

So it is not speculation. The expert from the Joint Tax Committee said so himself. This is what will happen, could happen, if we pass this legislation.

Please reject this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I think I am the last speaker on this side, so I am prepared to close, but I will defer to the gentleman from Michigan if he wants to wind it up.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who has worked so hard for so long on this issue. It is a privilege.

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, fundamentally, this is about which direction we want to move in as a country, as a Congress, as a responsible institution, as a government, in terms of whether we are going to respect the American people and their voice, whether we are going to turn their voice over to Big Money, to special interests that are hijacking our politics and our government.

The problem with the proposal that is being put on the floor today is that it is moving us in the wrong direction. It is moving us away from the kind of disclosure information transparency in our political process that the American people are demanding.

If you talk to the average person out there, they feel disrespected, locked out, left out, left behind, pushed to the margins of their own democracy, feeling as though Big Money calls the shots, the insiders rule the roost, and the average person has no voice, is of no consequence.

They see the money being spent on these campaign commercials during election time. They don't know where it is coming from. They don't know what organizations are supporting it, and they feel like they don't have a stake in their own democracy anymore.

What is interesting is that, you know, traditionally, in the past, Republicans had argued for more transparency and disclosure; that all political activity, all contributions that were made and all expenditures, should be divulged. In fact, in 1996, MITCH MCCONNELL, the majority leader in the Senate, declared, proudly: "Public disclosure of campaign contributions"—public disclosure of campaign contributions—"and spending should be expedited so voters can judge for themselves what is appropriate."

We are moving even further away from public disclosure because this bill would say that the IRS isn't even going to be able to collect information on who is donating to these 501(c)(3) organizations. So at a time when the American people are saying we need more accountability in our politics, in our government when it comes to this secret money that is out there, at a time when Americans want more accountability, this bill moves us towards less accountability. It will move secret money even further into the shadows and contribute further to a less responsive and less transparent democracy.

I can hear the American people saying to the Republicans who are putting this on the bill, who are authoring this legislation: Are you new here? Are you new in this current environment, political environment, where we are so angry, as the American people, that we want to understand who is trying to hijack our politics, and you are going to move us in the opposite direction?

People already feel locked out. We don't have to do more to push them in that direction. We need more accountability, not less. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill today.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons people feel locked out and left out is the cold notion that the government that is supposed to be collecting taxes and evaluating things according to the law, it turns out that they were acting for a malevolent reason. It turns out that they were going after the very people that they were supposed to protect. Turns out they were investigating based on religious belief, political belief, education belief, and so forth.

So it is no wonder that the public feels disconnected from this. It is no

wonder that they feel like they were trusting somebody that was just supposed to collect taxes and then they learned that they were being targeted. That is part of the locked out and left out feeling.

There is another problem, too, with the logic of the argument that we heard just a minute ago, and there is somehow an implication that this information is supposed to be public. That is news. Schedule B isn't public today, and nobody is proposing that it be public. And, in fact, the courts have said it would be unconstitutional to make it public.

So who is the beneficiary of this information, Mr. Speaker, if it is not the public, because it is not the public according to the law now. Who would be the beneficiary?

Oh, the IRS. They are the only ones, Mr. Speaker, that have access to this information. The public doesn't have it. And we already learned what happened. The courts have said: You cannot tell the NAACP, you cannot make them reveal their donors.

By that logic that we heard a minute ago, those organizations, during the civil rights movement, what would they have had to do? They would have had to disclose all of that information. And thanks be to God, Mr. Speaker, that the Court said no.

Speech is special, speech is sacrosanct, and speech ought not be manipulated and intimidated by people with power.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

□ 1445

Mr. SARBANES. I just wanted to respond to this idea that the public wouldn't benefit from this. Yes, there are opportunities to develop more disclosure of this information to the public, and certainly the Democrats would like to see that. But the public would benefit from the IRS' getting more information about where this money comes from because it is the IRS' responsibility to determine whether these 501(c)(3) organizations are getting hijacked and taken over by special interest money—potentially foreign interest—and so forth. So the public would absolutely benefit if the IRS, which is the organization that has responsibility for determining whether you should have tax-exempt status or not, can fulfill that function on behalf of the public, and this would make it even more difficult for that agency to do its job in that respect.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion here about abuse. There was mismanagement. I was among those who indicated that the person or the two people most responsible should be relieved of their duties.

It is also true, when we asked the inspector general, "Did you find any evidence of political motivation in the selection of the tax-exemption applications," the answer of the inspector general was, "We did not, sir," period.

There is another abuse here, and that is the abuse of 501(c)(4)s. It is scandalous. They are supposed to be doing social welfare. What has happened is they have used the mask of legality, many of these, to essentially become political organizations. That is the scandal.

Essentially what the Republican Party is doing here is saying that they want to essentially pull a mask over what is scandalous.

As Mr. SARBANES said, this bill goes in the wrong direction. We need more disclosure, not less.

The Achilles' heel in the argument of Mr. ROSKAM and others is this: A foreign government has to now disclose to IRS; a foreign individual would have to disclose a contribution that was illegal. They essentially want to eliminate that requirement in terms of this form altogether—eliminate it—so that there would be no way of knowing through that operation when there was a violation by a foreign government or an individual trying to influence the political process of this country.

It is bad enough that domestic money reigns so supremely. Essentially what the majority here wants to do is add foreign operations to that process.

You say that speech is power. But speech backed up by hidden money essentially undermines the democratic processes of this country. What you are doing today is coming forth here and essentially wanting to give a further imprimatur to this distortion of the democratic process. Money reigns too strongly in the political process, and you now essentially want to say: if it is foreign, all the better. It is terrible.

It is terrible what is going on in this country today in terms of the power of money over the political process. You make it worse by essentially inviting foreign entities to join in that distortion of democracy in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong "no" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The foreign money invitation is a straw man argument, and we have spent a lot of time on it talking about it this afternoon. But remember, all these activities are legal. Also remember that it is the Internal Revenue Service based on past practice that has developed or communicated an inability to hold confidential information close. That is important.

It is also important to recognize that it was the Internal Revenue Service Commissioner who has essentially said: We don't need this information. We have had this debate and basically an admonition against the campaign finance laws. The minority's objection is largely directed to the United States

Supreme Court and their conclusion in the Citizens United decision. That is all fine, well, and good.

But let's focus in here on what we are actually talking about. What we are talking about is the lack of trust that we have in the Internal Revenue Service based on past activities to hold this information close, based on their projections about their challenges as it relates to cybersecurity and identity theft, and I think a general recognition of the chilling effect of what happens when you have an organization that chooses to target people based on their political speech.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have thoroughly debated this. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5053, Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act is a common sense bill meant to help curb the rampant abuses of the IRS, an agency that has proven itself to be completely out of control in recent years.

In April, Federal Judge David Sentelle said that the IRS can't be trusted, and that there is strong evidence that the agency violated the constitutional rights of conservative groups when it delayed their nonprofit status applications and asked inappropriate questions about their political beliefs.

Currently, the IRS requires non-profits to submit a schedule B form, listing the names and addresses of their donors. According to the law, the IRS is forbidden from using this form for any purpose.

If they are forbidden from using this form for any purpose then, why are they even allowed to ask for this information? This doesn't make any sense.

This is another "mistake" waiting to happen. The mere presence of this form will make it easier for unscrupulous employees to target individuals for increased scrutiny based on their political beliefs or what non-profit they choose to give money to.

I have seen this kind of political targeting first hand with my constituent Catherine Engelbrecht in Houston Texas. She was targeted because she dared to attempt to start a voting integrity group called True the Vote.

This kind of political targeting needs to stop. It's un-American and Unconstitutional.

We need to reign in the IRS, and H.R. 5053 is a step in the right direction.

And that's just the way it is.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 778, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. 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. Sarbanes moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5053 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON REQUIRING CONTRIBUTOR IDENTITY NOT TO APPLY IN CASE OF ORGANIZATION INTERVENING IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall not apply in the case of an organization described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which directly or indirectly participates in, or intervenes in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SARBANES. 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, we have had a debate here today on this larger issue of accountability to the American people when it comes to our politics, the way we govern, and the huge amounts of secret money that are pouring into our politics in a way that has left the average American feeling cynical and disconnected from their democracy. If anything, what Americans want to see is not less information and less accountability when it comes to politics, but more of it.

Now, many people out there are just kind of hanging on by a fingernail in terms of any confidence or trust when it comes to our democracy and our politics because they see how Big Money has sort of taken over the conversation and that the megaphone that Big Money has is hard to compete with if you are just a regular person out there who wants your voice to be heard. But it is made even worse when you don't know who is holding that megaphone when that speech comes in with all that money behind it and you don't know who the speaker is because that is hidden away because all of this money has become secret.

One of the mechanisms that is being used by Big Money out there to kind of foist themselves onto our politics and push average Americans on to the margins of their own democracy is to go in there and try and hijack, commandeer, and takeover these 501(c) organizations. These tax exempt organizations end up really engaging primarily in political activity but are masquerading as these 501(c) organizations that are supposed to be engaged in tax exempt activities.

So what this motion to recommit would do is pretty straightforward. It says that if one of these 501(c) tax exempt organizations—and I am reading now from the motion to recommit, from the amendment that would be made—is directly or indirectly participating in or intervening in any political campaign on behalf of or in opposi-

tion to any candidate for public office, then in that instance, the IRS ought to be able to collect that information on who their donors are.

Look, it makes sense. Taxpayers out there are saying: We understand that there are organizations that should be tax exempt because of the good work that they are doing, that they are actually social welfare organizations, the local Boys & Girls Club, organizations like that, providing a public benefit. That is okay. We will pay our taxes. But we understand that those organizations shouldn't have to because they are doing something that is good for the public and good for the community and so forth.

But if an organization is getting taken over by some group that has got a political goal or political objective, then it shouldn't be entitled to that tax exemption anymore.

That is what this motion to recommit says: You don't get to deny the IRS the kind of information that will allow them to make a judgment as to whether you deserve to have that tax exempt status. So that is all that we are trying to do.

There are two things that the IRS needs to look at when they are deciding whether a C organization is engaged primarily in political activity. One is, where is the money going? How are they spending it? They will be able to see that. But the other is, where is the money coming from that is getting spent? Who is behind the thing? That helps them decide, is this organization really fulfilling tax exempt purposes, or is it just masquerading that way when, in fact, what it is doing is engaged primarily in political activity?

So we want the IRS to have the information that allows them to reach a judgment as to whether an organization that is benefiting from this tax exemption really deserves to get that tax exemption. That is what this motion to recommit would do.

We need more accountability, not less, in our politics. We need more information to decide who appropriately is benefiting from this tax exempt status.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, and I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit essentially says this: All kind of speech is sacred, and all types of speech should be protected, except certain kinds. So you can say whatever you want to say, you can say it however you want to say it, but if it is political, we are going to treat it differently. And that is the problem; that is absolutely the problem.

H.R. 5053 is commonsense legislation that protects Americans from having their information improperly disclosed.

It eliminates a burdensome reporting requirement for not-for-profits, and the IRS itself has indicated that it doesn't use the reported information for tax enforcement.

There is absolutely no reason not to eliminate the Schedule B on the Form 990. Not only is it unnecessary, but the IRS doesn't have a good track record at protecting sensitive information or treating everyone fairly. We shouldn't be giving the Internal Revenue Service access to this information, especially when they don't need it to do their job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion, "yes" on H.R. 5053, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of the motion to recommit H.R. 5053, and

Passage of H.R. 5053, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Any remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PREVENTING IRS ABUSE AND PROTECTING FREE SPEECH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 5053) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from requiring that the identity of contributors to 501(c) organizations be included in annual returns, offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 238, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—180

Adams	Garamendi	Napolitano
Aguilar	Graham	Neal
Ashford	Grayson	Nolan
Bass	Green, Al	Norcross
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Becerra	Grijalva	Pallone
Bera	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Beyer	Hahn	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Pelosi
Blum	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Higgins	Peters
Bonamici	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Honda	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Bustos	Israel	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capps	Jeffries	Rangel
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carney	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	T. Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	Lawrence	Serrano
Courtney	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cueellar	Lewis	Sinema
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Loebsack	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Speier
DeGette	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lowe	Takano
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	(NM)	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tonko
Doggett	(NM)	Torres
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Tsongas
F.	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Carolyn	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Edwards	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCaul	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McDermott	Walz
Esty	McGovern	Wasserman
Farr	McNerney	Schultz
Foster	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Moulton	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Gallego	Nadler	

NAYS—238

Abraham	Amodei	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Benishek
Allen	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (MI)

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

NOT VOTING—16

Boyle, Brendan	Fattah	Mulvaney
F.	Forbes	Rigell
Cicilline	Goodlatte	Takai
Deutch	Herrera Beutler	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Hinojosa	Wilson (FL)
Duffy	Moore	

□ 1622

Messrs. ROONEY of Florida, BRAT, and CULBERSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. POCAN, HUFFMAN, Ms. BASS, Messrs. HIMES and CLYBURN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 302.

Stated against:

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, during the second voting series today, I intended to vote “nay” in accordance with leadership recommendation on the first vote, Democrat Motion to Recommit H.R. 5053—Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech. I inadvertently voted “yes.” I intended to vote “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—240

Abraham	Fitzpatrick	Long
Aderholt	Fleischmann	Loudermilk
Allen	Fleming	Love
Amash	Flores	Lucas
Amodei	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Babin	Fox	Lummis
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	MacArthur
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Barton	Garrett	Marino
Benishek	Gibbs	Massie
Bilirakis	Gohmert	McCarthy
Bishop (MI)	Gosar	McCaul
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	McClintock
Black	Granger	McHenry
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Blum	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Bost	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Boustany	Griffith	McSally
Brady (TX)	Grothman	Meadows
Brat	Guinta	Meehan
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Messer
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Mica
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Miller (FL)
Buchanan	Harper	Miller (MI)
Buck	Harris	Moolenaar
Bucshon	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Mullin
Byrne	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer
Carter (GA)	Hill	Newhouse
Carter (TX)	Holding	Noem
Chabot	Hudson	Nugent
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Nunes
Clawson (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Coffman	Hultgren	Palazzo
Cole	Hunter	Palmer
Collins (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Paulsen
Collins (NY)	Hurt (VA)	Pearce
Comstock	Issa	Perry
Conaway	Jenkins (KS)	Peterson
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Pitts
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Crawford	Jolly	Poliquin
Crenshaw	Jones	Pompeo
Culberson	Jordan	Posey
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce	Price, Tom
Davidson	Katko	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Reed
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Reichert
Dent	King (IA)	Renacci
DeSantis	King (NY)	Ribble
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Roby
Dold	Knight	Roe (TN)
Donovan	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Ellmers (NC)	Lamborn	Rokita
Emmer (MN)	Lance	Rooney (FL)
Farenthold	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Fincher	LoBiondo	Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

□ 1630

Ms. BROWN of Florida changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 14, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 14, 2016 at 3:45 p.m.:

That the Senate concur in the House amendment to the bill S. 2276.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5293, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 778 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5293.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1633

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to present the Appropriations Committee recommendation for the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

I would like to begin by paying tribute to those who are not with us today—our men and women in uniform—all volunteers—who serve all across the globe defending our freedom. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines provide the mantle of security that allows us to meet in settings like this every day, and they should never be far from our minds.

Mr. Chairman, they, those who serve in uniform and their families, deserve our heartfelt thanks for their personal sacrifice.

I also want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY for their support during the process, and special thanks to my counterpart, PETE VISCLOSKEY, for his partnership in this effort. I thank him for his assistance and collaboration.

Mr. Chairman, our Defense Subcommittee conducted 11 formal hearings and had numerous briefings to help shape this legislation. These meetings allowed us to look in great detail into our national defense posture and the capabilities of our adversaries and our partners, and we are very concerned by what we see.

Over the past several years, we have largely focused on the dangers posed by Islamic terrorist organizations—al Qaeda, barbaric ISIS, al-Nusrah, and others. They remain a clear and present danger. But in recent years, new threats have emerged: a more aggressive and capable Russia, an expansionist China, emboldened states like Iran, and rogue nations like North Korea. At the same time, we are dealing with fiscal constraints imposed by sequestration and budget caps.

So, looking today at our Department of Defense and intelligence community, we note that our readiness levels are alarmingly low for our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen; our decisive technological edge over our adversaries is eroding; and our adversaries' resolve and their capability are only growing.

The bill before you begins to reverse these trends by providing more money for national security.

This measure includes a total of \$575.8 billion for the Department of Defense for functions under our subcommittee's jurisdiction and \$58.6 billion for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism funding.

Our recommendation mirrors the funding structure that the House Armed Services Committee and this House approved a few weeks ago and shifts roughly \$16 billion from the President's request for OCO operations into critical investments in our personnel, training, and equipment, while

NOES—182

Adams
Aguilar
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)
Chu, Judy
Ciحline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Dingell
Duffy
Fattah
Forbes
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Moore
Mulvaney
Rigell
Takai
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

providing a bridge fund for our overseas operations through the end of April of 2017.

By that time, our new Commander in Chief will be able to assess our defense posture, reevaluate readiness levels and recapitalization efforts, and request a targeted supplemental to support our troops. Congress did a similar maneuver in 2008.

I am confident that Members of this House will work in a bipartisan way to ensure that this essential supplemental appropriations legislation is passed when that time comes. Rest assured that we will never let our troops down.

By providing a bridge fund to next April, our bill is able to make targeted investments in additional manning for the Army, Marines, and Air Force, more training, as well as the equipment they rely upon—all designed to repair the worrisome readiness gaps we see across our Armed Forces.

We currently have the lowest manning level in the Army since before World War II, and this legislation boosts Army and Marine Corps end strength.

Despite the Secretary's assurances that we are on our way to a 300-ship Navy, we now have 273 in our fleet, which is smaller than at any time since before World War I. This bill funds a significant increase in shipbuilding.

Our Air Force is flying the oldest planes in its entire history, and the bill before you boosts the modernization of our fighters, bombers, tankers, and other aircraft.

We are also able to increase funding by \$9.6 billion for equipment the service chiefs have requested in their unmet needs list.

Our investments will allow our military services to fully meet critical training requirements, such as flying hours, steaming days, depot mainte-

nance, ground training, facilities improvement, and base operations.

I also want to note that our legislation again includes \$500 million to continue improvements for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance for our combatant commanders. They need it; they will welcome it.

Mr. Chairman, as I close, I want to make an observation about this year's debate. The President's spokesman and Secretary of Defense were quick to criticize the funding structure of the National Defense Authorization bill and, indeed, this proposal, and issued a veto threat against our bill this morning.

The White House and Secretary Carter have suggested we are, in their own words, "gambling" with our troops' mission in the Middle East and that our approach is somehow "irresponsible" or, in their own words, "dangerous."

But what was really "gambling," "irresponsible," and "dangerous" was the administration's decision to pull all of our troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan—against the advice of our military leadership—and not anticipate that the resulting vacuum would be filled by ISIS, the Taliban, and other terrorist groups.

What was "gambling," "irresponsible," and "dangerous" was—and is—the constant changing of the military rules of engagement to meet political objectives.

What was "gambling" and "irresponsible" was ousting Qadhafi in Libya without any plan whatsoever for the aftermath.

Indeed, it is "gambling," "irresponsible," and "dangerous" to believe that Iran would not violate any aspects of the Geneva Agreement.

And surely it was a "gamble" to believe that the American people would ignore the capture and provocative

treatment of 10 American sailors seized by the Iranian regime last January; and surely it was a "gamble" that the American people would not pay attention to increased military operations in Syria and Iraq and, yes, the tragic deaths of American service personnel, if the President refused to call them "combat operations."

There is more happening in the Middle East today than the airstrikes against ISIS, and we need to thank those warfighters on the ground that are there as we gather here this afternoon. They are risking their lives right now—every day—and their families are dispirited because their sons and daughters are in combat and do sustain injuries while the administration hides behind semantics of "no boots on the ground." There are boots on the ground.

Further, it was "gambling" and "dangerous" to establish a poorly thought-out and poorly executed "train and equip" scheme in Syria, or to conclude that Russia and China would not cease their aggressive challenges to American superiority around the world.

My friends, one thing we can all agree upon is that the last 2 years of budget cuts, constant deployments, and new crises have only eroded our military's readiness and capabilities.

The bill before you does not gamble. It is highly responsible.

Rather, our proposal wisely invests more money for our troops, more training for our troops, more modern equipment, expanded cybersecurity, more intelligence-gathering capabilities, and better healthcare outcomes for our troops and their families.

Mr. Chairman, it deserves your support; it deserves our support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army.....	41,045,562	40,028,182	39,986,962	-1,058,600	-41,220
Military Personnel, Navy.....	27,835,183	27,951,605	27,774,605	-60,578	-177,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps.....	12,859,152	12,813,412	12,701,412	-157,740	-112,000
Military Personnel, Air Force.....	27,679,066	27,944,615	27,794,615	+115,549	-150,000
Reserve Personnel, Army.....	4,483,164	4,561,793	4,458,983	-4,201	-102,740
Reserve Personnel, Navy.....	1,866,891	1,924,155	1,898,825	+31,934	-25,330
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps.....	702,481	744,995	736,305	+33,824	-8,690
Reserve Personnel, Air Force.....	1,682,942	1,742,906	1,718,126	+36,184	-24,780
National Guard Personnel, Army.....	7,892,327	7,910,894	7,827,440	-64,887	-83,254
National Guard Personnel, Air Force.....	3,201,890	3,280,065	3,271,215	+69,325	-8,850
Total, Title I, Military Personnel.....	129,228,658	128,902,332	128,168,468	-1,060,190	-733,864
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army.....	32,399,440	33,809,040	34,436,295	+2,036,855	+627,255
Operation and Maintenance, Navy.....	39,600,172	39,483,581	40,213,485	+613,313	+729,904
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps.....	5,718,074	5,954,258	6,246,360	+528,292	+292,108
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.....	35,727,457	37,518,056	38,209,602	+2,482,145	+691,546
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide.....	32,105,040	32,571,590	32,263,224	+158,184	-308,366
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve.....	2,648,911	2,712,331	2,767,471	+120,660	+55,140
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve.....	998,481	927,656	975,724	-22,757	+48,068
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve.....	274,526	270,633	320,088	+45,540	+49,433
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve.....	2,980,788	3,067,929	3,106,068	+125,298	+38,137
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.....	6,595,483	6,825,370	6,923,595	+328,112	+98,225
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard.....	6,820,589	6,703,578	6,708,200	-112,369	+4,622
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.....	14,078	14,194	14,194	+116	---
Environmental Restoration, Army.....	234,829	170,167	170,167	-64,662	---
Environmental Restoration, Navy.....	300,000	281,762	289,282	-10,738	+7,500
Environmental Restoration, Air Force.....	368,131	371,521	371,521	+3,390	---
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.....	8,232	9,009	9,009	+777	---
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites.....	231,217	197,084	222,084	-9,133	+25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.....	103,266	105,125	108,125	+4,859	+3,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction Account.....	358,496	325,604	325,604	-32,892	---
Total, Title II, Operation and maintenance.....	187,485,170	171,318,488	173,680,060	+6,194,890	+2,361,572
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army.....	5,866,367	3,614,787	4,628,897	-1,237,670	+1,013,910
Missile Procurement, Army.....	1,600,957	1,519,966	1,502,377	-98,580	-17,589
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.....	1,951,646	2,265,177	2,244,547	+292,901	-20,630
Procurement of Ammunition, Army.....	1,245,426	1,513,157	1,513,157	+267,731	---
Other Procurement, Army.....	5,718,811	5,873,949	6,081,856	+363,045	+207,907
Aircraft Procurement, Navy.....	17,521,209	14,109,148	15,900,093	-1,621,116	+1,790,945
Weapons Procurement, Navy.....	3,049,542	3,209,262	3,102,544	+53,802	-106,718
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps.....	651,920	684,368	601,563	-50,357	-62,805
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy.....	18,704,539	18,354,874	18,484,524	-220,015	+129,650
Other Procurement, Navy.....	6,484,257	6,338,861	6,099,326	-384,931	-239,535
Procurement, Marine Corps.....	1,186,812	1,362,769	1,213,872	+27,060	-148,897
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.....	15,756,853	13,922,917	14,325,117	-1,431,736	+402,200
Missile Procurement, Air Force.....	2,912,131	2,426,621	2,288,772	-623,359	-137,849
Space Procurement, Air Force.....	2,812,159	3,055,743	2,538,152	-274,007	-517,591
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.....	1,744,993	1,677,719	1,609,719	-135,274	-68,000
Other Procurement, Air Force.....	18,311,882	17,438,056	17,342,313	-969,569	-95,743
Procurement, Defense-Wide.....	5,245,443	4,524,918	4,649,876	-595,567	+124,958
Defense Production Act Purchases.....	76,680	44,065	74,065	-2,615	+30,000
Total, Title III, Procurement.....	110,841,627	101,916,357	104,200,570	-8,641,057	+2,284,213

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	7,585,327	7,515,399	7,884,517	+299,190	+349,118
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	18,117,677	17,276,301	16,831,290	-1,286,387	-445,011
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force...	25,217,148	28,112,251	27,106,851	+1,889,703	-1,005,400
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	18,695,955	18,308,828	18,311,236	-384,719	+2,410
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	188,558	178,994	178,994	-9,564	---
Total, Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	69,784,665	71,391,771	70,292,888	+508,223	-1,098,863
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds.....	1,738,768	1,371,613	1,371,613	-367,155	---
National Defense Sealift Fund.....	474,164	---	---	-474,164	---
Total, Title V, Revolving and Management Funds....	2,212,932	1,371,613	1,371,613	-841,319	---
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program					
Operation and maintenance.....	29,842,167	32,231,390	31,096,337	+1,854,170	-535,053
Procurement.....	365,390	413,219	413,219	+47,829	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	2,121,933	822,907	1,467,007	-654,926	+644,100
Total, Defense Health Program 1/ 3/.....	32,329,490	33,467,516	33,576,563	+1,247,073	+109,047
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense:					
Operation and maintenance.....	118,198	147,282	147,282	+29,084	---
Procurement.....	2,281	15,132	15,132	+12,851	---
Research, development, test and evaluation.....	579,342	388,609	388,609	-190,733	---
Total, Chemical Agents 2/.....	699,821	551,023	551,023	-148,798	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense/1/					
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.....	1,050,598	844,800	908,800	-141,798	+64,000
Office of the Inspector General 1/.....	---	99,300	---	---	-99,300
Total, Title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,392,468	35,284,674	35,358,421	+965,953	+73,747
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund.....	514,000	514,000	514,000	---	---
Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA).....	505,206	533,596	483,596	-21,610	-50,000
Total, Title VII, Related agencies.....	1,019,206	1,047,596	997,596	-21,610	-50,000

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (Sec.8005).....	(4,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(4,500,000)	---	(-500,000)
FFRDC (Sec.8023).....	-65,000	---	-126,800	-61,800	-126,800
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery (Sec.8028).....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Rescissions (Sec.8041).....	-1,768,937	---	-1,283,416	+485,521	-1,283,416
National grants (Sec.8048).....	44,000	---	44,000	---	+44,000
O&M, Defense-wide transfer authority (Sec.8052).....	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---	---
Fisher House Foundation (Sec.8067).....	5,000	---	5,000	---	+5,000
Revised economic assumptions (Sec.8074).....	-1,500,789	---	-573,400	+927,389	-573,400
Fisher House O&M Army Navy Air Force transfer authority (Sec.8089).....	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	---	---
Defense Health O&M transfer authority (Sec.8093).....	(121,000)	(122,375)	(122,375)	(+1,375)	---
John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (O&M, Navy transfer authority).....	(1,000)	---	---	(-1,000)	---
Basic allowance for housing.....	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Working Capital Fund, Army excess cash balances (Sec.8118).....	-389,000	---	-336,000	+53,000	-336,000
Working Capital Fund, Defense-wide excess cash balances (rescission).....	-1,037,000	---	---	+1,037,000	---
Revised fuel costs (Sec.8117).....	-2,576,000	---	-1,493,000	+1,083,000	-1,493,000
Military pay raise (Sec.8131).....	---	---	340,000	+340,000	+340,000
Total, Title VIII, General Provisions.....	-6,986,726	---	-3,423,616	+3,563,110	-3,423,616

TITLE IX

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM
(GWOT)

Military Personnel

Military Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,846,356	2,051,578	1,271,302	-575,054	-780,276
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	1,154,828	+1,154,828	+1,154,828
Subtotal.....	1,846,356	2,051,578	2,426,130	+579,774	+374,552
Military Personnel, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	251,011	330,557	194,001	-57,010	-136,556
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	63,500	+63,500	+63,500
Subtotal.....	251,011	330,557	257,501	+6,490	-73,056
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	171,079	179,733	104,542	-66,537	-75,191
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	349,000	+349,000	+349,000
Subtotal.....	171,079	179,733	453,542	+282,463	+273,809
Military Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	726,126	719,896	446,792	-279,334	-273,104
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	145,000	+145,000	+145,000
Subtotal.....	726,126	719,896	591,792	-134,334	-128,104

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Reserve Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	24,462	42,506	30,812	+6,350	-11,694
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	172,362	+172,362	+172,362
Subtotal.....	24,462	42,506	203,174	+178,712	+160,668
Reserve Personnel, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	12,693	11,929	7,905	-4,788	-4,024
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,393	3,764	3,087	-306	-677
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	18,710	20,535	15,979	-2,731	-4,556
National Guard Personnel, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	166,015	196,472	120,514	-45,501	-75,958
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	316,454	+316,454	+316,454
Subtotal.....	166,015	196,472	436,968	+270,953	+240,496
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	2,828	5,288	4,125	+1,297	-1,163
Total, Military Personnel OCO/GWOT Requirements...	3,222,673	3,562,258	2,199,099	-1,023,614	-1,363,199
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	2,201,144	+2,201,144	+2,201,144
Grand Total, Military Personnel.....	3,222,673	3,562,258	4,400,203	+1,177,530	+837,945
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation & Maintenance, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	14,994,833	15,310,587	10,398,008	-4,598,825	-4,914,579
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	2,186,672	+2,186,672	+2,186,672
Subtotal.....	14,994,833	15,310,587	12,582,680	-2,412,153	-2,727,907
Operation & Maintenance, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	7,169,611	6,827,391	3,947,082	-3,222,529	-2,880,309
(Coast Guard) (by transfer) (GWOT).....	---	(162,692)	(162,692)	(+162,692)	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	1,082,170	+1,082,170	+1,082,170
Subtotal.....	7,169,611	6,827,391	5,029,252	-2,140,359	-1,798,139
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	1,372,534	1,244,359	749,596	-622,938	-494,763
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	166,900	+166,900	+166,900
Subtotal.....	1,372,534	1,244,359	916,496	-456,038	-327,863
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	11,128,813	9,498,830	5,909,780	-5,219,033	-3,589,050
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	960,626	+960,626	+960,626
Subtotal.....	11,128,813	9,498,830	6,870,406	-4,258,407	-2,628,424
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	5,665,633	5,962,173	3,544,434	-2,121,199	-2,437,739
(Coalition support funds) (GWOT).....	(1,160,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(-60,000)	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	351,000	+351,000	+351,000
Subtotal.....	5,665,633	5,962,173	3,895,434	-1,770,199	-2,086,739

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	99,559	38,679	85,666	-13,893	+46,967
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	186,381	+186,381	+186,381
Subtotal.....	99,559	38,679	272,047	+172,488	+233,358

Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	31,643	26,265	25,669	-6,974	-596
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	112,350	+112,350	+112,350
Subtotal.....	31,643	26,265	138,019	+106,378	+111,754

Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	3,455	3,304	5,078	+1,623	+1,774
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	24,550	+24,550	+24,550
Subtotal.....	3,455	3,304	29,628	+26,173	+26,324

Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	58,106	57,586	45,173	-12,933	-12,413
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	27,550	+27,550	+27,550
Subtotal.....	58,106	57,586	72,723	+14,617	+15,137

Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	135,845	127,035	142,341	+6,496	+15,306
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	237,880	+237,880	+237,880
Subtotal.....	135,845	127,035	380,221	+244,376	+253,186

Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	19,900	20,000	31,086	+11,186	+11,086
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	247,950	+247,950	+247,950
Subtotal.....	19,900	20,000	279,036	+259,136	+259,036

Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance.....	40,679,932	39,136,209	30,465,942	-10,213,990	-8,670,267

Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (GWOT).....	1,100,000	1,000,000	750,000	-350,000	-250,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (GWOT).....	3,652,257	3,448,715	3,448,715	-203,542	---
Iraq Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	715,000	630,000	---	-715,000	-630,000
Counter-ISIL Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	---	880,000	+880,000	+880,000
Syria Train and Equip Fund (GWOT).....	---	250,000	---	---	-250,000

Total, Operation and Maintenance OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	46,147,189	44,464,924	29,960,628	-16,186,561	-14,504,296
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	5,584,029	+5,584,029	+5,584,029

Grand Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	46,147,189	44,464,924	35,544,657	-10,602,532	-8,920,267
=====					

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	161,987	313,171	313,171	+151,184	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	481,900	+481,900	+481,900
Subtotal	161,987	313,171	795,071	+633,084	+481,900
Missile Procurement, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	37,280	632,817	632,817	+595,537	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	196,100	+196,100	+196,100
Subtotal	37,280	632,817	828,917	+791,637	+196,100
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	486,630	153,544	398,544	-88,086	+245,000
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	212,000	+212,000	+212,000
Subtotal	486,630	153,544	610,544	+123,914	+457,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	222,040	301,523	301,523	+79,483	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	240,200	+240,200	+240,200
Subtotal	222,040	301,523	541,723	+319,683	+240,200
Other Procurement, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	1,175,596	1,373,010	1,373,010	+197,414	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	8,400	+8,400	+8,400
Subtotal	1,175,596	1,373,010	1,381,410	+205,814	+8,400
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	210,990	393,030	344,323	+133,333	-48,707
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	626,714	+626,714	+626,714
Subtotal	210,990	393,030	971,037	+760,047	+578,007
Weapons Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	---	8,600	8,600	+8,600	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	175,100	+175,100	+175,100
Subtotal	---	8,600	183,700	+183,700	+175,100
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	117,966	66,229	62,540	-55,428	-3,689
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	58,000	+58,000	+58,000
Subtotal	117,966	66,229	120,540	+2,574	+54,311
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	3,086,300	+3,086,300	+3,086,300
Other Procurement, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	12,186	124,206	111,551	+99,365	-12,655
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	102,530	+102,530	+102,530
Subtotal	12,186	124,206	214,081	+201,895	+89,875
Procurement, Marine Corps (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	56,934	118,939	106,204	+49,270	-12,735
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	107,463	+107,463	+107,463
Subtotal	56,934	118,939	213,667	+156,733	+94,728
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	128,900	859,399	709,833	+580,933	-149,566
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	1,295,716	+1,295,716	+1,295,716
Subtotal	128,900	859,399	2,005,549	+1,876,649	+1,146,150

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Procurement					
Missile Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	289,142	339,545	141,375	-147,767	-198,170
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	194,420	+194,420	+194,420
Subtotal	289,142	339,545	335,795	+46,853	-3,750
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	228,874	487,408	155,158	-73,716	-332,250
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	323,000	+323,000	+323,000
Subtotal	228,874	487,408	478,158	+249,284	-9,250
Other Procurement, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	3,477,001	3,696,261	3,479,781	+2,780	-216,500
Procurement, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	173,918	238,434	219,134	+45,216	-19,300
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	170,000	+170,000	+170,000
Subtotal	173,918	238,434	389,134	+215,216	+150,700
National Guard and Reserve Equipment (GWOT)	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	+1,000,000
Total, Procurement OCO/GWOT Requirements	7,779,424	9,106,136	9,357,564	+1,578,140	+251,428
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements	---	---	7,277,843	+7,277,843	+7,277,843
Grand Total, Procurement	7,779,424	9,106,136	16,635,407	+8,855,983	+7,529,271
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	1,500	100,522	100,522	+99,022	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	67,000	+67,000	+67,000
Subtotal	1,500	100,522	167,522	+166,022	+67,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	35,747	78,323	40,333	+4,586	-37,990
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	65,990	+65,990	+65,990
Subtotal	35,747	78,323	106,323	+70,576	+28,000
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	17,100	32,905	32,905	+15,805	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Subtotal	17,100	32,905	42,905	+25,805	+10,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT)	177,087	162,419	159,919	-17,168	-2,500
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT)	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Subtotal	177,087	162,419	179,919	+2,832	+17,500
Total, RDTE OCO/GWOT Requirements	231,434	374,169	333,679	+102,245	-40,490
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements	---	---	162,990	+162,990	+162,990
Grand Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	231,434	374,169	496,669	+265,235	+122,500

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (GWOT).....	88,850	140,833	140,833	+51,783	---
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance (GWOT)					
OCO/GWOT Requirements (GWOT).....	272,704	331,764	331,764	+59,060	---
OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements (GWOT).....	---	---	450,000	+450,000	+450,000
Subtotal.....	272,704	331,764	781,764	+509,060	+450,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (GWOT).....	186,000	215,333	215,333	+29,333	---
Joint [Improvised Explosive Device] Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund (GWOT).....	349,464	408,272	408,272	+58,808	---
Office of the Inspector General (GWOT).....	10,262	22,062	22,062	+11,800	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs					
OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	818,430	977,431	977,431	+159,001	---
Total, OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	450,000	+450,000	+450,000
Grand Total, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	818,430	977,431	1,427,431	+609,001	+450,000
TITLE IX General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (GWOT) (Sec.9002).....	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	---	---
Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative (GWOT) (Sec. 9014).....	250,000	---	150,000	-100,000	+150,000
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (GWOT) (Sec.9018).....	500,000	---	500,000	---	+500,000
Rescissions (GWOT) (Sec.9020).....	-400,000	---	-669,000	-269,000	-669,000
Total, General Provisions.....	350,000	---	-19,000	-369,000	-19,000
Total, Title IX OCO/GWOT Requirements.....	58,638,000	58,625,551	42,949,994	-15,688,006	-15,675,557
Total, Title IX OCO/GWOT For Base Requirements.....	---	---	15,676,006	+15,676,006	+15,676,006
Grand Total, Title IX.....	58,638,000	58,625,551	58,626,000	-12,000	+449
=====					
Grand Total, Bill.....	566,816,000	569,858,382	569,272,000	+2,666,000	-586,382
Appropriations.....	(510,783,937)	(511,232,831)	(511,929,416)	(+1,145,479)	(+656,585)
Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	(59,038,000)	(58,625,551)	(59,295,008)	(+257,006)	(+669,449)
Rescissions.....	(-2,805,937)	---	(-1,283,416)	(+1,522,521)	(-1,283,416)
Rescissions (GWOT).....	(-400,000)	---	(-669,000)	(-269,000)	(-669,000)
=====					

Department of Defense Appropriations Act - FY 2017 (H.R. 5293)
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Lease of defense real property (permanent).....	33,000	37,000	37,000	+4,000	---
Disposal of defense real property (permanent).....	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to DOD-VA Joint Incentive Fund (permanent):					
Defense function.....	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	---	---
Non-defense function.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
DHP, O&M to Joint DOD-VA Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (Sec. 8098):					
Defense function.....	-120,000	-122,375	-122,375	-2,375	---
Non-defense function.....	120,000	122,375	122,375	+2,375	---
Navy transfer to John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Development Trust Fund (Sec. 8107):					
Defense function.....	-1,000	---	---	+1,000	---
Non-defense function.....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Tricare accrual (permanent, indefinite auth.) 4/.....	6,631,000	6,953,000	6,953,000	+322,000	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	6,672,000	6,998,000	6,998,000	+326,000	---
=====					
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel.....	129,228,658	128,902,332	128,168,468	-1,060,190	-733,864
Title II - Operation and Maintenance.....	187,485,170	171,318,488	173,680,060	+6,194,890	+2,361,572
Title III - Procurement.....	110,841,627	101,916,357	104,200,570	-6,641,057	+2,284,213
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation...	69,784,665	71,391,771	70,292,888	+508,223	-1,098,883
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,212,932	1,371,613	1,371,613	-841,319	---
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs.....	34,392,468	35,284,674	35,359,421	+965,953	+73,747
Title VII - Related Agencies.....	1,019,206	1,047,596	997,596	-21,610	-50,000
Title VIII - General Provisions (net).....	-6,986,726	---	+3,423,616	+3,569,110	-3,423,616
Title IX - Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).....	58,638,000	58,625,551	58,626,000	-12,000	+449
Total, Department of Defense.....	566,616,000	569,856,382	569,272,000	+2,656,000	-586,382
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	6,672,000	6,998,000	6,998,000	+326,000	---
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	573,288,000	576,856,382	576,270,000	+2,982,000	-586,382
=====					

1/ Included in Budget under Operation and Maintenance
 2/ Included in Budget under Procurement
 3/ Budget request assumes enactment of DoD's
 pharmacy/Consolidated Health Plan proposals
 4/ Contributions to Department of Defense
 Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund
 (Sec. 725, P.L. 108-375). Amount does not include
 Budget proposals to amend TRICARE

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

I would like to begin by conveying my deep appreciation, as well, for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's steady leadership of the Defense Subcommittee. His commitment to this subcommittee's tradition of cooperation and bipartisanship is unwavering, and it is a pleasure to be able to work with him.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the other members of the subcommittee for their very good efforts.

Additionally, as we all know, this bill could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, and discerning and thoughtful input of our committee staff and associate staffs.

The chairman has well and clearly articulated the major elements of the bill and report. Under less than ideal circumstances and unsettled conditions, he and the subcommittee staff have, again, demonstrated their talent and acumen in putting together this legislation. There are many highlights to the bill. However, I will use my time during general debate to discuss the circumstances and conditions that led to the proposal to use nearly 27 percent of the overseas contingency operations, OCO, accounts to fund base Department of Defense programs, which gives me pause as an appropriator.

It was as an appropriator that I opposed the Budget Control Act of 2011 and its arbitrary spending caps that only address one-sixth of the Federal budget equation.

□ 1645

In each session of Congress, we should be making discrete decisions on how we annually invest our discretionary dollars. Setting inflexible spending targets for 10 years is, in my opinion, nonsensical. I believe we need to invest in our roads, ports, drinking water infrastructure, universities, and our Nation's defense. We need to generate more resources, and we need to have a fulsome discussion of our entitlement programs. My assumption is that there are very few people in Congress who believe that the Federal Government is currently making enough of a long-term investment in our Nation and its interests.

It was as an appropriator that I voted for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, which mitigated the BCA caps on base discretionary funding and capped OCO spending for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. I, obviously, would have rather seen the complete repeal of the act. But, nevertheless, I supported it because it provided some clarity to the appropriations process for the balance of this Congress. As such, we were able to wrap up the fiscal year 2016 process, and with a top line number for fiscal year 2017, I was guardedly optimistic that the House would have predictability this year.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was far along in its 2017 process when the OCO to base strategy—conceived to placate some on other committees—was settled upon as the strategy for the House majority. While this bill technically does not violate the caps established by the BBA for base defense programs and OCO, it is hard to argue that this bill was assembled under what passes for normalcy in this Congress. And there is no doubt that the chairman and the subcommittee members and staff made smart investment decisions in executing the \$15.7 billion in OCO to base funding strategy. However, I am troubled with the circumstances that compelled the subcommittee's action.

First and foremost, the fiscal year begins October 1, 2016, not May 1, 2017, and it is the responsibility of us holding office in the second session of the 114th Congress to execute the 2017 fiscal year appropriations process. In order to make OCO funding available for base programs, our bill only provides enough funding to fully support the warfighter until the end of April 2017, which is 5 months before the end of the fiscal year. This is intended to force the next administration and the next Congress to pass a supplemental in calendar year 2017 to support ongoing combat operations.

It is not the responsibility of the 115th Congress to finish a predetermined fraction of our work, and we should not be dismissive of the difficulties created. To assume that there will be smooth sailing for a supplemental appropriations bill in the spring is very problematic. We do not know who will be in the White House. We do not know who will be the civilian leadership at the Department of Defense. And we do not know the composition in the next Congress. And as we have clearly seen from the Zika virus debate and, before that, Hurricane Sandy, supplemental appropriations bills are not without controversy.

Additionally, in making the \$15.7 billion in cuts to the OCO budget request, the committee has had to make some assumptions on the pace of combat operations between now and May 2017. While Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN exercised great care and caution, there is not much wiggle room in the interim. If the OCO spend rate were to increase for any reason in an uncertain world, Congress and a new administration would have to act quickly to pass a supplemental in early 2017. If that supplemental were not timely, the Department would likely be forced to reprogram or transfer base dollars to OCO, which shortchanges other priorities, negates the committee's funding levels, and still requires a supplemental to backfill both base and OCO while not violating the BCA caps. Will said supplemental be funded by offsets from resources within the other 11 appropriations bills?

Adding to the uncertainty, the House majority is going it alone with this

strategy. To date, it has been rejected by the administration, the Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as the full Senate. While those institutions are not infallible, I fear that if the House majority insists upon heading down this path, we are looking at an impossible conference process.

Putting concerns about uncertainty aside, I further believe that the OCO to base strategy abdicates our discretion—Congress' discretion—to the Department of Defense in executing the remaining OCO funding. In order to free \$15.7 billion, certain appropriations in OCO were subject to reductions. These reductions were done at the account level, not at the program level. For example, Navy O&M in the OCO title was reduced by \$2.9 billion from its requested level. The Department has discretion on how to apply that \$2.9 billion reduction across 10 programs under that account. I believe that should be our discretion.

A final concern I have—and one expressed in prior years—is that we should eliminate the reliance on OCO funding in the first instance and shift activities to the base budget. It is increasingly difficult after 15 years of war to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our Nation and our interests. This subcommittee has correctly begun to limit what is an eligible expense in OCO, but under the act and this latest proposal, we could take a step back. For example, this bill proposes to increase end strength by 52,000 troops above planned reductions for the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force. The chairman alluded to it in his opening remarks. I absolutely agree with him that we need new personnel, but this additional force structure costs \$3 billion in 2017. What remains unsaid is if you look out for the next 5 years, it will also increase spending by \$30 billion that is not budgeted for.

In closing, I have taken some time describing my concerns with the circumstances that impact less than 3 percent of the total bill. But the manufactured uncertainty introduced by these circumstances diminishes the likelihood that this committee and the Congress will complete its work on time. It is a mark of the talent of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and our staff, their commitment to our troops and our Nation's defense, and their seriousness of purpose, that they have done so much good to ameliorate the problems caused and highlighted in my remarks. I look forward to working with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the Members of this House as we advance the process over the next several days and complete the task before us. I also look forward to the debate on amendments.

Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by conveying my deep appreciation for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN's steady leadership of the Defense Subcommittee. His commitment to this

subcommittee's tradition of cooperative bipartisanship is unwavering and it is a pleasure working with him.

I also would like to express my gratitude to Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the other Members of the Subcommittee for their efforts.

Additionally, this bill could not have been written without the dedication, long hours, discerning and thoughtful input of our committee staff and personal staffs. I want to thank Rob Blair, Sherry Young, Walter Hearne, BG Wright, Brooke Boyer, Adrienne Ramsay, Allison Deters, Megan Milam, Colin Lee, Cornell Teague, Matthew Bower, Rebecca Leggieri, Chris Bigelow, Steve Wilson, Joe DeVooght, and Luke Wood.

The Chairman has well and clearly articulated the major elements of the bill and report. Under less than ideal circumstances and unsettled conditions, he and the Subcommittee staff have again demonstrated their talent and acumen in putting together this legislation. There are many highlights to the bill. However, I will use my time during general debate to discuss the circumstances and conditions that led to the proposal to use nearly 27 percent of the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) accounts to fund base Department of Defense programs, which gives me pause as an Appropriator.

It was as an Appropriator that I opposed the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and its arbitrary spending caps that only address one-sixth of the federal budget equation. In each session of Congress we should be making discrete decisions on how we annually invest our discretionary dollars. Setting inflexible spending targets for 10 years is nonsensical. I believe we need to invest more in our roads, ports, drinking water infrastructure, universities, and our defense. We need to generate more resources, and the need to have a fulsome discussion of our entitlement programs. My assumption is that there are very few people in Congress who believe that the federal government is currently making enough of a long-term investment in our nation and its interests.

And it was as an Appropriator, that I voted for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA), which mitigated the BCA caps on base discretionary funding and capped OCO spending for Fiscal Years (FY) 2016 and 2017. I obviously would have rather seen the complete repeal of the BCA, but nonetheless, I supported the BBA, because it provided some clarity to the Appropriations process for the balance of the 114th Congress. As such, we were able to wrap up the FY 2016 process and, with a number for FY 2017, I was guardedly optimistic that the House would have predictability this year.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee was far along in its FY 2017 process, when the OCO to Base strategy—conceived to placate some on other Committees—was settled upon as the strategy for the House Majority.

While this bill technically does not violate the caps established by the BBA for base defense programs and OCO, it is hard to argue that this bill was assembled under what passes for normalcy in this Congress. And there is no doubt that the Chairman and Subcommittee staff made smart investment decisions in executing the \$15.7 billion in OCO to Base funding strategy. However, I am troubled with the circumstances that compelled the subcommittee's action.

First and foremost, the fiscal year begins on October 1, 2016, not May 1, 2017, and it is the responsibility of those of us holding office in the 2nd session of the 114th Congress to execute the FY 2017 appropriations process. In order to make OCO funding available for base programs, our bill only provides enough funding to fully support the warfighter until the end of April 2017, which is five months before the end of the fiscal year. This is intended to force the next administration and the next Congress to pass a supplemental in calendar year 2017 to support ongoing combat operations.

It is not the responsibility of the 115th Congress to finish a predetermined fraction of our work, and we should not be dismissive of the difficulties we created. To assume there will be smooth sailing for a supplemental appropriations bill in the spring is problematic. We do not know who will be in the White House, who will be the civilian leadership at DoD, nor the composition of the next Congress. And as we can clearly see from the Zika Virus debate, and before that Hurricane Sandy, supplemental appropriations bills are not without controversy.

Additionally, in making the \$15.7 billion in cuts to the OCO budget request, the Committee had to make some assumptions on the pace of combat operations between now and May 2017. While Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN exercised care and caution, there is not much wiggle room in the interim. If the OCO spend rate were to increase for any reason, Congress and a new Administration would have to act quickly to pass a supplemental early in 2017. If that supplemental were not timely, the Department would likely be forced to reprogram or transfer base dollars to OCO, which shortchanges other priorities, negates the committee's funding levels, and still requires a supplemental to backfill both base and OCO while not violating the BCA caps. Will said supplemental be funded by offsets from resources within the other 11 Appropriations bills?

Adding to the uncertainty, the House Majority is going it alone with this strategy. To date, it has been rejected by the Administration, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the full Senate. While those three are not infallible, I fear that if the House Majority insists upon heading down this path, we are looking at an impossible conference process.

Putting concerns over uncertainty aside, I further believe the OCO to Base strategy abdi-

cates our discretion to the Department of Defense in executing the remaining OCO funding. In order to free up \$15.7 billion, certain appropriations in OCO were subject to reductions. These reductions were done at the account level, not at the program level. For example, Navy O&M in the OCO Title was reduced by \$2.9 billion, from its requested level of \$6.8 billion. The Department has discretion on how it will apply that \$2.9 billion reduction across the tens of programs under that account.

A final concern I have, and one expressed in prior years, is that we should eliminate the reliance on OCO funding in the first instance and shift activities to the base budget. It is increasingly difficult after fifteen years of war to argue that this operational tempo for our military is a contingency and not the new normal in defending our nation and our interests. This Subcommittee had correctly begun to limit what is an eligible expense in OCO, but under the BBA and this latest proposal we would take a step back. For example, this bill proposes to increase end strength by 52,000 above planned reductions for the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force. And I agree that we need more personnel, but this additional force structure costs \$3 billion in FY 2017 and is paid for with OCO to Base dollars. But, we defer the tough decisions. This is particularly true when recognizing the fact that BCA caps are scheduled to lower defense spending by \$2 billion in FY 2018. An increase in end strength creates a tail of spending in future years. The DoD estimates that the troop levels funded in the bill will increase spending by \$30 billion over five years. That is \$30 billion that is not budgeted for, but \$30 billion that our Committee will be expected to pay for.

In closing, I have taken some time describing my concerns with the circumstances that impact less than three percent of the total bill. But the manufactured uncertainty introduced by these circumstances diminishes the likelihood that this Committee and the Congress will complete its work. It is a mark of the talent of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and our staff, their commitment to our troops and our nation's defense, and their seriousness of purpose, that they have done so much good to ameliorate the problems caused by this approach. I look forward to working with Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the members of the House to advance the process and complete the task before us.

I look forward to the debate on amendments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the full committee chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

I rise in support of this fine bill. This bill provides critical funding to uphold our defense posture, maintain our military readiness, and protect our Nation from those who would seek to do us harm. The world, of course, is changing rapidly. We are reminded regularly that we are still a Nation at war, and new threats arise daily. It is clear that a strong national defense is of the highest priority.

In total, as has been said, the bill contains \$575.8 billion in base and Overseas Contingency Operations funding for critical national security needs, and the health and well-being of our troops.

The use of OCO funds in this bill is in line with the National Defense Authorization Act that the House passed on a bipartisan basis last month. This funding will provide the resources that our military needs to be successful in the fight right now, and that will improve our readiness for the future.

This includes over \$209 billion for operations and maintenance, the programs that help prepare our troops, like flight time and battle training, as well as base operations. The bill also includes \$120.8 billion for equipment and upgrades, providing the weapons and platforms needed to fight and win in the field.

And to improve this equipment, develop and test new technologies, and meet future security threats, the bill contains \$70.8 billion for research and development. This will help keep our Nation on the cutting edge, ensuring that we will remain the most superior military power in the entire world.

This legislation prioritizes a robust, healthy, and well-cared-for force. In total, \$132.6 billion is provided to support over 1.3 million Active Duty troops and over 826,000 Guard and Reserve troops. This wholly rejects the administration's proposed troop reductions by providing an additional \$3 billion to maintain our troop strength and fully funds the authorized 2.1 percent pay raise for our soldiers.

It is also critically important that we adequately fund the quality-of-life programs for our troops and military families need and deserve. The bill contains \$34 billion for defense headline programs—targeting increases to cancer research, facility upgrades, traumatic brain injury, psychological health research, and sexual assault prevention.

I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his care and consideration in drafting this big bill. He, as well as the members of his subcommittee, have put the security of the Nation and the welfare of our warfighters above all else. I also want to thank the subcommittee staff for their expert work and dedication on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill fulfills the Congress' most important responsibility—providing for the common defense. And it does so responsibly—funding those military needs that must be addressed now, planning and preparing

for the future, and respecting the taxpayer by making commonsense budgeting decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill to continue to protect our Nation from threats to our freedom, democracy, and way of life.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, with only the fourth appropriations bill of the year on the floor, we should not be patting ourselves on the back.

Today's bill blows up last year's budget agreement through a gimmick that needlessly creates a funding cliff next spring. It forces the new President, as one of her or his first actions in office, to request emergency supplemental funding.

The difference here is about more than bookkeeping. Sending our military men and women into some of the most dangerous places on Earth—Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria—without ensuring mission support, including to combat ISIL, or their salaries for a full year, is the height of irresponsibility.

Here are some of the things that Secretary Carter has said about the Republican OCO budget gimmick: deeply troubling, flawed, gambling with warfighting money, creating a hollow force structure, working against our efforts to restore readiness, a road to nowhere, a high probability of leading to more gridlock, undercuts stable planning and efficient use of taxpayer dollars, dispirits troops and their families, baffles friends, and emboldens foes.

Additionally, President Obama issued a veto threat due to this harmful gimmick.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the President's Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 5293.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5293—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—REP. ROGERS, R-KY

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 5293, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year (FY) ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

While the Administration appreciates the Committee's support for certain investments in our national defense, H.R. 5293 fails to provide our troops with the resources needed to keep our Nation safe. At a time when ISIL continues to threaten the homeland and our allies, the bill does not fully fund wartime operations such as INHERENT RESOLVE. Instead the bill would redirect \$16 billion of Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds toward base budget programs that the Department of Defense (DOD) did not request, shortchanging funding for ongoing wartime operations midway through the year. Not only is this approach dangerous but it is also wasteful. The bill would buy excess force structure without the money to sustain it, effectively creating a hollow force structure that would undermine DOD's efforts to restore readiness. Furthermore, the bill's funding approach attempts to unravel the dollar-for-dollar balance of defense and non-defense funding increases provided by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA),

threatening future steps needed to reverse over \$100 billion of future sequestration cuts to DOD. By gambling with warfighting funds, the bill risks the safety of our men and women fighting to keep America safe, undercuts stable planning and efficient use of taxpayer dollars, dispirits troops and their families, baffles our allies, and emboldens our enemies.

In addition, H.R. 5293 would impose other unneeded costs, constraining DOD's ability to balance military capability, capacity, and readiness. The Administration's defense strategy depends on investing every dollar where it will have the greatest effect. The Administration's FY 2017 proposals would accomplish this by continuing and expanding critical reforms that divest unneeded force structure, balance growth in military compensation, modernize military health care, and reduce wasteful overhead. The bill fails to adopt many of these reforms, including through measures prohibiting the use of funds to propose or plan for a new Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. The bill also continues unwarranted restrictions regarding detainees at Guantanamo Bay that threaten to interfere with the Executive Branch's ability to determine the appropriate disposition of detainees and its flexibility to determine when and where to prosecute Guantanamo detainees based on the facts and circumstances of each case and our national security interests.

In October 2015, the President worked with congressional leaders from both parties to secure the BBA, which partially reversed harmful sequestration cuts slated for FY 2017. By providing fully-paid-for equal dollar increases for defense and non-defense spending, the BBA allows for investments in FY 2017 that create jobs, support middle-class families, contribute to long-term growth, and safeguard national security. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to enact appropriations that are consistent with that agreement, and fully support economic growth, opportunity, and our national security priorities. However, the bill is inconsistent with the BBA, and the Administration strongly objects to the inclusion of problematic ideological provisions that are beyond the scope of funding legislation. *If the President were presented with H.R. 5293, the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.*

The Administration would like to take this opportunity to share additional views regarding the Committee's version of the bill. *Department of Defense (DOD)*

Reduction and Misuse of OCO Funds. The Administration strongly objects to the Committee's proposal to substitute \$16 billion of DOD's OCO request in the FY 2017 Budget with \$16 billion of unsustainable base budget programs that do not reflect the Department's highest joint priorities. This approach creates a hollow force structure and risks the loss of funding for critical overseas contingency operations. This gimmick is inconsistent with the BBA, which provided equal increases for defense and non-defense spending as well as the certainty needed to prosecute the counter-ISIL campaign, protect readiness recovery, modernize the force for future conflicts, and keep faith with servicemembers and their families. Shortchanging wartime operations by \$16 billion would deplete essential funding for ongoing operations by the middle of the year, introducing a dangerous level of uncertainty for our men and women in uniform carrying out missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere. Our troops need and deserve guaranteed, predictable support as they execute their missions year round, particularly in light of the dangers they face in executing

the Nation's ongoing overseas contingency operations.

Guantanamo Detainee Restrictions. The Administration strongly objects to sections 8097, 8098, 8099, and 8130 of the bill, which would restrict the Executive Branch's ability to manage the detainee population at the Guantanamo Bay, Cuba detention facility. Section 8098 would prohibit the use of funds for the construction, acquisition, or modification of any facility to house Guantanamo detainees in the United States. Sections 8097 and 8099 would continue prohibitions and restrictions relating to transfers of detainees abroad. In addition, section 8130 would restrict the Department's ability to transfer U.S. Naval Station functions in support of national security. The President has repeatedly objected to the inclusion of these and similar provisions in prior legislation and has called upon the Congress to lift the restrictions. Operating the detention facility at Guantanamo weakens our national security by draining resources, damaging our relationships with key allies and partners, and emboldening violent extremists. These provisions are unwarranted and threaten to interfere with the Executive Branch's ability to determine the appropriate disposition of detainees and its flexibility to determine when and where to prosecute Guantanamo detainees based on the facts and circumstances of each case and our national security interests. Sections 8097 and 8099 would, moreover, violate constitutional separation-of-powers principles in certain circumstances.

Military End Strength. The Administration strongly objects to the unnecessary funding for end strength levels above the FY 2017 Budget request. The bill would force the Department to take additional risk in the training and readiness of the current force, as well as investment in and procurement of future capabilities. Adding unnecessary end strength in the manner proposed in the bill would increase military personnel and operation and maintenance support costs by approximately \$30 billion (FY 2017 through FY 2021). This would also invite a significant, unacceptable risk of creating a future hollow force, in which force structure exists, but the resources to make it ready do not follow. The Administration urges support of the Department's plan, which reflects sound strategy and responsible choices among capacity, capabilities, and current and future readiness.

Military Compensation Reform. The Administration is disappointed that the Committee has rejected the pay raise proposal and most of the health care reform proposals included in the FY 2017 Budget request. The FY 2017 Budget request includes a set of common-sense reforms that would allow the Department to achieve a proper balance between DOD's obligation to provide competitive pay and benefits to servicemembers and its responsibility to provide troops the finest training and equipment possible. The Administration strongly encourages the Congress to support these reforms, which would save \$500 million in FY 2017 and \$11 billion through FY 2021.

Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga-Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships. The Administration strongly objects to section 8124 of the bill, which would prohibit the Navy from executing its phased modernization approach for maintaining an effective cruiser and dock landing ship force structure while balancing scarce operating and maintenance funding. It also would significantly reduce planned savings and accelerate the retirement of all Ticonderoga-Class cruisers. The Navy's current requirement for active large surface combatants includes 11 Air Defense Commander ships, one assigned to each of the active car-

rier strike groups. This requirement is met by the modernization plan proposed in the FY 2017 Budget request. Furthermore, section 8124 would require an additional \$3.2 billion across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) to fund manpower, maintenance, modernization, and operations when compared to the FY 2017 Budget request.

Restoration of Tenth Navy Carrier Air Wing. The Administration strongly objects to restoration of the Carrier Air Wing in Title IX of the bill. The tenth Carrier Air Wing is no longer needed, and results in ineffective use of the aircraft and pilot inventory in the Navy. The plan proposed in the FY 2017 Budget request optimizes Carrier Air Wing force structure to meet the Global Force Management Allocation Plan demand in a sustainable way. As an additional benefit, the plan also generates \$926 million in FYDP savings. Furthermore, if forced to retain the tenth Carrier Air Wing, the bill's current military personnel funding levels are insufficient. The Navy would require an additional \$48 million in FY 2017 for military personnel above the levels already in the bill, as well as an end strength increase of 1,167 above the Navy end strength in the bill.

Restoration of Third Littoral Combat Ship. The Administration strongly objects to the Committee's proposal to increase the purchase of Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) in FY 2017 from two to three. The FY 2017 Budget request reduced from 52 to 40 the total number of LCS and Frigates (FF) the Navy would purchase over the life of the program. A combined program of 40 LCS and FF would allow DOD to invest in advanced capabilities across the fleet and would provide sufficient capacity to meet the Department's warfighting needs and to exceed recent presence levels with a more modern and capable ship than legacy mine sweepers, frigates, and coastal patrol craft they would replace. By funding two LCS in FY 2017, the Budget request ensures that both shipyards are on equal footing and have robust production leading up to the competition to select the shipyard that would continue the program. This competitive environment ensures the best price for the taxpayer on the remaining ships, while also achieving savings by down-selecting to one shipyard. The bill prevents the use of resources for higher priorities to improve DOD's warfighting capability, such as undersea, other surface, and aviation investments.

Prohibition on Proposing Planning or Conducting an Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round. The Administration strongly objects to section 8121 of the bill and the proposed \$3.5 million reduction to funds that would support a 2019 BRAC round. By forcing the Department to spread its resources more thinly, excess infrastructure is one of the principal drains on the Department's readiness, which the Committee recognizes as a major concern. In addition to addressing every previous congressional objection to BRAC authorization, the Department recently conducted a DOD-wide parametric capacity analysis, which demonstrates that the Department has 22 percent excess capacity. In addition, the Administration's BRAC legislative proposal includes several changes that respond to congressional concerns regarding cost. Specifically, the revised BRAC legislation requires the Secretary to certify that BRAC would have the primary objective of eliminating excess capacity and reducing costs, emphasizes recommendations that yield net savings within five years (subject to military value), and limits recommendations that take longer than 20 years to pay back. The Administration strongly urges the Congress to provide BRAC authorization as requested so that DOD can make better use of scarce resources to maintain readiness.

Asia-Pacific Rebalance Infrastructure. The Administration strongly objects to the exclusion of a general provision requested in the FY 2017 Budget that would allow for \$86.7 million of the amounts appropriated for the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account to be available for the Secretary of Defense to make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds. This critical provision addresses the need to provide assistance for civilian water and wastewater improvements to support the military build-up on Guam, as well as critical existing and enduring military installations and missions on Guam. A key aspect of the Asia-Pacific rebalance is to create a more operationally resilient Marine Corps presence in the Pacific and invest in Guam as a joint strategic hub. This funding supports the ability and flexibility of the President to execute our foreign and defense policies in coordination with our ally, Japan. In addition, it calls into question among regional states our commitment to implement the realignment plan and our ability to execute our defense strategy.

Prohibition of Funds to Enforce Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. The Administration strongly objects to section 8132 of the bill, which would prohibit DOD from using FY 2017 funds to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Section 526 provides an environmentally sound framework for the development of future alternative fuels.

Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle. The Administration objects to the reductions to both the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle and the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Infrastructure requested in the FY 2017 Budget. The Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle reduction would eliminate three launch service procurements, instead of the two procurements the Committee intended. Further, the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Infrastructure reduction exceeds the amount ascribed to these two procurements, and would cause the Government to default on the current contract and the block buy, unnecessarily introducing costs and schedule risk for national security space payloads.

Missile Defense Programs. The Administration objects to the reduction of \$324 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for U.S. ballistic missile defense programs, including \$49 million to homeland defense programs, \$91 million to U.S. regional missile defense programs, \$44 million to missile defense testing efforts, and \$140 million to missile defense advanced technology programs. These programs are required to improve the reliability of missile defense system and ensure the United States stays ahead of the future ballistic missile threat. Furthermore, the Administration opposes the addition of \$455 million above the FY 2017 Budget request for Israeli missile defense procurement and cooperative development programs.

Coalition Support Fund (CSF). The Administration objects to section 9020 of the bill, which would rescind funds available for CSF by \$300 million. Reducing CSF would limit DOD's ability to reimburse key allies in the fight against ISIL and other extremist groups in the region. The rescission is especially harmful because it would reduce funds available for programs that are already underway and would limit DOD's flexibility to continue to program these funds for critical needs. The Administration urges the Congress to retain the authority to make certain funds available to support stability activities in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas as provided in section 1212(f) of the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF). The Administration objects to the reduction of \$250 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for CTPF because it would restrict the

resources required to empower and enable partners in responding to shared terrorist threats around the world. The Administration also objects to the \$200 million rescission in FY 2016 CTPF resources in the bill. Both of these reductions would preclude DOD from continuing important security assistance programs begun in FY 2016. The Administration strongly encourages the Congress to provide the \$1 billion originally requested to continue support for CTPF activities in FY 2017 and restore the rescinded FY 2016 funding.

Elimination of Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (JUONF) Funding. The Administration objects to the elimination of the \$99 million JUONF base funding requested in the FY 2017 Budget. This funding is vital to the Department's ability to quickly respond to urgent operational needs. Eliminating this funding may increase life-threatening risks to servicemembers and contribute to critical mission failures.

Rapid Prototyping, Experimentation and Demonstration. The Administration objects to the reduction of \$42 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for the Navy's research and development funding to support the Rapid Prototyping, Experimentation and Demonstration (RPED) initiative. RPED is an essential element in the Navy's strategy to employ successful innovation technologies to help pace the dynamic threat of our adversaries, more quickly address urgent capability needs, accelerate our speed of innovation, and rapidly develop and deliver advanced warfighting capability to naval forces. This reduction would render the initiative ineffective in promoting rapid acquisition, hindering the Navy's ability to determine the technical feasibility and operational utility of advanced technologies before committing billions of dollars toward development. This reduction hinders the Department-wide goal of employing new techniques to make the acquisition process more agile and efficient.

Innovation and Access to Non-Traditional Suppliers. The Administration objects to the reduction of \$30 million for programs that seek to broaden DOD's access to innovative companies and technologies. Specifically, the Administration is concerned about the elimination of the investment funding associated with the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx), as well as the reduction in funding for In-Q-Tel's efforts to explore innovative technologies that enable the efficient incorporation into weapons systems and operations capabilities. These investments would enable the development of leading-edge, primarily asymmetric capabilities and help spur development of new ways of warfighting to counter advanced adversaries.

Reduction of Funds for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) Situational Awareness System. The Administration objects to the reduction of \$27 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for the development of a CWMD situational awareness information system, known as "Constellation." The Department is developing and fielding this system in response to requirements articulated by all Combatant Commands and validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. This capability is critical to anticipating WMD threats from both nation-state and non-state actors and sharing information between DOD and its U.S. interagency and international partners. Funds were appropriated in FY 2014-2016 specifically to develop and field the Constellation system, which would be deployed in July 2016 as an initial prototype. A reduction of \$27 million would effectively terminate this initiative and prevent DOD from developing a high priority capability needed to counter WMD threats.

Navy High Energy Lasers. The Administration objects to the reduction of \$20 million from the FY 2017 Budget request for the Power Projection Advanced Technology program, which would delay by one year fielding of the High Energy Laser (HEL) program laser and demonstration of its technology maturation. The HEL technology is a means of countering low-cost unmanned aerial vehicles and small surface vessels.

Limitation on Intelligence Community General Transfer Authority (GTA). The Administration objects to section 8096 of the bill, which reduces the Intelligence Community's (IC's) FY 2016 enacted GTA cap from \$1.5 billion to \$1.0 billion for FY 2017. This proposed cap would place severe limits on the IC's flexibility to manage resources and could compromise the ability to meet critical intelligence priorities at a time of shifting and dynamic worldwide threats, especially in urgent circumstances. This flexibility is especially important given the broad applicability of the GTA constraints to the appropriation accounts that fund IC.

Availability of Funds for Improvement of IC Financial Management. The Administration objects to section 8066 of the bill, which places limits on the ability of IC to review and take action on financial management improvement measures. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and DOD are engaged in a comprehensive review of financial management practices that may result in recommendations for changes to financial management or appropriations structures.

Constitutional Concerns

Several other provisions in the bill raise constitutional concerns. For instance, sections 8055, 8071, 8121, and provisions under the headings "Operations and Maintenance—Defense-wide" and "Joint Improved Threat Defeat Fund" may interfere with the President's authority as Commander in Chief.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the FY 2017 appropriations process moves forward.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, using OCO for base funds detracts from the true purpose of OCO, which is to fund wartime efforts. This prevents our Armed Forces from using these funds to counter ISIL and other threats.

A great deal of good elsewhere in the bill is overshadowed by this failure. I thank the chairman for his work to increase cybersecurity operations by nearly \$1 billion; invest in the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance resources combat commanders clamor for; provide strong, bipartisan support for our allies in the Middle East; and finance important health initiatives that help warfighters and their families.

□ 1700

All of that could have been done while providing certainty for troops in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the vice chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill.

This very important bill provides for our national security by supporting our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, on whom we rely to provide that security. During very dangerous times, we must ensure that the United States remains not only the greatest country in the world, but also the strongest.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN takes the constitutional responsibility of providing for the common defense very seriously, and he deserves all of our thanks for drafting such a significant and meaningful bill.

This is not an easy bill to draft. With increased threats and reduced budgets, the Department of Defense is being forced to make decisions it should never have to make. It is making decisions to align with the budget crisis instead of making decisions to protect the homeland and defeat our enemies. The military readiness accounts are an example of the shocking consequence of this budget environment. Already stretched thin by more than a decade of war, Marine aviation squadrons actually have to salvage aircraft parts from museums in order to keep planes flying. This is unconscionable. Our national security needs more. Our troops deserve better.

The bill Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN drafted takes a responsible approach in addressing these and other pressing issues. Rather than just throwing money at these crises, he exercises the subcommittee's oversight responsibilities by reducing funding for programs with unjustified cost increases or subpar performance. This allows the chairman to redirect those critical dollars in order to increase the number of troops, to increase funding for training, and to address many of the service chiefs' priorities.

The U.S. and our allies continue to face threats from countries such as Iran, Russia, China, and North Korea. Radical Islamist terrorists, such as ISIS, continue to threaten everything we stand for. As the chair of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, and as vice chair of Defense Appropriations, I am very proud of what this bill does to ensure resources are available to counter all of these threats.

The passage of this bill ensures the United States will lead in this very dangerous world. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY for the time.

Mr. Chair, I, regretfully, rise in opposition to this defense bill—a bill I certainly would prefer to support. Surely, this decision is difficult because of the deep respect I hold for the chairman, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, and for Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY of Indiana; but like this year's National Defense Authorization Act, this bill recklessly endangers our servicemembers by severely restricting the

financial stability, certainty, and budgeting predictability that commanders need to plan beyond next April.

Over and over, our service chiefs and secretaries have requested one thing from Congress—stability and predictability in the budget so they can properly train and equip their troops for war. “Do your job,” they say, “so we can do ours.” This bill does not fulfill our responsibilities as a Congress nor does it uphold our end of the bargain with our servicemembers and their families.

Instead, this bill replaces predictability with political posturing, and it replaces stability with budget shortsightedness. It places our national defense in a position of uncertainty after April 30 of 2017, and it proclaims neither strength nor vision. Thus, it shortchanges our troops who need it most—those engaged in the battlefield. This bill creates a funding cliff that sends a message of hesitation to both our allies and our enemies during a time when steadfast resolve is vital to our success.

Throughout my career, I have always supported our troops and our national defense. Whether honoring veterans with the World War II Memorial or pushing for energy independence to increase security at home and abroad, our commitment to protect and defend the American people has always been my top priority as a Member of Congress. However, I can't support a bill that causes a soldier who is deployed in Afghanistan or in any theater to wonder whether or not he or she is going to be paid on May 1 of 2017. I urge my colleagues to vote against this flawed and incomplete bill.

Finally, in closing, let me extend special regards to my brother, Steve, who is as courageous a fighter as I have ever known.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, almost a year ago today, I stood on this floor to state my disgust at this administration's plans to slash the Army by 40,000 troops and make a large, non-proportional cut to Fort Hood, in my district, which is known as the Great Place and as the home of the heavy armor of the United States Army.

These cuts would have a disastrous effect on our national security and would lead to putting our Army, in the words of Chief of Staff General Mark Milley, at high risk. This is unacceptable. As Members of Congress, it is our sworn, constitutional duty to raise and support Armies. This is why I am proud to support the FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, which pays for an increase of 45,000 active, guard, and reserve soldiers, including their training and equipping for war.

I thank the committee for its continued support for Operation Phalanx, which is a proven program that is aimed at protecting our southern bor-

der—of which Texas has a lot—that remains in high demand. The DOD has received a request to execute the additional FY16 hours, and I would urge the Department to immediately take action on the FY17 hours.

Mr. Chair, from the years 2011–2014, the United States cut its budget for defense by 19 percent while Russia and China increased theirs by 31 and 30 percent. Given world events and the Director of National Intelligence's assessment that he could not recall a more diverse array of challenges and crises, it is clear that the Obama administration has failed to adequately address our national security needs.

This bill before us recognizes the military's shortfalls in modernization and force readiness. It makes targeted investments to ensure that the military has the tools, training, and manpower that is necessary to maintain peace and, if necessary, to defeat any potential enemy.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and his staff for their hard work, and I urge the adoption of this year's Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I do, indeed, rise to engage the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chair, I express my profound gratitude to the committee for the inclusion of report language on the bill, an inclusion which notes the contributions made to our Nation's defense against digital threats by National Guard Cyber Protection Teams. The report language also expressed support for partnerships with Federal agencies, universities, and the private sector to achieve more effective training for missions like protecting the industrial control systems of critical infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, the report language refers specifically to Army National Guard Cyber Protection Teams, but as the chairman is likely aware, the Air National Guard is also leading efforts in this area. For example, the 194th Wing of the Air National Guard, which is based in the 10th Congressional District of Washington State, at Camp Murray, has several Cyber Protection Teams with demonstrated expertise in industrial control system assessment, cybersecurity remediation, and cyber mission planning.

I ask the chairman whether the language in the report that expresses support for collaborative training efforts for Army National Guard Cyber Protection Teams would also apply to the Air National Guard.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, the committee recognizes the important role of the Reserve, including the Army National Guard, as well as the Air National Guard, as a flexible and ready force that contributes to our cyber preparedness.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for raising this important issue, and I look forward to working with him as we move forward with this bill.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the chairman for agreeing to work with me on this critically important issue as well as for his and the ranking member's leadership on this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), a vital member of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chair, we are considering this critical legislation in the wake of the horrific terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida, during which 49 innocent Americans were killed and 53 were wounded by a terrorist who pledged loyalty to the Islamic State. Make no mistake—we are a Nation at war with militant Islamic terrorism, and that is why this legislation is so important. It provides our brave men and women in uniform with the resources they need to defeat the enemy.

For example, this bill includes my provision to speed the replacement of a critical radar system and aircraft known as the JSTARS. The technology which is stationed at Robins Air Force Base in Georgia significantly enhances the ability of our warplanes and other military assets to target enemy combatants while helping, at the same time, to protect our soldiers on the ground by detecting threats and allowing for better coordinated and more effective support. This bill also prevents the retirement of the A-10 Warthog aircraft, which is the most potent close air support platform in our arsenal and is a key tool in fighting the Islamic State.

Now, with more than 100,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in Georgia—the fourth largest military population in the Nation—I am proud to support our men and women in uniform by supporting this legislation.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for his great work on this bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I have long supported the Iron Dome weapons system to defend Israel from short-range missile attacks. I voted to authorize the United States to assist Israel in procuring the weapons. I voted for massive increases in funding for the Iron Dome during the summer of 2014 when Israel was under a daily barrage of missiles, and I spoke out repeatedly on the House floor in favor of fully funding the Iron Dome. I have been lucky enough to have visited Israel many times. Four years ago, I visited an Iron Dome battery in Israel. A single Iron Dome launcher can protect a medium-sized city. I am pleased that this bill includes \$62 million for the program.

I have offered an amendment to provide an increase in funding of \$10 million, which would be sufficient for the

procurement of an additional 500 interceptors. My amendment is designed to ensure that Israel has the means to defend itself against an increase in rocket attacks.

As we all know, Israel lives in a dangerous part of the world. Since Israel withdrew from the Gaza Strip in 2005, terrorists have fired more than 11,000 rockets into Israel. Over 5 million Israelis currently live under the threat of rocket attacks, and more than a half a million Israelis have less than 60 seconds to find shelter after a rocket is launched from Gaza into Israel.

Therefore, I offer this amendment in defense of the civilian population of Israel. I am pleased to hear that the amendment will be accepted. I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, today, the Army celebrates its 241st birthday and a long, proud history of defending our great Nation. The Army and all of our military branches make up the finest fighting force in the world because of our extraordinary men and women who serve in them and because they have the tools that are necessary to carry out their missions.

□ 1715

Just days ago, we saw a tragic and horrific reminder in Orlando that we are a Nation very much at war with radical Islamic extremists. While there may be differing opinions on what steps our country can and should do to stop attacks on our homeland, there should be no daylight between all Members of this body in our commitment to ensuring our soldiers have the resources necessary to win this war.

I want to thank my friend and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, and all of my Appropriations Committee colleagues for putting together a good bill that deserves all our support.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill and continue to support our men and women in uniform as they defend our great Nation.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a great member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill.

In a world that is more dangerous and more complex than ever before, it is critically important that we ensure our military remains the best trained, the best equipped, and the best supported on the planet. This bill takes the next step toward fulfilling these necessary goals.

After years of budget cuts and sequestration, we are at a point now where we can no longer ask our mili-

tary to keep meeting the needs of our Nation without providing the right amount of resources.

Mr. Chairman, if we are unable to provide our troops with proper funding, I fear that very soon we will find ourselves at risk of sending our men and women in uniform into conflict without the training, equipment, or support that they need. Our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deserve better. And this Defense bill does better by helping our military return to full spectrum readiness in order to properly meet the challenges our Nation is facing on all fronts and across the globe.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right by America by doing what is right for the men and women who sacrifice so much to ensure the freedoms that we enjoy today.

Vote "yes" on the bill. Vote "yes" for a strong American military. Vote "yes" to send a message to all our enemies that the American military is as strong as ever and that the United States remains steadfast and capable of defending herself and her allies against those who wish to do us harm.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their tireless work on behalf of our Congress and on behalf of the American public.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a key member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, since I first was elected to Congress, one of the things that I talked most directly about was the fact that if there is one thing that is so important in the Federal Government to do, it is the duty to provide for national security. The legislation that we have before us now may be the most important document that we will take up this entire year.

My colleague on the Republican side, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and my colleague on the Democratic side, Mr. VISCLOSKY, both take their job very seriously. As they work on this bill, they work with great dedication and care, and it is a privilege to work with both of them, along with the committee staff, as they work forward to move this bill.

Our men and women in uniform carry out a broad spectrum of missions. Some missions are directly combat related. Some are related to rescue. And some are humanitarian missions. Health research to help our soldiers also benefits civilians of all ages and all backgrounds. This bill specifies both the base funding and also overseas contingency operations funding in a way that meets the needs to carry out all of those missions.

So I would encourage my colleagues, as we vote on this bill and as we move forward on this, to vote "yes" on it. We owe it to our men and women in uni-

form and our dedicated civil servant workforce to provide that stability and continuity and also to continue making sure that we stay the greatest and the strongest nation on the Earth.

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

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

I would like to join with Ranking Member VISCLOSKY in taking a moment to thank the hardworking and effective staff of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. These are truly professional men and women who work on behalf of our national security and do remarkable things for our military that serve around the world and look after the needs of our intelligence community throughout the country and throughout the world.

Led by our clerk, Rob Blair, and our minority staff member, Becky Leggieri, the House owes both of these individuals a deep debt of gratitude for their hard work.

Along with Mr. VISCLOSKY, I also want to recognize, the work of others on the staff: Walter Hearne; Brooke Boyer; B.G. Wright; Adrienne Ramsay; Megan Milam; Allison Deters; Collin Lee; Cornell Teague; Matt Bower; the indispensable Sherry Young, who has been upstairs and downstairs at various points doing some incredible work on behalf of the committee; and Chris Bigelow.

I recognize my own staff: Nancy Fox, Steve Wilson, and Katie Hazlett. And I know that we give a shout-out to Joe DeVooght, who is dedicated to the whole process and works very closely with the ranking member.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the chairman's remarks and would also recognize Lucas Wood, who is on our staff as a fellow from the Department of Defense this year. Also, the chairman and I express our gratitude to the associate members of our subcommittee for each of the members of the subcommittee.

I do join with the chairman. I appreciate him enumerating the names of all of the staff.

I would suggest, given the difficult circumstances I alluded to in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, they legislated this year with elegance, under very difficult circumstances and the country owes them a debt of gratitude. I appreciate the chairman recognizing them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a key member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill. I would start, by the way, by thanking and commending the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, not only for putting together a great bill

that recognizes the dangers that exist in this world, whether it is China and their expanding aggression around that part of the world, whether it is ISIS in the Middle East, or whether it is Russia with their aggressive nature. Wherever you look, Mr. Chairman, the world has gotten a lot more dangerous in the last number of years.

So I want to thank the chairman for putting together a bill which will increase readiness, increase the number of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I will close with this: All of those things are hugely important, and it is about time that we address them in an aggressive way like this bill does.

To the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, we all owe a great bit of gratitude for the way that he is treating and continues to treat the men and women in uniform, the men and women of the Armed Forces. This bill is a reflection of his passion for them.

Again, this is a great bill. We can all be very proud of what this bill does. It is about time, and I thank the chairman for his leadership.

I would ask for your favorable consideration of this bill.

The CHAIR. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Indiana has yielded back the balance of his time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), a member of the authorizing committee, the Armed Services Committee. We thank him for joining us this evening.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this 2017 Defense Appropriations bill, which is another example of the Appropriations Committee's hard work to provide the funding needed to keep our country safe and to take care of our soldiers and their families.

As a veteran, as my wife is a veteran, and as somebody who has a lot of friends who are still wearing the uniform and serving, we need to take care of our soldiers, our troops, our sailors, our airmen, and marines. And this bill makes sure that we do just that. It gives them the equipment that they need to complete their mission while also providing them the peace of mind that their families will have the support that they need; that when they are also veterans, they will be taken care of.

As the Islamic State continues to grow, the constant threat of global terrorism, the nuclear-ambitious Iran, the dangers our Nation faces continues to grow, and we must stand ready to defeat them.

This bill meets our defense needs for the next year. We do need a long-term plan to ensure that the men and women in our Armed Forces have the capability to protect our Nation in this increasingly dangerous world, and this bill goes very far and is the first step in doing that.

I thank the committee and I especially thank the chairman for allowing me to speak in its favor.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, H.R. 5293 is key to funding our country's national security programs and provides for the essential needs of our military.

Just as our military service members answer the call to defend the United States, so too should Americans always prioritize the funding they need to be successful in whatever mission they are tasked with. I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides for our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

This bill makes difficult budgetary choices but includes funding for safety, security, and the ongoing success of our service members and their families. Our armed forces will stay prepared, safe and trained to fight.

The legislation addresses not only current threats but instability in the Middle East, Russian aggression in the Ukraine and Baltic, and changing relationships in the Pacific.

Specifically, the bill provides \$517.1 billion, an increase of \$3 billion above last year's level, and \$58.6 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) funding—the level allowed under current law.

\$219 billion is included for operations and maintenance, which provides for readiness programs that prepare our troops for combat and peacetime missions.

An effective military, one that is well equipped and well trained, is indispensable to the common defense of our country and is in the best interest of all Americans.

I thank the Chairman for his outstanding leadership, appreciate the Ranking member's common commitment to work in a bipartisan manner and fund our military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to instability abroad.

I has perhaps never been more urgent to invest in the future of our military and renew our ability to project power.

The funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, 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. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-142)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the proposed Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of Norway's export control system with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A(w) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(w)), is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement contains all the provisions required by section 123 a. of the Act, and provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with Norway based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. It would permit the transfer of unclassified information,

material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. Norway has no nuclear power program, and no current plans for establishing one, but the proposed Agreement would facilitate cooperation on such a program if Norway's plans change in the future. Norway does have an active nuclear research program and the focus of cooperation under the proposed Agreement, as under the previous agreement, is expected to be in the area of nuclear research. The proposed Agreement would not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology, sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components of such facilities.

The proposed Agreement would provide advance, long-term (programmatic) consent to Norway for the retransfer for storage or reprocessing of irradiated nuclear material (spent fuel) subject to the Agreement to France, the United Kingdom, or other countries or destinations as may be agreed upon in writing. The United States has given similar advance consent to various other partners, including to Norway under the previous U.S.-Norway Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreement that was in force from 1984 to 2014. The proposed Agreement would give the United States the option to revoke the advance consent if it considers that it cannot be continued without a significant increase of the risk of proliferation or without jeopardizing national security.

The proposed Agreement will have a term of 30 years from the date of its entry into force, unless terminated by either party on 1 year's advance written notice. In the event of termination or expiration of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls will continue in effect as long as any material, equipment, or component subject to the proposed Agreement remains in the territory of the party concerned or under its jurisdiction or control anywhere, or until such time as the parties agree that such items are no longer usable for any nuclear activity relevant from the point of view of safeguards.

Norway is a non-nuclear-weapon State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Norway has concluded a safeguards agreement and additional protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Norway is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which establishes international standards of physical protection for the use, storage, and transport of nuclear material. It is also a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, whose non-legally binding guidelines set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use. A more detailed discussion of Norway's domestic civil nuclear activities and its nuclear non-proliferation policies and practices is provided in the NPAS and the NPAS

classified annex submitted to the Congress separately.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the proposed Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 2016.

□ 1730

GOVERNMENT OVERREACH ON SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months more than 175 Members of Congress from both parties and both Chambers have expressed concerns about the FCC's proposed set-top box rules. Even the Small Business Administration has weighed in with concerns about how these rules could burden small operators.

Last month, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and I authored a bipartisan letter signed by 59 of our colleagues that says, in part: "the proposal threatens the economic welfare of small pay-TV companies providing both vital communications services to rural areas and competitive alternatives to consumers in urban markets."

Mr. Speaker, if continued innovation in the video industry is the goal, then this proposed rule is the wrong direction. In fact, it is estimated that this rule could cost up to a million dollars or more per system. Now, a million dollars may not be a lot to a big company, but to most of the companies in rural North Dakota, it could be the difference between staying in business or going out of business.

I also have strong concerns that the proposed rules are outside the Commission's legal authority. Instead of getting into another lengthy legal battle with Congress, I urge Chairman Wheeler and the FCC to drop these proposed rules because of the harm it could inflict on small rural operators.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE YOUTH TOUR

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize more than 1,800 youth from 47 States across America visiting our Nation's Capital this week as part of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Youth Tour. This trip is a tradition that has continued for over 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the tour is to bring together students from all walks of life to attend meetings with their Senators and Representatives to ask us questions and witness the legislative process firsthand. I just came from a meeting with those from Indiana, and they had excellent questions of me, and we had a great discussion.

These students are all sponsored by a local electric cooperative in which the student is a member or an associate member. This year, 34 of Indiana's 38 electric cooperatives have sponsored a total of 82 students for the trip. I am proud that many of them reside in my district.

I want to thank America's electric cooperatives, and specifically those from Indiana, for working with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to support and sponsor this opportunity for the next generation of young leaders.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for extending the time tonight. I am very grateful to the staffs who have helped us with the preparation for this evening's activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here this evening for many reasons. One of the reasons has to do with today being a very special day. Today is Flag Day. Flag Day is a day for us to honor the flag of the United States of America, which is one of the reasons I am wearing my flag tie. I want people to know that I am proud to be an American, and I am proud to honor the flag and to salute the flag. Flag Day is a date that we honor the flag for its adoption back on June 14, 1777.

I say the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, and I say it proudly. I say it proudly because it means something to me—each word means something to me—to 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.

"With liberty and justice for all" are words of great importance tonight, and

they are important because of some circumstances that have occurred in other parts of our country. We have had some tragic circumstances to befall some persons in Florida. I was reared in Florida. I went to Florida A&M University. I went to elementary school and high school in Florida.

Florida means something to me, but the people there are most important, because the people of Florida are people of goodwill, people who mean well, people who enjoy themselves. Florida is a vacation spot, if you will. Because so many people come there to vacation, it is expected that they would have the opportunity to enjoy themselves, to go out and be a part of the nightlife. We have Disney World in Florida, many attractions to attract people from around the country to Florida.

Unfortunately, some things have happened there recently that are going to cause us to pause for a moment as we, tonight, will celebrate, to a certain extent, commemorate, LGBT Pride Month. LGBT Pride Month, celebrate and commemorate this month. But we will also memorialize some of the things that have happened in terms of lives that have been lost.

I am proud tonight to note that there will be a Member joining me who has had some circumstances occur in his State that he will call to our attention that will have to be memorialized, and persons will have to be remembered for the services that they have given, but also because they lost their lives.

I am proud to ask my colleague to come over now, the Honorable JIM CLYBURN, and ask him to give his comments. He is a leader in this Congress. He is a person who stands for justice for all, as is indicated in the flag, "liberty and justice for all." He stands for this.

After the incident that took place in Mr. CLYBURN's State, I remember a lady who lost her child indicating at the probable cause hearing, "I forgive you. I forgive you," speaking to the person who had committed this deed. "I forgive you." She lost her child, but she forgave. But I believe that people who forgive still have an expectation that things will be done. Mr. CLYBURN, I am proud to say, is one who has legislation that can be of benefit to all. Not to some, but to all.

I am proud to yield the floor now to our leader, the Honorable JIM CLYBURN.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GREEN for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 17, we will commemorate the first anniversary of what I like to refer to as the Charleston 12. Nine people lost their lives that night at the Emanuel AME Church, but three people survived: two by playing dead and a third because the murderer went over to her and said: I am going to spare you so you can carry the message.

This young man who perpetrated this act did so after doing some significant research. We know that he went on the Internet, and he found the historic

church that he thought would be the proper place to start, in his words, a race war. This young man was able to purchase a weapon that he did not qualify to purchase.

Under our laws, he was to be subjected to a background check, and he was; except that our law has created a loophole that says, though there is a 3-day waiting period that the background check should take place, if at the expiration of the 3 days the background check is not completed, then you can purchase the weapon.

Well, 3 days after he started the purchase, the background check was not completed. Why? Somebody keyed in or gave the wrong information.

Let's just think about this for a moment. A person knowing what the law is could very well give erroneous information knowing that it might take more than the 3 days for anybody to find the error. They found the error, but 3 days had expired. I have no idea whether or not this young man did this or whether or not the seller entered the wrong information.

There are two cities that border one river with a short bridge between the two: West Columbia and Columbia. This gun was purchased in West Columbia, but, as I understand it, the seller keyed in Columbia, and so the error was not found until too late.

I have proposed legislation here to close what has become known as the Charleston loophole by saying the purchase cannot be completed until the background check is completed. If it takes 3 days, fine. If it takes 1 day, that is fine. But it may take 4 or 5 days or may even be 10 days if the wrong information is keyed in.

So I don't understand why this commonsense piece of legislation cannot be brought to this floor so we can vote to close that loophole or attempt to close the loophole. I think it is time for us to go on record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I grew up in South Carolina. I was a part of the movement that started back in the late 1950s and early 1960s that a lot of people have called the student movement. I was a part, along with JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this body, of the first and second organizing meetings of what became known as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

I still remember my first meeting with Martin Luther King, Jr., October 1960, the same weekend that I met JOHN LEWIS for the first time. I spent that evening that I met Dr. King, I was with him until around 4, 4:30 the next morning. I started reading and studying everything I possibly could about Dr. King. I believe, of all of his speeches, of all of his writings, the one thing that stands out to me more than any other is his letter from the Birmingham City Jail.

□ 1745

It is an iconic document; a timely document, in my opinion. Dr. King wrote his letter from that jail in re-

sponse to a letter that he had received from 8 White clergymen who called upon him to leave Birmingham because they thought his being there was disruptive.

In the letter to Dr. King, they said to him: We want you to understand, Dr. King, we believe that your cause is right, but your timing is wrong.

In responding to them, Dr. King said: Time is neutral. Time is never right; time is never wrong. Time is always what we make it.

Dr. King continued that thought by saying he was coming to the conclusion that the people of ill will in our society make a much better use of time than the people of good will. He closed that particular thought by saying that we are going to be made to repent not just for the vitriolic words and deeds of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people.

We are suffering today because some real good people in this House are remaining silent when events cry out for our attention. We should not be ignoring these issues that lead to incidents like the one that occurred at Emanuel AME Church. We should not be silent after things like Sandy Hook. And we should not be silent today, after experiencing what we have earlier this week in Orlando, Florida.

I think that the more we look into this, we see that this is not about ISIS or any foreign terrorists. All of that, it seems to me, from what I have read, is to camouflage something else. And that is, in my opinion, this was, in fact, a hate crime. It certainly shows from the evidence that this young man who perpetrated this act hated a lot of the people he was around, and maybe even himself.

So I believe that the time has come for us to break our silence in this House. The LGBT community cries out for our involvement. This incident highlights what we ought to be doing to show our respect for that community as well as our respect for the rule of law.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. CLYBURN, before you step away, with reference to the letter from the Birmingham jail, which I agree with you, is one of the greatest literary works that I have had an opportunity to read, it becomes especially important when you understand how Dr. King actually produced it. He did not have a library. He did not have persons to assist him. It is my understanding that he was able to slip notes out to people who would come and visit him, and they compiled these notes into the letter.

I want to mention this. Those clergy people that you talk about, in that letter that they wrote, if you read it first, you will see a line of logic that many people abide with, that many people of that time and this time would find very reasonable. It is after you get into Dr. King's message where he dissects each and every point that they make one by one by one that you realize that there is something not only special

about Dr. King—and there is something very special about him—but that this was a seminal moment in time.

It was a seminal moment in time in that Dr. King was educating all of us in the eons to come about the evils of bigotry and hatred. Those warnings that he gave us and the lessons, he takes us back into Biblical Scriptures about those who, at that time in the biblical days, were considered outside educators. No one is an outside educator if you come for righteous reasons.

So I am mentioning this to you because I have a great appreciation for that letter as well, and I am pleased that you brought it up.

As you know, tonight our theme is: You are not alone. I greatly appreciate what you have said about the LGBTQ community, because we want them to know they are not alone. We are allies, we are friends. We are people on whom they depend. And we do so because of a debt we owe, to a certain extent. We didn't get here by ourselves. Someone suffered and sacrificed so that we could have this opportunity to stand in the Congress of the United States of America, and indeed to breathe the breath of freedom we have because of others. And they are not alone. I appreciate what you have said about the LGBTQ community. If you have additional commentary, I would welcome it.

Mr. CLYBURN. I appreciate that. I do have something I would like to say on that. Dr. King was sitting in jail in Birmingham, Alabama, because he found some injustices there. In fact, in the letter, he said—in responding to those ministers—that a threat to justice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. And I think that Dr. King, if he were here today, would be speaking out about the threat to justice that the LGBTQ community is now experiencing. I do want the people of that community to know that they are not alone. I do believe that we should all respect human beings.

If I may? I thought as you were speaking, Dr. King, in his letter, talked about those who carried the gospel and how they were vilified. I thought about, I believe it is the 11th chapter in the Book of Second Corinthians, Paul, in his writings, talked about all that he had endured—the beatings, the jailings that he had endured—trying to spread the gospel.

I thought about those badges of honor—the jailings that Dr. King, JOHN LEWIS, and many others endured. I had a few sentences myself, but I thought about that, and these are, in fact, badges of honor.

So I want the people of the LGBTQ community to know that they are not alone in their trials and tribulations, and that at some point in, hopefully, the not too distant future, the good people in this body will rise up and break their silence.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I will add to what you have just said, Mr. CLYBURN. When you are not alone and you have some people to show up, it means

something. But there are people who believe that everybody has to show up for something significant to occur. This would take us to the eighth chapter of the Book of Judges and a man named Gideon.

The evidence has shown us—you and I, Mr. CLYBURN—that there are times when you can have too many people to get a job done. You don't have to have everybody to have the genesis of a movement. You don't have to have every person in Congress to sign onto something to have that become the genesis of the movement.

If you get enough people to sign on, what you have can be heard in this Congress. And that is called a discharge petition. There are some pieces of legislation right now that are pending with discharge possibilities.

What we have to do is take a few people, just as Gideon did; make enough noise, as he did; have a righteous cause, as he did; have a means of weeding out some of the people who may not be ready for the work that has to be done, and then work with those who are ready to work.

I believe that we can do great things in this Congress, understanding that we don't have to have everyone on board to have the genesis of a great movement.

Mr. CLYBURN. I agree. Of course, having served as the majority whip in this body, all it takes is 218. I do believe that there are 218 good people in this body who will vote for these—especially these three pieces of legislation dealing with what I call commonsense, good gun policy.

The fact of the matter is that all of us believe in the Constitution of these United States. It is the glue that holds us together as a country, as a people. The fact of the matter is the Constitution—our right to the Constitution—is not unbridled.

I am often amused to hear people talk about our First Amendment rights to free speech and to peaceably assemble. Those of us back in the sixties lived and died advocating the First Amendment, but the fact of the matter is our rights under the First Amendment are not unbridled. The Supreme Court has spoken to that with the famous phrase: your First Amendment rights will not give you the right to yell “fire” in a crowded theater.

That means that the First Amendment is not unbridled.

Why is it, then, that we can't look at the fact that the Second Amendment rights that we have to bear arms, we are not taking that right away when we say the background check should be completed?

Maybe we will turn up that you are mentally incompetent to have a weapon. Maybe we will find that you at one time, if not another, are on this no-fly list.

One piece of legislation we have here deals with it. No fly, no buy. Anyone on the no-fly list, to me, ought not be able to get a firearm. If you are sus-

picious enough as to pose a threat and be on that list, I don't think you ought to be getting a firearm. If you have been convicted of a hate crime, which is another piece of legislation here, you ought not to be able to buy a gun.

Those are commonsense policies that ought to be put into law. And for us to lay prone at the altar of the NRA and not allow just simple, good faith bills to come to this floor, I don't quite understand that. I don't think that the American people will continue to be kind to us if we do not step up and do what is necessary to protect them.

Those 49 people who lost their lives in that nightclub in Orlando are deserving of a Congress that will protect them. Also, those nine lives at the Emanuel AME Church. If we had stepped up and not put that loophole in this law, they would have been protected. I am convinced from all that I have seen that those people would still be alive today if that loophole were not in the law.

□ 1800

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill that you speak of, Mr. CLYBURN, H.R. 4063, that is Mr. CICILLINE's bill, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act; and that merely says, if you have been convicted of vandalizing a place of worship or assaulting someone based on their race, their religion, their gender, their sexual orientation, their gender identity or disability, then you ought not be able to buy a weapon.

Who believes that persons who have been convicted of these offenses ought to be able to buy weapons? If you believe that they should, then I am going to respect your opinion, but we ought to be able to debate those opinions on the floor of the United States Congress.

We don't have to win the vote. The people of this country expect us to at least do that, however. They expect us to vote. And what Mr. CLYBURN is saying, and what many others have been saying, the clarion call, the hue and cry, is let's have a vote and let's have a debate. Let the debate precede the vote. Let us make some comments about these bills, and let's let the American people have an opportunity to judge why each of us holds a position with reference to this kind of legislation. That is not asking too much.

I respect my friends who have opinions different from mine. I don't, in any way, badger people who have opinions that are different from my opinions. But I do respect people even more when they are willing to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America and state their position and allow others to state theirs. And then, afterwards, have that vote, and let's let the American people know where the Congress stands, based upon empirical evidence and based upon arguments that have been presented, so that people can get a greater understanding and get greater clarity.

Another of the bills is the one that you have, Mr. CLYBURN, H.R. 3051, the

Background Check Completion Act. "Completion," that is the operative word. Completion Act. Let the background check be completed before a person buys a firearm.

Now, if you differ with this, okay. Then let's bring this to the floor, state your difference, and let the American people know how we stand, where we stand, and then have a vote. That will make a difference for everybody in this country because people will know that the Congress of the United States is functional. There are many who believe that we are not functioning right now.

The final of the three that the gentleman mentioned is H.R. 1076. This is denying firearms and explosives to dangerous terrorists. Now, this is a bill that is being sponsored by the Honorable PETER KING. He is a Republican.

So the point to be made is that we have bipartisan legislation that can't get to the floor for a debate and then a vote. That is what we believe ought to happen. There ought to be a debate and a vote on these pieces of legislation that deal with what we believe to be legislation that can save some lives. It won't save all lives, no legislation will, but it can save some lives.

Well, someone would say that is not enough. One life is enough, to be quite honest with you. One life is enough. And to lose any life because we haven't acted is to lose too many.

At the end of the day, after having lost 49 lives in Orlando, do we want it said that after all was said and done, more was said than done? Or nothing was done and all was said? Is that what we want our legacy to be, that we did not act on pending legislation that could have made a difference for the people of the Nation?

Surely, asking for a vote, asking for debate, asking for an opportunity to be heard is not asking too much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) if he has further commentary.

Mr. CLYBURN. Well, I think the gentleman has summarized this adequately and, I think, appropriately.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored tonight to mention again that this is a resolution that we have on the floor, H. Res. 772. This is the LGBTQ Pride Month legislation, and I am honored that it is on this day, which is Flag Day, because the flag speaks to liberty and justice for all—not liberty and justice for some, not liberty and justice for some of a certain hue, not liberty and justice for some of a certain religion, but, rather, liberty and justice for all, regardless of your race, your creed, your color, your sexuality, liberty and justice for all, regardless of your religious affiliation—liberty and justice for all.

I assure you that the American people expect no less than what we pledge allegiance to, the flag of the United States of America. So I am honored tonight that we have this resolution.

This resolution is one that speaks to the accomplishments and the successes

of the LGBTQ community. And there are accomplishments and successes that we should mention, notwithstanding the circumstance that we are, unfortunately, having to deal with at this time. There are these accomplishments and these successes. Let me just name a few of them as we move along.

First, I would like to mention the passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, a significant piece of legislation, a great success for America. However, the beneficiaries are persons who are discriminated against, who are harmed because of who they are.

People do that in this country. We have people who will hurt you and take your life, as has been evidenced recently, because of who you are.

This Congress took action and passed this law to say that, if you do this, whatever the punishment was, we will enhance it. We will make this punishment greater because you ought not target people because of who they are.

Someone would say, well, why would we want to enhance the punishment for this reason?

Here is the response. Here is the re-tort. Because we do it if you are a person in a blue uniform. You hurt a peace officer in the State of Texas, because he or she is a peace officer, your punishment is going to be enhanced.

There is nothing wrong with that. I celebrate that. That is why I celebrate the passage of this piece of legislation, the Matthew Shepherd and James Byrd Hate Crime Prevention Act. This is an accomplishment that the LGBTQ community as well as other communities and all should celebrate.

Of course, there is Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Can you imagine, as a heterosexual person, having to hide who you are every day of your life, having to be incognito in a sense, under an assumed identity, cannot be authentic, cannot be yourself? Can you imagine what that would be like?

That's what Don't Ask, Don't Tell was all about, asking people to hide your identity. Don't tell anybody who you are. And if you don't tell anybody who you are, we will let you die for the country. We will let you go into harm's way and die as long as you won't tell people who you are.

And I thank President Obama. When we eliminated Don't Ask, Don't Tell, we liberated a lot of people. One in particular that I am sure felt liberation was the Honorable Eric Fanning, because he now is the first openly gay Secretary of the Army.

Can you imagine how many persons with talents that could have benefited our country were overlooked as a result of Don't Ask, Don't Tell?

Some people refused to participate in that kind of system. So I am proud that this country has stepped away from this, because every person ought to be allowed to be himself or herself.

Every person was created by the same Creator. We know the Creator by many names, but by any name, the

Creator is the one that created all that is and ever shall be. And each one of us is a creation of the Creator of the universe, and we all should be proud of who we are because we all owe allegiance to the same Creator.

I am proud to announce that 2012 was the first year that all 50 States had at least one LGBTQ elected official.

I remember many years ago, as an African American, how proud I was when I could read annually that we had persons who were getting elected across the country to various positions who were of African ancestry. I was so proud that they were getting elected because I knew that we were making progress; I knew that there was a certain amount of acceptance taking place.

This is what is happening with the LGBTQ community by having elected officials in all 50 States who can say "I am proud to be who I am," who can be authentic.

This is what America is all about, liberty and justice for all, pledge of allegiance to the flag, Flag Day. That is what this is all about: this country honoring who you are, letting you succeed on your merits and fail on your demerits, not based upon who you are.

Unfortunately, I will tell you this, there are still some places in this country where members of the LGBTQ community are discriminated against openly and notoriously. Twenty-eight States still allow someone to be fired for being gay—for that alone. Show up and tell, show up and don't pretend, show up with a friend, and you could be fired in 28 States in this country.

I think that, among all of the legislation that we talk about, this is something that the Congress ought to address. No one should be fired because of who you are, because of what God has made you. You ought not be fired for that.

In 30 States, you can be fired for being a transgender person. In 28 States, you don't have protections for sexuality under housing discrimination laws, meaning, if someone believes or concludes or has evidence that you are a part of the LGBTQ community, then you can be discriminated against in housing.

Is that the way a great country that I love, that has the notion of liberty and justice for all in the pledge of allegiance behaves? Do we allow this to continue?

America stands for justice, stands for liberty, and it stands for it for all. It is time for us to extend all of the liberty and justice that I and others might have to the members of the LGBTQ community.

I am an ally of this community, and because I am an ally, I am proud that the Supreme Court decided that marriage between same-sex couples should take place.

The Constitution of the United States of America was not written for heterosexuals only. The 14th Amendment applies to people, not to sexuality. The 14th Amendment and the

Constitution is something that is precious for all of us, and the Supreme Court has so said that these marriages between couples of the same sex have to be recognized and the licenses have to be issued. This is what allies of the LGBTQ community will call to the attention of persons on occasions such as this.

I am also proud to tell you that we who are allies of the LGBTQ community are of the opinion that we can make some of these changes. We know that we can make these changes because we have done so before. We have passed legislation after horrific events in this country. Because we have done it before, we can do it again; because we did it with the Civil Rights Act of 1968. It took us 7 days in the Congress of the United States of America to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1968 after the assassination of Dr. King.

We had 49 people assassinated in Orlando, Florida. Something can be done.

People, some would say: Well, what can be done? That is what we can debate on the floor of the Congress. Let's debate it. Rather than conclude that whatever is said is wrong and you don't deserve a hearing because what you have said is wrong, let's debate it.

We have bills to come before this Congress that we vote up and down on a daily basis. We vote them up or we vote them down. Why not have regular order apply to hate crime legislation? Why not have regular order apply to gun safety legislation? Not gun control—I don't buy into that terminology—gun safety.

But if you think otherwise, then come to the floor, stand in the well, and state your position so that all can hear.

□ 1815

The Gun Control Act of 1968 passed after the assassinations of President Kennedy, Dr. King, and Robert Kennedy. That legislation, I am sure, could have passed at other times, but it didn't. It was after a horrific act, or horrific acts, that it passed.

I think that these lives were important. But the lives of the 49 people who died at Orlando are just as important as these lives that I call to your attention. Every life is precious. We should not allow ourselves to wait until it happens to be somebody that we perceive as being somebody. We ought not have to wait until someone who happens to hold public trust is harmed before we decide we are going to do something.

Every person who is in this country is under the protection of the Constitution of the United States of America. We can debate our issues, but we ought to at least bring them to the floor and let's have a vote on them. I will accept, by the way, the vote. I always do. But I don't accept the notion that you can never have a vote on something because someone else happens to think that it is not worthy of voting on.

I think all opinions have some value, and I think whether bills are presented

by the Democrats or the Republicans, they are bills that have merit and bills that ought to receive consideration. Let them go through regular order. Let them come to this floor, and let's debate them.

Of course, the one that many people will remember is the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1994. This was passed following the shooting of President Ronald Reagan.

By the way, I am pleased that we passed all of these things. I believe that we did the right thing. Someone might argue that we could have passed this without the shooting of President Reagan. Thank God the person who attempted to assassinate him was not successful. I am so grateful that he was able to live and serve out his Presidency. But that shooting, that act alone, allowed this Congress to act. It is a known fact that you cannot have an act of Congress if you don't have a Congress willing to act. I am grateful that the Congress was willing to act after the shooting of a President of the United States.

So, because we have done it before, I am convinced that we can do it again, and I am convinced that we should do it again. I believe that this is a seminal moment in time. We have these seminal moments in time—seminal moments, moments that impact all time.

Rosa Parks, when she took that seat, ignited a spark that started a human rights-civil rights movement. That was a seminal moment in time. But there were also people who helped her at that time, which is one of the reasons why we come to the floor tonight, because we are allies of the LGBTQ community.

The African American community at that time had allies. We had people who were willing to stand up for us and stand up with us. When Rosa Parks went to jail, there were people who came to post her bond. The people who bailed Rosa Parks out of jail: Mr. Nixon was African American, but Mr. and Mrs. Durr were not. Mr. and Mrs. Durr were people of goodwill who understood that an injustice was taking place. In fact, Mr. Clifford Durr was a lawyer, and his wife was a noted person in the community. The people who posted the bail to get Rosa Parks out of jail were not all of African ancestry.

So we all have a debt that we owe. I am grateful to Rosa Parks. I wouldn't be here but for the efforts of the Rosa Parks of the world. So I have to repay that debt, and tonight I stand here to give an additional down payment on the debt that I owe that allowed me to be a part of the Congress of the United States of America.

There was the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge on what was known as Bloody Sunday. Many people lost blood at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. If you haven't been to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, I would invite you to go. Every person ought to see the Edmund Pettus Bridge, because if you can see the Edmund Pettus Bridge, you

will understand the level of angst and consternation that persons marching forward had to have as they were going up, knowing that on the other side was the constabulary prepared to do whatever was necessary to force them to go back to their starting point and not to proceed with the march.

Many of the people there with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who said he thought he was going to die, were not African Americans. There were people of all hues at the Edmund Pettus Bridge there to see that justice was done. I owe a debt to the people who were willing to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge on that fateful day.

I come to the floor tonight because I understand that I owe this debt. I believe that we owe a debt to those who have made it possible for us to be here, regardless of our hue. And believe me, regardless as to who you are, you owe a debt too. It may be to Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death." It can be to any number of the Founding Fathers. But you owe a debt to people who made it possible for us to be here in the Congress of the United States of America and to have the liberties and freedoms that we have in this country. We ought to repay the debt so that we can pass on to others what has been passed on to us: a greater sense of freedom and a greater sense of belonging in the greatest country in the world.

I am honored to tell you tonight that this resolution will not pass. I am honored to tell you this, that it will not pass this Congress. But I must be quite candid and tell you that we rarely pass any resolutions in Congress now. So I want to be fair to my friends who are in leadership to let them know that I respect the fact that any resolution, not just this one, would probably get the same results.

But I do believe this: I am honored to tell you that it will pass some Congress. I hope I am here to see it pass. I hope I am here to cast my vote that will have it pass the Congress, that will give it a chance to be heard, and that will let people debate the issues of our time as they relate to this resolution. I hope I am here.

But whether I am here or not, I believe that, at some point, we will look back through the vista of time, and we will reflect upon this time. We will ask ourselves: Who was there? Who was there to stand up for people other than themselves? I want the record to reflect that there were a good many people of goodwill who said to the LGBTQ community: You are not alone. You are not alone. We are with you. We will stand with you, and we will fight injustice with you.

In the end, as Dr. King put it, "though the arc of the moral universe may be long"—the arc of the moral universe may be long—"it bends toward justice." We will bend the arc of the moral universe toward justice. There will be justice for the LGBTQ community.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the comments that I have given tonight, I have

a statement that I will be submitting for the RECORD, a statement that speaks to the tragic circumstances that occurred in Orlando, Florida. I will be submitting this for the RECORD because I want the RECORD to show that I, along with many of my friends, took a stand.

By the way, many of my friends who are taking a stand are Republicans. Many of my friends who are taking a stand are conservatives, and many of my friends who are taking a stand are persons of goodwill who happen to be Muslims.

By the way, the Muslim community in Houston, Texas, took a stand at the iftar that I attended. The Honorable M. J. Khan, former city council member, was loud and clear. He explained that the Muslim community respects the LGBTQ community, supports that community, and wants to fight for the community to have justice.

Also, I would add that Saeed Sheikh Muhammad was there. He too made similar commentary. So there are persons across the spectrum who are supporting the LGBTQ community. I respect all of these persons, and I appreciate them for what they are doing. I want my statement to reflect that there are those of us who came together and said to the LGBTQ community: You are not alone.

Mr. Speaker, you have been more than generous. I greatly appreciate it. I want to thank my colleague who appeared. I want to thank the many colleagues who could not appear because of circumstances associated with an event that is taking place tonight. But I know that their hearts are here, and I know that they will do what they can at an appropriate time to make sure that the LGBTQ community understands and knows that the community is not alone.

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

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF FARM CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT 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 include extraneous materials on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Farm Credit's 100th anniversary of supporting our rural communities and providing reliable credit to those in the agricultural industry throughout our country.

Throughout this Congress, as the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, I have worked with Farm Credit extensively. These interactions have reaffirmed what I already knew: the Farm Credit system is made up of dedicated Americans who understand the needs and champion the values of rural America.

I am honored to represent Georgia's Eighth Congressional District, most of which is farmland. A good portion of my constituents are farmers themselves or have family and friends who farm. Georgia's Eighth District is home to roughly 15 percent of Farm Credit borrowers in the State of Georgia. I myself come from an agricultural background, as both sets of my grandparents were farmers.

Farm Credit has met the credit needs of many of my constituents and maintains an active presence in south and middle Georgia, where we are leaders in Georgia's agricultural production. For a century, Farm Credit has been providing our farmers, ranchers, and rural communities with the capital they need to build and grow successfully.

The centennial anniversary coincides with a time when our agricultural industry is facing significant economic challenges. In the past few years, our farmers and rural communities have been faced with lower commodity prices, increased input costs, and unstable and inconsistent international markets, all of which are placing strains on our food producers and those who provide essential services to our agricultural industry. This not only affects the producers and manufacturers, but it also has a tremendous effect on the communities in which they live and work.

A strong agricultural economy is essential to the health and vitality of the communities I represent in 24 counties across south and middle Georgia. During times like this, farmers in rural communities depend on Farm Credit, whose mission is focused on helping rural communities and agriculture grow and thrive.

For example, in my home State of Georgia, young, beginning, and small farmers make up 72 percent of AgFirst Farm Credit's customers. While these customers represent the future of the agricultural industry, they have entered into the industry at a difficult economic time.

Our Nation's farmers, young and old, embody the American ideals of hard work and dedication, and their commitment to providing the food and fiber for a growing nation and needy world remain steadfast. Alongside them, Farm Credit's commitment to our agricultural future remains just as important as it was 100 years ago.

Farm Credit is a critical provider of credit, not only to producers but also to the communities they live in. They are dedicated to supporting rural com-

munities' critical infrastructure needs such as access to clean water, efficient energy, sufficient healthcare facilities, and modern telecommunication services. Access to these essential services is critical to a thriving rural America. The future of our rural communities and the agricultural industry depends on a modern infrastructure, which requires access to affordable and reliable financing.

Additionally, I want to thank my colleagues who are here today to offer a few words and to celebrate Farm Credit's centennial. Rural communities in Georgia's Eighth Congressional District as well as the districts across this country are stronger when their infrastructure needs are efficiently and effectively met, and Farm Credit is providing the capital with which this can be achieved.

I want to say a special thank-you to my cohost for tonight's Special Order, the ranking member of the Commodity Exchange, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee, my friend from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

□ 1830

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT, whom I affectionately refer to as my cousin from Georgia, and my good, dear friend in addition to that.

This is a remarkable 100-year observance of a truly remarkable organization that provided a great need at a great time. Imagine where we were 100 years ago. In 1916, the world teetering on World War I, boll weevil, a lot of things happening. Just a matter of, perhaps, 50 years, the South recovering from the Civil War. Great devastation.

Enter into this picture of great need comes Farm Credit. When we celebrate this 100-year anniversary, we have to celebrate it right. We have to let people know the importance, and why this organization came into existence. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that particularly in the South, we might not have really made it as quickly in terms of our recovery as we did if it were not for Farm Credit. On this 100th anniversary, we have so much to celebrate, so many fine people. Those who started it are gone, but they built it on a solid foundation that had lasted.

Agriculture is the single most important industry in the world. It is the food we eat, it is the water we drink, it is the clothes we wear, and it is the financial system that we have created. The very commitment that Chairman AUSTIN SCOTT and I share was birthed out of that—the Commodities Exchange. The South didn't have everything it needed, but it had the land and it had the crops. It had commodities. Farm Credit provided the liquidity that our farmers needed. So there is so much to cherish in this time that we are celebrating.

There is something else, too, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this. As Chairman SCOTT said, 72 percent of their

loans are going to beginning, new farmers.

Now, why do I say that is so important?

Because the number one issue that we are faced with today is the age of the average farmer. To me, and to many of us in agriculture, this is not only a farming issue, it is a national issue, that the average age of a farmer today is 60 years of age.

What other industry has that? What other sector has that?

That is why we have to move aggressively. That is why I appreciate Farm Credit so much—because they jumped out front. Seventy-two percent of their lending capacity goes to getting young, beginning farmers in.

The other thing is they are partnering with our committee and going a step further. There is so much we can do. But, Mr. Speaker, it was the land grant colleges in the South that was the pivot. The 1860s and the 1890s is what pulled this country and pulled the South together. Every 5 years, we put a farm bill together. In that farm bill, we allocate badly needed dollars to these 1890 land grant institutions as well as to the 1860s.

I mention that because we have to get young, beginning farmers—African Americans, White, all of America's people. So what we are doing is to open up a new spending category in the farm bill for these 1890s that we will be able to give loan forgiveness and scholarships to young people who will go into farming. That is how we solve this problem. And Farm Credit has to template. They are there with that other arm.

Mr. Speaker, it costs \$8,000 just for one acre of land. You can hardly get a tractor for less than \$50,000. It is needed—when these young people graduate and they have that loan forgiveness there, they have that debt in school—in order for them to go and become farmers. They have to pay \$8,000 to start with just an acre, and \$50,000. But if we would be able to help them and say: We will help your loan forgiveness.

I mention that because the people at Farm Credit said: Let me reach out a hand. Let me help Fort Valley State in Georgia to partner with the University of Georgia. Let me help Florida A&M University Land Grant to work with the University of Florida, a land grant. Let me help Alabama A&M University and Tuskegee Institute work with the University of Alabama.

That is how we solve this problem. That is why it is important for us to understand the foundation. Farm Credit was developed out of a crisis need, and here they are moving to help with another crisis need to get more young people involved in farming.

I say a national crisis because, Mr. Speaker, if we allow this to continue without addressing this highly escalating age of our farmers, we will be in serious trouble. For if we do not continue to be the leading agriculture producer in the world and have to depend

on other nations to feed us, that is a national crisis.

So on this 100th anniversary, isn't it something that we celebrate Farm Credit when they ushered in and came and helped to restore and invigorate America at a great time, and they are still doing the same thing today?

With a century of experience and a focus on the future, I want to say to Farm Credit: God bless Farm Credit. God bless those 100 years. We look forward to many hundred more years. And God bless the United States of America.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. SCOTT, for being here. It has been a wonderful partnership to work with him on our subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank our chairman, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT, and ranking member, Mr. DAVID SCOTT, for their leadership in bringing this vital topic to the floor.

Farm Credit System is not only part of our economic security of this great Nation, but I would argue it is also part of our national security with what they provide. We are here just to commend the cooperative owners, the employees of the Farm Credit System, as they celebrate this 100th anniversary.

The Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916 was passed by Congress and President Wilson in 1916. It was a permanent means to support the well-being and prosperity of the Nation's rural communities and agricultural producers of all types and sizes, a mission it has been accomplishing every day for a century.

It plays a vital role, as you have heard my colleague say, in the success of United States agriculture and our rural communities. It has provided more than \$237 billion in loans to more than 500,000 customers. I am one of those customers, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am still paying on one of their loans.

The Farm Credit System helped me get started in farming back when I was 25 years old. It helped me buy the land I needed. I still farm that land today. It has helped my family buy land that it has needed to farm.

We are just a small part of a community of 1,349 borrower-customers from the Fifth District of Louisiana. We customers account for \$354 million in credit and investments in rural Louisiana.

In my State, Farm Credit serves more than 3,600 Louisianans, with a total loan volume of \$645 million.

What I and other farmers like about Farm Credit System is that they just seem to get it. In an age where we are losing this person-to-person contact and we are losing the sincerity, I think, sometimes of the people we come in contact with, Farm Credit System remains hometown people who give out hometown loans.

We know these people. We go to church with them. We eat supper with them in the South. They are the DNA

of our rural communities. That is why we trust them. We trust them to give honest and forthright advice. They are going to do the right thing every time for you as a borrower, as a cooperative owner, and just as a friend.

As you have heard from Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT and Mr. DAVID SCOTT, they are supporting the next generation of farmers by annually providing billions of dollars of loans to young and beginning farmers, again, the future of this country—just like me once upon a time—through organizations like 4-H and the Future Farmers of America.

It helps communities moving forward by financing vital infrastructure to bring clean water, reliable energy, and high-speed Internet to places that normally would not have this available.

I am proud to cosponsor House Resolution 591 that commends the cooperative owners and employees of Farm Credit System for their 100 years of service to our rural communities.

I thank Chairman MIKE CONAWAY, Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON, Representative AUSTIN SCOTT, and Representative DAVID SCOTT for introducing this resolution.

Congratulations to the Farm Service Agency on its 100 years of service. May it continue to help farmers and rural America for another 100 years.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT for arranging this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Farm Credit on their 100th anniversary. That is a significant anniversary.

Earlier this year, when I visited all 14 counties in Florida's Second Congressional District on the first-ever North Florida Farm Tour, I saw just how important Farm Credit System is to each and every one of our rural communities.

In the Second Congressional District alone, Farm Credit of Northwest Florida serves 439 borrower-customers, providing more than \$120 million in loans. That has helped small businesses like Southern Craft Creamery, where I performed a workday in a hair net making north Florida ice cream. It was very good. I recommend it to everyone. Remember Southern Craft Creamery.

These small businesses and small farms aren't just growing food; they are growing our economy and creating jobs. Mr. Speaker, Farm Credit is working to make sure the next generation of Americans are interested in farming and growing food for our growing country.

I am proud to have worked with them on workshops for new and veteran farmers like Bob Jackson, who Farm Credit has helped start a honey and bee business.

Mr. Speaker, again, I congratulate Farm Credit on their 100th anniversary, and I look forward to continue working with them to support Florida farmers.

□ 1845

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank Ms. GRAHAM.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Farm Credit System for supporting agriculture and the rural communities in my home State of North Carolina for the past 100 years.

Established in 1916, Farm Credit provides farm families across America with consistent and reliable credit to help finance our Nation's food production needs. Without Farm Credit Services of America, our farmers would not have the resources they need to grow their crops and their livestock—putting food on the tables of every American family. Let me underscore that—putting food on the tables of every American family. Farm Credit organizations provide more than a third of the credit that is needed by United States agriculture, accounting for more than \$217 billion in loans, leases, and related services.

In my home district, our local farm lender is Cape Fear Farm Credit, which operates in a 12-county territory and issues loans to more than 2,500 farmers and rural North Carolinians. I applaud them for supporting farm families in my district with real estate and farm improvement loans, equipment loans, operating loans, country home loans, life insurance plans, and appraisal services. Cape Fear Farm Credit also helps young, beginning, small, and minority farmers become successful by offering courses that provide not only them but their families with a unique set of tools to increase the quality and sizes of their operations.

Without a doubt, Cape Fear Farm Credit is an incredibly valuable resource for our farm families and our rural communities in North Carolina's Seventh Congressional District. Our friends at Farm Credit should be proud of their great work. They have successfully delivered on their mission for the past 100 years, and I know they will continue to have great success. They are great and fine people who understand the unique needs of agriculture production, our farm families, and our rural communities. I am proud to stand with them.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank Mr. ROUZER.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the two gentlemen from Georgia for hosting this hour to celebrate 100 years of Farm Credit and the important role it has played in our country.

For the past 100 years, Farm Credit has made vital contributions to the success of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District in our agricultural community, which includes over 10,000 farms and 15,000 farm operators. Farm

Credit has allowed farmers and growers to invest in their operations with new equipment and buildings in good times, and, in tough times, it has provided crop insurance and helped family farmers keep their lands. Farm Credit has helped Michigan farmers put healthy, delicious food on the tables of millions of people. In my district specifically, it has contributed to a districtwide output of \$1.7 billion in products sold across the country and around the world. These profits come back to our rural communities and help to keep them strong.

Mr. Speaker, Farm Credit has made America a more prosperous Nation, and I hope it will enjoy another 100 years of continued success.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank Mr. MOOLENAAR.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) for holding this Special Order hour tonight so we may have the opportunity to recognize our friends at the Farm Credit System. I am glad to join my colleagues in doing so as the Farm Credit System has been a great service to agriculture and rural communities for these 100 years.

Originally enacted by Congress and signed into law by President Wilson 100 years ago, the Farm Credit System has played a very valuable and vital role in sustaining agriculture in our Nation. While many things have changed in the last 100 years, one thing has not: the need to feed and clothe our Nation. The Farm Credit System exists to help farmers and ranchers meet this challenge while it also adapts to meet the ever-changing agricultural needs.

For example, right now, the median age for farmers, as was mentioned by Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, is around 60 years old, with farmers who are 75 years old and up outnumbering those who are in their twenties and thirties. We have to do more to give those young people hope and the opportunity to be viable and have stability in the occupations they would choose.

With the population expected to increase by over 2 billion by 2050 and as prices for farmland and equipment significantly increase, the concerns of having enough farmers to feed the world are very real. Farm Credit initiatives have helped younger farmers not only access the financial tools that are necessary to get started, but also the education and advice they need to grow their business for years to come.

More generally, Farm Credit is vital to managing the everyday risks and the uncontrollable variables farmers face, such as the weather, natural disasters, or market distortions. Just this spring, in my part of California, high winds and heavy rains—even hail—have helped to shrink California's prune crop to half or less of its normal size, with some growers losing their entire crops for the year and with some not being able to even recover their costs

for harvesting—therefore, not harvesting at all. This is on top of devastating profit losses and cutbacks that are due to the ongoing drought in the State of California.

While insurance, certainly, comes nowhere close to making up for these losses or even breaking even, it helps farmers survive another year—to get by—so they can continue growing the food, hopefully, in that good following year as they faithfully go out to their fields, to their orchards, to their vineyards to produce what Americans want and need. This helps keep our communities and local economies strong.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues and join in recognizing the critical role the Farm Credit System has played for over 100 years and to support our farmers and ranchers throughout rural communities across the country. Let's do everything we can to hold onto this vital piece of rural America, and let's keep food on the tables for all Americans and for those around the world who depend on it as well.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank my fellow colleague on the Agriculture Committee for hosting tonight's Special Order hour and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Farm Credit System for 100 years of service to rural America and the agriculture industry.

The importance of the Farm Credit System is largely unknown to those who are outside of agriculture, often leaving it prone to political attacks. However, its importance to those it serves has never been greater as declining commodity prices have led to a sharp downturn in the farm economy. Thankfully, the Farm Credit System and its members have been there to help lessen that burden.

To understand the Farm Credit System, it is important to look back at its roots. In the early 1900s, credit was largely unavailable or unaffordable in many parts of rural America, and lenders avoided agriculture loans due to their associated risks. In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a commission to explore the problem and, ultimately, found a need to develop more cooperatives and a cooperative credit system for farmers. From that idea, Congress passed the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, which eventually resulted in the establishment of the Farm Credit System, a system created to provide a permanent, reliable source of credit to American agriculture.

The Farm Credit System's mission has evolved over time. For example, in 1980, Congress empowered the Farm Credit System to provide valuable capital for infrastructure that is necessary for communities to thrive.

Since its inception, the Farm Credit System has never wavered in its mission of providing lines of credit to rural communities in good times and in bad. During the late 1980s, our farmers and ranchers faced particularly difficult times. Fortunately, the agriculture industry and the Farm Credit System were able to weather the storm together, and they emerged even more prepared for the years to come. Today, I believe that the Farm Credit System is fundamentally safe and sound and in a position to endure the challenges that it will inevitably face.

To acknowledge and celebrate a century of dedicated service to rural America, I was proud to sponsor H. Res. 591, which commemorates Farm Credit's 100th anniversary. Providing more than \$237 billion in loans to more than 500,000 customers, the Farm Credit System has worked tirelessly in all 50 States to ensure a vibrant rural economy, and I am proud to congratulate it on its 100 years of good work and the system we have in place today.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank Mr. CONAWAY.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank all of my colleagues for taking the time to come down here and recognize all of the great things that Farm Credit has done in the past 100 years. I thank all of the people who have been a part of the Farm Credit System over the past 100 years. I thank the men and women who are out there, working every day on the farm, to make sure that Americans have the food and fiber that they need. May God continue to bless them.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, one hundred years ago, Congress recognized the need for a permanent means to support our nation's rural communities and agricultural producers and established the Farm Credit System.

Cooperatively owned and operated, the Farm Credit System was designed to be responsive to the needs of its borrowers while being able to adapt to changes in rural communities and agriculture.

Today, credit in rural America remains an important issue. The Farm Credit System maintains a vital presence in all 50 states as well as Puerto Rico. In my home state of Minnesota, Farm Credit serves more than 24,000 borrower-customers by making available \$6.9 billion in loans.

Credit is one of the most important tools available for farmers and ranchers. It is a vital piece of the farm safety net during times of low commodity prices and an important resource to the next generation of farmers and ranchers looking to get started.

Farm credit also supports rural economic development, helping to fund important infrastructure improvements, provide reliable energy to rural communities, and connect rural Americans through modern telecommunications.

The impact of the Farm Credit System is felt across the country, and I congratulate them on this milestone.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Farm Credit System's one-hundred years of serving rural communities in Michigan and across the country.

Michigan's Second Congressional District is among the most agriculturally diverse in the nation. West Michigan farmers grow countless specialty crops such as asparagus, apples, cherries, blueberries, carrots, and onions. They also lead the state in livestock, poultry, eggs, nursery, greenhouse, and floriculture production. For the last one-hundred years, the Farm Credit System has been there to provide agriculture producers with reliable, consistent credit and sound financial advice.

In Michigan, GreenStone Farm Credit Services has provided the support needed to keep agriculture running. Whether it is helping young, beginning, and small farmers get their start or transitioning family farms to the next generation, GreenStone has been committed to supporting rural communities.

GreenStone's mission is to provide reliable credit and financial services for rural communities and agriculture. It is a mission they have fulfilled for the last century, and this centennial milestone is an important achievement. As many producers face uncertain economic times, it is imperative that they have a partner who understands their business and the challenges they face. GreenStone has demonstrated their commitment to farmers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring GreenStone and the entire Farm Credit System for their efforts to ensure a prosperous, productive agricultural sector for our nation.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the centennial of the Farm Credit System and its unwavering dedication to our nation's agricultural sector. As an almond farmer, House Ag Committee member and Representative of California's abundant Central Valley, I understand that our nation's farmers and ranchers are continuously faced with unique credit and finance needs.

Since its inception 100 years ago, the Farm Credit System has worked to serve our nation's farmers and rural communities. Roughly \$240 billion in loans have been made to 500,000 borrowers nationwide. These funds have built viable farming operations, improved expanded existing ones, improved trade opportunities, and enhanced vital infrastructure needs. Farm Credit was integral in helping the ag sector to navigate the Great Depression, World War II, the Farm Crisis of the 1980s, and the Great Recession.

What may be more important than Farm Credit's impact on a national scale is its presence at the local level. Our local branch and representatives work hard to establish relationships and craft finance options that work for their clients, whether they are small farmers new to the business or the next generation of an established family operation. Over the years, this institution has also committed hundreds of thousands of dollars to support our district's student ag programs, scholarships, and community events.

I'm proud to cosponsor H. Res. 591, an overwhelmingly bipartisan commendation of the Farm Credit System and the service its cooperatives provide. California's Central Valley is the most productive ag region in the world, and I remain committed to ensuring our farmers and their communities have access to the financial support that the Farm Credit System and others provide.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, the availability of credit is of paramount importance to the success of farm country, and we learned this lesson the hard way. Over a century ago, our

farm forbearers faced a credit crunch that threatened the viability of the industry. As a result, farmers, creditors, rural stakeholders and policymakers worked together to create the Farm Credit System (FCS). This system has been improved upon throughout the years as events require and has provided more than \$210,000,000,000 in loans to more than 500,000 customers.

Today, the availability of farm credit is as vital an issue for rural America as ever. Without credit, a beginning farmer or rancher will find it nearly impossible to purchase land, equipment and inputs to start a farming operation, and a long-time farmer will find it equally difficult to continue and pass on their legacy to the next generation.

To be clear, the importance of the FCS is not limited to the private land between the fence posts. Instead, the entirety of the rural economy benefits from services provided by the FCS whether those services include funding for housing, markets, or infrastructural upgrades.

Finally, the success of the FCS is equal to the sum of its parts. The system works because it is composed of individuals who care about what they do, who believe 100 percent in the mission of their enterprise to bring results and prosperity to a rural community where, without them, there might be none. These individuals are neighbors, friends and family members who take the time to get to know their customers so that they can best serve the needs of the community.

On this 100th anniversary, I am both proud to celebrate the successes of FCS and supportive of its future role in the fabric of our rural economy.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the cooperative owners and the employees of the Farm Credit System for 100 years of service in meeting the financial needs of our nation's agricultural producers.

The Farm Credit System was established by Congress through the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916 and signed into law on July 17, 1916 by President Woodrow Wilson. This year marks the centennial anniversary of the founding of the cooperatively owned and operated Farm Credit System.

Congress designed the Farm Credit System as a permanent means to support the well-being and prosperity of our Nation's agricultural sector. Today, the Farm Credit System plays a vital role in the success of United States agriculture and the economic vibrancy of communities throughout all 50 States and Puerto Rico. The Farm Credit System provides more than \$237 billion in loans to more than 500,000 customers.

The Farm Credit System has served my home district, Ohio's 11th Congressional District particularly well. In 2012, three Farm Credit System organizations; AgriBank, CoBank and Farm Credit Services Mid-America joined to provide \$135,000 in financial support for Cleveland's Gardening for Greenbacks program.

The Gardening for Greenbacks program provides grants to local entrepreneurs for the development of for-profit urban food gardens. This program encourages economic development, improves access to fresh, healthy and affordable food, and has helped to establish the City of Cleveland as a model for local food system development.

I am proud to honor the Farm Credit System on its centennial. Happy 100th Anniversary to the Farm Credit System.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, this July marks the 100-year anniversary of the Farm Credit System, and I rise today to commend the cooperative owners and employees for their continuing service and support in meeting the financial needs of rural communities and agricultural producers in the 28th District of Texas and across the country.

I was pleased to cosponsor House Resolution 591, introduced by House Agriculture Committee Chairman MIKE CONAWAY and Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON as well as the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee for Commodity Exchanges, Energy & Credit, Chairman AUSTIN SCOTT and Ranking Member DAVID SCOTT, and join my colleagues in celebrating the Farm Credit System for its 100 years of service.

Congress established the Farm Credit System through the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, which was signed into law on July 17, 1916 by President Woodrow Wilson. The Farm Credit System is comprised of independently owned cooperatives that are controlled by their borrowers. Each cooperative is therefore responsive to its borrowers' individual credit requirements and can continually adapt to the changing needs of our rural communities and agricultural producers.

Today, the Farm Credit System plays a vital role in the success of our country's agricultural sector, and the vibrancy of rural communities throughout the country. The Farm Credit System provides more than \$237 billion in loans to more than 500,000 customers nationwide. In the state of Texas specifically, Farm Credit has issued over 47,000 loans, providing \$9.5 billion in credit to farmers and other agricultural borrowers. 1,443 of those loans were made to people in the 28th District of Texas, totaling over \$593 million in loans. In 2013, Farm Credit returned nearly \$258 million to its borrowers in the state of Texas alone.

Farm Credit actively supports the next generation of agricultural producers by providing billions of dollars of funding to emerging farmers and producers, and providing financial support for organizations like 4–11 and Future Farmers of America. Additionally, Farm Credit finances reliable energy sources for farms and rural towns, clean water systems, and modern telecommunications systems that connect rural America with the rest of the world. By financing these vital infrastructure projects, Farm Credit supports the agricultural and rural communities in my congressional district and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the Farm Credit System on the occasion of its centennial and extend my appreciation to the cooperative owners and employees for their commitment to providing innovative financial services to the people of the 28th District of Texas and to the nation as a whole.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2114

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5293, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-623) on the resolution (H. Res. 783) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 15, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5667. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Member Business Loans; Commercial Lending (RIN: 3133-AB37) 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.

5668. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Trade Acknowledgment and Verification of Security-Based Swap Transactions [Release No.: 34-78011; File No.: S7-03-11] (RIN: 3235-AK91) received June 10, 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.

5669. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5670. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0004] (RIN: 1904-AB94) 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 Energy and Commerce.

5671. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee; Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies Advisory Committee; Termination [Docket No.: FDA-2016-N-0001] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5672. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0838; FRL-9947-76-Region 3] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5673. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District and Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0124; FRL-9946-38-Region 9] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5674. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; UT; Revised format for Material Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0309; FRL-9945-65-Region 8] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5675. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit a State Implementation Plan; New Jersey; Interstate Transport Requirements for 2008 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone [EPA-R02-2016-0316; FRL-9947-77-Region 2] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5676. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indiana; Ohio; Disapproval of Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS [EPA R05-OAR-2011-0969; FRL-9947-71-Region 5] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0235; FRL-9946-75] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5678. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clofentezine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0749; FRL-9942-23] received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the February 2015 Australia Group (AG) Interseasonal Decisions and the June 2015 AG Plenary Understandings [Docket No.: 160302176-6176-01] (RIN: 0694-AG88) 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 Foreign Affairs.

5680. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; exemptions [FDMS No.: NARA-16-0005; NARA-2016-021] (RIN: 3095-AB91) received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5681. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, section 701: Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Improvements Act of 2015 [Docket No.: SSA-2016-0009] (RIN: 0960-AH99) received June 10, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5682. A letter from the Paralegal, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Categorical Exclusions [Docket No.: FHWA-2016-0008] (RIN: 2125-AF69; 2132-AB29) received June 9, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5683. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Government Contracting and National Defense Authorization Act of 2013 Amendments (RIN: 3245-AG58) 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 Small Business.

5684. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applying for certification as a certified professional employer organization (Rev. Proc. 2016-33) 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.

5685. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2016-33] 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.

5686. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rules — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Respiratory System Disorders [Docket No.: SSA-2006-0149] (RIN: 0960-AF58) received June 10, 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. 4768. A bill to amend title 5,

United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions, with amendments (Rept. 114-622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 783. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-623). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 5465. A bill to repeal section 1075 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 relating to rules for payment card transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Mr.

HONDA):

H.R. 5466. A bill to secure the United States technological edge in commercial and military aviation; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr.

BECERRA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 5467. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5468. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment obligations under Repayment Contracts between the United States and the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Ms.

MOORE):

H.R. 5469. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to support the capacity of the International Monetary Fund to prevent money laundering and financing of terrorism; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 5470. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require a criminal background check to be conducted before a federally licensed firearms importer, manufacturer, or dealer may transfer a large capacity ammunition feeding device to a non-licensee, and to prohibit a semiautomatic assault weapon or large capacity ammunition feeding device from being so transferred until the Attorney General has verified that the prospective transferee has truthfully answered questions about whether the prospective transferee has been contacted recently by Federal law enforcement authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5471. A bill to combat terrorist recruitment in the United States, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5472. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the procurement practices of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5473. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to create a grant program to promote Federal, State, and local coordination to address substance use needs of families in the child welfare system, in order to improve child well-being and permanency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY):

H.R. 5474. A bill to suspend United States security assistance with Honduras until such time as human rights violations by Honduran security forces cease and their perpetrators are brought to justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 5475. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, the Judiciary, Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, and Natural Resources, 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. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 5476. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5477. A bill to eliminate the requirement that, to be eligible for foster care maintenance payments, a child would have been eligible for aid under the former program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children at the time of removal from the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 5478. A bill to improve the implementation of the settlement agreement reached between the Pueblo de Cochiti of New Mexico and the Corps of Engineers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5479. A bill to provide for programs under the Department of Health and Human

Services to improve newborn screening, evaluation, and intervention for critical congenital heart defect; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 5480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for early payment of principal on certain home mortgages and to reduce the amount which may be treated as acquisition indebtedness for purposes of determining the home mortgage interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 5481. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize institutions of higher education to provide additional loan counseling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 5482. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing medical assistance at a residential pediatric recovery center to infants under 1 year of age with neonatal abstinence syndrome and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H. Res. 781. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Res. 782. A resolution encouraging the people of the United States to honor the service of military retirees who continue to serve the United States long after such retirees have completed military service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 784. A resolution expressing support for the designation of Journeymen Linemen Recognition Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

259. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 16-004, urging Congress to reauthorize the federal "Older Americans Act of 1965" and ensure that the reauthorization of the OAA treats all older adults fairly by eliminating the "hold harmless" provision; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

260. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 16-022, concerning the designation of March 21, 2016 as "Colorado Aerospace Day" and to urge and request the government of the United States of America to take action to preserve and enhance United States leadership in space, spur innovation, and ensure our continued national and economic security; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

261. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution 16-002, to encourage the United States Congress to restore the presumption of service connection for Agent Orange exposure to United States veterans who served on the waters off the coast of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule MI 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. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 5465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 5467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act is constitutionally authorized under and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 5469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5471.

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 an Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with

foreign nations; Article I, section 8, clause 18: Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill seeks to improve the health outcomes in, access to health care to, and accountability of health care providers for, underserved and minority communities. The power of Congress to enact such a measure rests in the General Welfare and Necessary and Proper clauses of Article I, as promoting health equity and accountability in minority communities promotes the well-being of minority Americans. U.S. Const., art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States[.]"); U.S. Const., art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 18 ("The Congress shall have the Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers[.]").

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 5476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 5478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 5480.

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. SALMON:

H.R. 5481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power . . . 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. TURNER:

H.R. 5482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ". . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) of the United States Constitution, to "To regulate Commerce with foreign

Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, “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.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 539: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 563: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 605: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 711: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 932: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 997: Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 1076: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1284: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 1319: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 1391: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 1421: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 1439: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1453: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 1490: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 1548: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 1717: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COLE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BARTON.
 H.R. 1859: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 1935: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 1969: Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2102: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2151: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 2174: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 2229: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 2350: Mr. PASCARELL.
 H.R. 2368: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2411: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 2446: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 2663: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 2713: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 2726: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BERA, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 2732: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 2739: Mr. LONG and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2802: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 2817: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 2844: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2849: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2903: Mr. NUNES, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 2942: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 2962: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 2980: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2992: Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 3012: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 3051: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3094: Mr. HARDY.
 H.R. 3099: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3198: Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 3299: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3514: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 3535: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 3590: Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H.R. 3666: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3684: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 3706: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 3765: Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 3870: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 3920: Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 4094: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 4247: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 4266: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 4275: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 4352: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 4368: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 4381: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 4435: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 4481: Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 4514: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 4538: Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 4592: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 4603: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. AGUILAR, and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 4625: Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 4626: Mr. PERRY, Mr. KIND, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARR, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 4662: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 4681: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 4695: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 4708: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 4715: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 4756: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4764: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 4766: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. BARTON.
 H.R. 4813: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 4893: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 4938: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 4955: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 5016: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 5021: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 5025: Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 5029: Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 5044: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KIND, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 5061: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 5067: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 5119: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRAT, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 5143: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 5166: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BOST, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 5210: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 5224: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 5254: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 5259: Mr. OLSON and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 5275: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 5292: Mr. MESSER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. HARDY.
 H.R. 5313: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5320: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 5324: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 5333: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROSKAM, and Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 5373: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 5386: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 5396: Mr. BERA and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 5404: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 5406: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 5457: Mr. KLINE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 5458: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 5462: Ms. MOORE and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H.J. Res. 47: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.J. Res. 85: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Ms. DELBENE.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. DONOVAN.
 H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H. Res. 94: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 169: Mr. SABLAN.
 H. Res. 590: Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 591: Mr. REED.
 H. Res. 729: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. YODER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. VELA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HARRIS, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 750: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H. Res. 753: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H. Res. 759: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 769: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging congress to enact legislation that would establish uniform nationwide infrastructure and procedures for the holding of a Convention to propose an

amendment to the United States Constitution, pursuant to Article V; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

70. Also, a petition of Delaware County Board of Supervisors, NY, relative to Resolution No. 68, urging the Veterans Affairs Administration to streamline requirements in

determining conditions for Non-VA Care when veterans are seeking emergency care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.