



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2016

No. 107

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 5, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK 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 1:50 p.m.

WE ARE ASKING FOR A VOTE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor early this afternoon knowing that later this day we have a meeting with the Speaker. It is our goal and our hope that the Speaker will provide an opportunity for the minority party to have its two votes taken up in this Congress.

We prevail on the good nature of the Speaker and know him to be an honest and forthright man and an institution-

alist who understands the House. We also know that he is not just Speaker for the Republican Conference, but he is indeed Speaker of the entire House.

We face an extraordinary calamity, a catastrophe unlike anyone has experienced in any other country in the world, and it is the ongoing slaughter that occurs. There have been more than 1,000 mass murders since the tragedy at Sandy Hook when they took, as Senator JOE MANCHIN said, our babies from us.

What we are asking for on this side of the aisle are very commonsense solutions; no fly, no buy. If you can't get on an airplane because you are a terrorist but you can buy a gun, doesn't it seem as though there should be regulations that would prevent that and keep guns out of the hands of terrorists, criminals, and the mentally challenged?

Also, there are background checks, which most law enforcement entities have talked about on the very bill that Senators PAT TOOMEY and JOE MANCHIN introduced in the United States Senate that received the majority of votes and that Representatives PETER KING and MIKE THOMPSON introduced in the House of Representatives.

We are asking for a simple vote. After all, that is what we are elected to do. We are elected to represent the people whom we are sworn to serve and cast votes.

It has been more than 3½ years we have not even been allowed to cast a vote in the House of Representatives. That is why so many took to this floor in an organic movement demonstrating that we have had enough and that we deserve a vote and that we demand a vote for the countless victims and families of these tragedies.

It is not enough, as respectful as it is, to stand for a moment of silence. Our caucus will not be silent anymore. We feel that silence means you are complicit with these ongoing tragedies.

So we have asked for two pieces of legislation, both commonsense and, oh, by the way, supported by—no matter what poll you read—between 85 and 95 percent of the American public. They are not controversial.

All we are asking for is the decency to perform our constitutional responsibility in representing our constituents and to have the ability to cast the vote that they are all asking for. We are prevailing upon the decency of the other side, their understanding of the Constitution, their understanding of the rules of this House. We are counting on their decency for the families and the victims to allow us those simple measures that we swear an oath to this office in order to perform.

We are asking you for a vote. It is nothing more than what is required of us when we raise our hand and take the oath here. To deny us of that is to deny us of our basic rights.

HOUSE RULES OR RULES FOR RADICALS?

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of June 22, a large number of Democrats brought the deliberations of the House of Representatives to a standstill in one of the most disgraceful and childish breaches of decorum in the history of this institution. In complete contempt of this House and the rule of law, they shouted down all with whom they disagreed. They blocked access to the microphones as Members sought to address the Chair, and they illegally occupied the Hall of the House, forcing an early adjournment and costing this House three full days of legislative deliberations.

Abraham Lincoln said it best: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

☐ 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.

H4195

What we saw was the mob law of Occupy Wall Street brought to the House floor. They are seeking to use the recent terrorist attacks as justification for making it harder for law-abiding Americans to defend themselves. That is a strange logic, but so be it. They certainly have a right to their opinions. They have a right to express those opinions on the House floor, and they have a right to use all of the procedures of the House to act on their opinions. What they do not have is the right to prevent those with different views from exercising the same rights, and yet that is precisely what they did.

These Democratic Members have many procedures and opportunities to bring their bills to the House for a vote. They could have executed a discharge petition to bring their bill immediately to the floor. They could have moved to have their bill inserted into any bill pending on the House floor, a common motion that we routinely hear and vote upon several times a week.

The fact is their proposals were considered in the Senate and voted down. Their proposals were considered in the House committee and voted down. Their discharge petition is pending at this desk right now, awaiting enough signatures to execute it. Their only problem is they don't have enough votes. Well, sorry, that is called democracy. The majority of their colleagues simply disagree with them for some very good reasons.

Their rights were honored and protected by the Republican majority under the rule of law, yet they denied those same rights to others by replacing the rule of law with the rule of the mob; and they did so on the most sacred ground of our democratic Republic, the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Instead of working within the time-honored rules of the House to convince the majority of their way of thinking, they decided to tear down the rules. This was the lawless left on full display, and I hope the American people took a long, hard look at it and understand the threat to our democratic traditions and institutions that this conduct reveals.

In recent days, we have seen leftist mobs assembled under a foreign flag violently attacking American citizens who were merely trying to exercise their right to peaceably assemble to support their candidate for President. We have seen this administration attempt to criminalize political dissent and use our institutions of government to intimidate people out of participating in our political process. And now we have watched this lawless behavior imported onto the floor of the House of Representatives.

The House leadership decided not to confront this unprecedented spectacle as it unfolded, and I do not gainsay their decision here. It was obvious the Members involved were trying to provoke a physical confrontation, but serious damage was done that day to our

orderly process of government and it cannot go unchallenged. Doing so would establish a dangerous and corrosive precedent, antithetical to everything which this institution and our country stands for.

The Constitution provides that the House may sanction Members for disorderly behavior, and the Members responsible for the events of June 22 and 23 must be called to account for their actions. If we fail to do so, we will have replaced the House rules with rules for radicals.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a little over a week and a half ago, my colleagues and I came to the House floor. We came to the floor to protest the inaction of this Republican Congress, the tyranny of the majority, to act on gun violence prevention measures—their deliberate inaction in the face of 33,000 deaths caused by gun violence every year. We came to demand substantive action to address our country's epidemic of gun violence.

Yet, today we will be presented with legislation promoted by the NRA that fails to address this serious problem. H.R. 4237 does not close or otherwise address the terror gap that allows known or suspected terrorists in the United States to legally buy guns.

Instead, this bill handicaps law enforcement, creating an impossibly burdensome process and allowing terrorists to take advantage of the Charleston loophole. In fact, H.R. 4237 doesn't just leave the loophole open, which led to the loss of nine lives at the Emanuel AME Church, it reinforces it and the terror gap.

Under this legislation, to prevent the transfer of a firearm, the government will be required to file an emergency petition, schedule a hearing, provide the suspect with notice and counsel, and win the hearing all within 72 hours of the attempted purchase. And even if the government is able to win the hearing, it can only prevent the transfer if the court finds that the suspected terrorist committed, attempted to, or will commit an act of terrorism. Put another way, the government can only prevent a gun sale to a suspected terrorist if they can arrest the person for terrorist activity within 3 days of an attempted purchase.

Ultimately, this legislation does not provide any meaningful safeguards to prevent terrorists from purchasing guns. Sadly, it is nothing more than a political tactic to avoid responsibility, a contrived effort to look busy and feign concern while thousands of Americans lose their lives to gun violence. The American people are smarter than this.

We have a moral responsibility to do something meaningful. The American

people demand that we do more, that we do something, that we do anything to help prevent another mass tragedy in this country. Make no mistake, this legislation falls short of a good-faith effort to save lives.

The GAO found that individuals on the terrorist watch list were able to pass a background check and legally purchase a firearm 2,043 times between February of 2004 and December of 2014. The FBI was only able to prevent 10 percent of these purchases.

As we all, unfortunately, learned on June 12, when we fail to prevent dangerous individuals from getting their hands on guns, we put the lives of Americans at risk. But there is legislation that the House can consider that will reduce gun violence.

First, H.R. 1076, the no fly, no buy bill, would effectively close the terror gap by providing the Department of Justice with the discretion to block gun sales to terrorist suspects. It will preserve due process for individuals who were mistakenly listed to appeal their denial.

Second, H.R. 1217 would implement universal background checks for all commercial gun sales. It is a measure supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people. And empirical research shows that universal background checks for all handgun sales have lowered levels of gun violence in those States where that occurs. Nationally, 34 percent of gun sales and 40 percent of all gun transfers occur without a background check.

□ 1215

This legislation would represent an important step toward closing this loophole and reducing gun violence.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to bring these two bills to the floor, to respond to the demands of the American people, to do something about the pandemic of gun violence, to do something meaningful that will actually reduce gun violence in this country and protect the American people, as we are sworn to do.

I know I speak for all of my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus. We will continue to fight in every way that we can until we can persuade our Republican colleagues to bring these bills to the floor, to do something about the carnage of mass gun violence in this country.

AMERICANS WANT CONGRESS TO PASS MEANINGFUL GUN LEGISLATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Americans want Congress to pass meaningful legislation that will actually keep guns out of dangerous hands.

So what is our majority doing?

They are bringing up a bill that was not only drafted by the gun lobby, but

that makes it nearly impossible to block gun sales to suspected terrorists. That is shameful.

The American people deserve a Congress that is willing to stand up to the gun lobby and do what it takes to help keep our communities safe. Congress has a responsibility to listen to the people who we are supposed to represent, to put partisan politics aside, and to bring up commonsense, bipartisan legislation to keep guns away from those who shouldn't have them: suspected terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. And the American people want those bills brought up now.

More than 30 people are killed every day by someone using a gun. We can't afford to allow more innocent lives to be lost to gun violence.

Just a few weeks ago, 49 innocent people were shot to death in the worst mass shooting our country has ever seen. Sadly, this isn't an insulated case. It has now been 3½ years since the tragedy at Sandy Hook took the lives of 20 elementary school kids and six educators, but for reasons that I will never understand, that horrific tragedy wasn't enough to convince the Republican leadership that something—something—needs to be done to prevent the next tragedy.

Let me give you some numbers:

Three and a half, that is how many years it has been since Sandy Hook; 34,000, that is the number of people who have been killed by someone using a gun since Sandy Hook; 1,182, that is the number of mass shootings that have taken place since Sandy Hook; 520, that is the number of days the House has been in session; 30, the moments of silence that we have observed on this House floor because of gun violence.

Most important, zero. Zero. That is the number of votes that this House has taken to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

What is the majority so afraid of? Is their fear greater than the fear of those young kids at Sandy Hook, or those parishioners in Charleston, or those young people at the nightclub in Orlando?

It is long past time for the House to give us a vote on meaningful legislation to make sure that terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill don't have easy access to guns in our country.

There is bipartisan legislation that would prohibit those on the FBI's terrorist watch list from being able to purchase firearms, and I have authored legislation, which has bipartisan support, to require background checks for all commercial gun sales. Background checks are our first line of defense when it comes to stopping dangerous people from getting firearms. They work. Every day more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives are stopped from buying a gun because of background checks. But in 34 States, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill

can bypass the background check by purchasing guns online, at a gun show, or through an ad in the paper. This is a dangerous loophole that needs to be closed, and it needs to be closed now.

The bill has 186 bipartisan coauthors. Bring our bill up for a vote. There is absolutely no reason why anyone should oppose this background check bill. Not only is it bipartisan, it respects the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

I am a gun guy. I own guns. I support the Second Amendment. If this bill did anything to violate those rights, my name wouldn't be on it.

All this background check bill does is require that folks pass a background check before purchasing guns online, at a gun show, or through an ad. Plain and simple. It does nothing to infringe on the Second Amendment right of law-abiding citizens to own firearms.

This debate on background checks isn't a choice between either protecting the Second Amendment or reducing gun violence. It is about the willingness of a responsible majority to do both. If there is one thing we should all be able to agree on, it is that suspected terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill shouldn't have guns.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote. Bring up H.R. 1076: bipartisan, effective, no fly, no buy legislation. And bring up H.R. 1217: bipartisan background check legislation.

Mass shootings followed by moments of silence and no action cannot become America's new normal. We need to vote, and we need to vote now.

INACTION IS NOT AN OPTION

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with over 30 Americans killed by a gun every single day, for far too long I have been saying that inaction is not an option. Yet, in my 3-plus years in Congress, House Republicans have refused to do anything on gun violence. This week's lackluster, Beltway, big-gun-lobby-written bill is the only gun vote this Congress has had.

Why is it that when our country was facing a horrific opioid epidemic, we empowered our local, State, and Federal governments with the resources necessary to combat this issue? And why is it that when a terrorist boarded a plane with a bomb in his shoe, we passed legislation that makes passengers remove their shoes when they go through airport security? Yet, after countless mass shootings and daily violence in the streets of Chicago, Newark, and Baltimore, we do nothing.

Many of us here today are still rightfully discussing the horrible 49 deaths in Orlando a few weeks ago, but I would like to share two other statistics with you about gun violence since Orlando.

During our honorable colleague, Senator CHRIS MURPHY's 15-hour filibuster,

48 people in America were shot. Forty-eight people in 15 hours. In Chicago, the last month has seen 79 people lose their lives to gun violence. Seventy-nine lost souls:

Fabian Lavinder; Kevin Montell Atkins, Jr.; Victor Felix; Marshaun Clinkscale; Kaysar Chako; Joseph Harden; Jamaal Bellamy; Christian Bandemer; Daniel Alcantara; Anthony Howard; Darnell Hardeman; William Palmer; Kori O. Sellers; Dontay Murray, Jr.; Donkel Riley; Anreco Nichols; Sami Salaymeh; Victor Sanders; Lewis Johnson; Lanarris Webster; Dawson Stephan; Paul Webster; Terry Bates, Jr.; Jeremy Ray; Fatimah Muhammed; Travell Montgomery; Timothy Boyd; Christopher Fields; Javil Nunn; Antwon Brooks; Dwayne Triplett; Jordan Liggins; Davion Barron; Adrian Watson; Antoine Randle; Steven Edwards; William Sandifer; Antonio Perkins; Jeremy Rodgers; Denzel Thornton; Angelo Davis; Demetrius Archer; Marshaun Jackson; Victor Robinson; Melvin Cook; Charles Wiley; Latrell McMahon; Eric Knox; Eric Smith; Margaret Shanahan; Alejandro Rosas; Michael A. Brown; Carlton Hall; Salvador Suarez; Otis Richmond; Eugene Singleton; Ramal Hicks; Amari Catchings; Stanley Boston; Jessica Hampton; Eric Burgin; Trevell Parker; Jeremy Clark; Brandon Nolls; Reginald Turner; Trayvon Wilson; Wondale Collier; Selton Ellis; Frederick Johnson; Lonnie King; Kentrail McCray; Alfondia Kelly; Matusalem Gutierrez; Darrell Guy, Jr.; Marshaun Hilson; Chanda Foreman; Robert Vaughn; Kenneth Whitaker; Hector Badillo, Jr.; and Willie Pittman.

We were led during our sit-in 2 weeks ago by an icon, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and I was very, very, very proud to participate and would do it again. He is fond of referencing a dream he shared with his mentor, a mentor of many of us, Dr. King, the dream of the Beloved Community, a place where people of all races, creeds, religions, and gender identification can live together in peace.

Certainly there is no place for assault rifles in the Beloved Community. There is no place for gun rights for terrorists in the Beloved Community. There is no place for gun rights for criminals and the dangerously mentally ill in the Beloved Community. In the Beloved Community, no child has to live a life where going to the park risks them from being mowed down by a stray bullet.

I will keep fighting and speaking out until we honor these victims' lives with action, not with moments of silence.

WE HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, in the month of June, 22 people were murdered by guns in Los Angeles. The oldest person

was 46, and the youngest was 3. On one day alone, June 11, eight people were killed. We all know the statistics: every 24 hours, 30 people are killed in the United States by guns. The leading cause of paralysis is gun violence.

People around the Nation have demanded action from Congress. When I returned to my district after the protest, I was met with cheers and standing ovations. People said, Finally, finally they saw us act. Finally, they saw us fight. Fight against the NRA, which has a stranglehold on Congress. My constituents reflect the over 90 percent of the U.S. public that is demanding that we act and pass legislation to address the carnage from gun violence.

I am proud to say that the State legislature in California has acted. Now Congress needs to act. The Governor signed five bills recently passed by the legislature. In California it is now against the law to possess ammunition magazines that hold more than 10 rounds. Background checks are now required to purchase ammunition. The Governor signed bills that ban bullet buttons designed to make it easy to detach a magazine and reload, a creative idea from gun manufacturers to get around the assault weapon ban when it was in effect.

Other bills signed by the Governor prohibit the lending of guns to family members who have not completed background checks, and people who knowingly make false reports about the loss or theft of a gun cannot possess firearms for 10 years. The bills were signed too late to have saved the 22 people who died in Los Angeles, but I have no doubt that these laws will help reduce death and injury from gun violence.

I am proud California is setting an example for the Nation, and it is my hope after the tremendous public response and demand that we act, that we pass sensible legislation to bring an end to the deaths and injuries. It is very difficult to explain to constituents how someone considered too dangerous to purchase an airline ticket is not too dangerous to buy a gun.

The no fly, no buy legislation authored by Republican Representative PETER KING is a modest piece of legislation that is really a first step. All of us are clear, much more needs to be done: comprehensive background checks, closing the gun show loophole.

My Republican colleagues argue that we don't need any new laws, we just need to enforce the ones we already have, but then hypocritically claim the President is overstepping his authority when he increases resources to the ATF so that they can modernize their technology to address Internet sales. The last time serious legislation was passed, the Internet didn't exist.

The shooter who killed the nine churchgoers in South Carolina might have been blocked from purchasing a weapon, but his background check wasn't processed in time. Three days or you get your gun. Without the staffing

and the technology, 3 days is almost impossible; and although he shouldn't have had a gun because of a prior arrest, he was able to purchase anyway.

As a nation, at some point we have to make a decision. The decision is ours. As a legislative body, we have to decide who rules this place.

Is it a handful of industries that dictate what we do?

I can name just a few industries that cause my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to vote however the industry decides, not their constituents. If they voted with their constituents who, poll after poll, say 85 percent of Republicans support sensible gun control. They vote the way an industry dictates or they face the consequences of an independent expenditure campaign and an opponent.

In memory of the following people who were killed in one day in Los Angeles, I mention their names:

June 11, Jesus Alfredo Duran, 31 years old;

June 11, Eddie Hernandez, 22 years old;

June 11, Stephanie Gonzalez, 17 years old;

June 11, Kimberly Gonzalez, Stephanie's sister, 13 years old;

June 11, Johnny Mark Elizalde, 27 years old;

June 11, Juan Zataray, 43 years old;

June 11, Jose Rene Espinoza, 46 years old;

June 11, Cynthia Ambriz, 19 years old.

□ 1230

WE NEED MEANINGFUL GUN LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, when this House last convened, a number of us were willing to sit in, in order to stand up—to stand up to the gun lobby, to stand up against gun violence. During our protest, House Republicans fled Washington, rather than face accountability on gun safety, leaving behind significant unfinished business.

During the past week, many of us across the country have joined neighbors in a national day of action against gun violence. I joined over 100 people in San Antonio, gathering with Patricia Castillo with the P.E.A.C.E. Initiative, Jamie Ford with Moms Demand Action, and State Senator Jose Menendez.

On a hot afternoon in Austin, Texas, more than 100 of us also gathered with Mayor Steve Adler, Andrea Brauer from Texas Gun Sense, members of the Austin City Council, State Representative Donna Howard, and other elected officials, all asking this Congress to respond to the horrific wave of gun carnage that threatens the security of our families. Each of these gatherings included powerful testimony from family tragedies and losses as a result of guns.

After the mass murders in Orlando and San Bernardino, carried out by in-

dividuals professing a twisted version of Islam, the most obvious next step is to question why, if someone is too dangerous to get on an airplane with you, they ought to be able to buy as many assault weapons as they would like? And ask why, in Orlando, the law enforcement officials did not hear about assault weapon purchases of one person who had been on the terrorist watch list? One of the three modest bills about which we were sitting-in would institute a no-fly, no-buy restriction.

The day after our protest, to their credit, four of our Republican colleagues here in the House, for the first time, introduced a version of a proposal to prohibit such gun purchases, but also to provide a means by which someone could get off the no-fly list if they were on it improperly.

This proposal copies verbatim one proposal that has been offered by Republican Senator SUSAN COLLINS. Hers is the only proposal pending in the United States Senate today that has not already been rejected. I think it is time for us to come together to unite behind this proposal. It is a modest step forward, but it is a step forward to address gun violence.

Instead, we are told today that Speaker RYAN is, apparently, committed to blocking this bipartisan initiative and anything else that doesn't have a seal of approval from the National Rifle Association. Apparently, the only provision on which we will be allowed to vote here in this House is a proposal that the Senate has already rejected.

This isn't action. It is theatrics. It is the appearance of the response to the concern of so many Americans for action on gun safety, without changing anything.

Under this gun lobby proposal, in order to prevent a gun purchase, the Justice Department would be required to obtain a court order within 72 hours to prove probable cause that a person has "committed, conspired to commit, attempted to commit, or will commit an act of terrorism." Well, if our law enforcement can do that, they should not only be preventing a person from acquiring a gun, they ought to be taking them to prison.

So much attention has focused on the sit-in on this floor, not enough has focused on the "sit-on." I am talking about the Speaker, who sits on any legislation concerning gun violence, including that advanced by fellow Republicans, if it does not have approval of the gun lobby.

We just celebrated Independence Day. How about the Republicans declaring independence from the gun lobby? Just once, in a very small, modest way declaring independence on a proposal that Republicans themselves have advanced—a few of them—to address more security for our families.

The Republican leadership has tried so very desperately to avoid accountability on gun safety. They cut off these microphones. They fled the

House in the middle of the night. Now they are cloaking themselves in an NRA-approved bill already rejected by the United States Senate that won't keep weapons of war out of the hands of terrorists.

Everyone who owns a gun knows that sometimes you need to keep the safety on that gun. I think it is time to put the safety back in gun safety legislation. It is time to engage in meaningful, real reform.

ERSKINE FIRE

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 2 weeks now, a wildfire has raged throughout my district. High heat, dry winds, and a long drought conspired together, enabling a fire that has burned tens of thousands of acres, hundreds of homes, and taken the lives of two people.

I did not know Byron and Gladys McKaig personally, but I have heard about them and learned a small part of their story. They were good and loving people. They met in a church. He was an Episcopal priest and she played the organ. Byron would preach; Gladys would play. They helped their friends and each other grow closer to God.

They died, it seems, from smoke. A neighbor said he spotted them, after the fire, lying out in front of their house near their fence. The trees were still burning. Byron looked as if he were shielding his wife from the coming flames. It was one last act of sacrifice for the woman he spent his life loving. Such people are a gift to everyone they meet.

As our community struggles now to return to a sense of normalcy, faced with the immense task of rebuilding after so much loss, we have our firefighters, police officers, and first responders to thank that this disaster was not worse. For days, with little sleep and near exhaustion, they kept the flames at bay. They remind us how willingly some face danger to protect others. We are forever thankful to them.

We continue to pray for those suffering from the loss of their businesses, their homes, their families, and their friends. Our community always has and always will stand strong in the face of disaster as we rebuild.

PASS GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION AND GIVE D.C. THE VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, anyone who thought the Democrats would go away after we were driven to a sit-in on the House floor for gun safety legislation learned differently very soon after we got home on Wednesday, June

29, when events were held all across the country on a National Day of Action for Gun Violence Prevention. We served notice.

Yes, there have been moments of outrage and sometimes we have not kept up the battle unceasingly. Watch us this time.

I am very pleased that our very effective police chief, Cathy Lanier, came with me to a roundtable where we heard not only from her, but from residents of the District of Columbia who have experienced the incredible heartache and throbbing agony of the loss of a loved one to gun violence.

This morning, unstimulated by me, parents organized themselves to come to the Capitol at 9 a.m. They call themselves D.C. Moms and Dads for Rational Gun Safety Legislation. They are a group of spontaneously formed District of Columbia parents who lack voting representation in the Congress, although they pay the highest taxes per capita of any Americans. They do not have the final vote on the House floor, and they have no Senators.

They wanted to come and show their support for national gun legislation to prevent gun violence in our city and our country. They came when, the week before, I had just fought off three amendments in the House Rules Committee to undermine D.C.'s gun laws with an attempt to erase some of those laws.

It is interesting that, in the Rules Committee, I was able to keep those Republican amendments to take away our gun laws from being made in order. I think it is because the Rules Committee took place only days after Orlando, and even Republicans didn't have the nerve to authorize gun legislation so close to the Orlando gun massacre. Is that what it is going to take? Or will it take the persistence that you saw when Democrats had no alternative but to sit on this hard floor just before recess?

Now, the Republicans have gotten the permission of the NRA to include a gun bill in a pending bill. No wonder, it makes things worse. Now you would have to go before a judge before you can get someone off the no-fly list, instead of depending on the slow administrative process, you would go through the much slower judicial process. Thank you for nothing. It certainly won't satisfy us or the American people.

We who live in your Nation's Capital, need national gun legislation to keep guns from flowing in from weak gun jurisdictions, and we need Congress to leave our gun safety laws alone.

Without fail, every single year, I have to drive back attempts to overturn our gun laws. I just described three that were in the Rules Committee before we left that I was able to drive back because of Orlando.

Yes, I am proud that the Nation's Capital has the strongest gun laws in the country, as well it might. Controversial world figures walk our

streets and visit our restaurants. Weak gun laws we do not need in this Capitol.

We have effective enforcement. We have good relations among Chief Lanier and her police force and our residents. But we are still at the mercy of a Congress, which will not do its job.

During our House sit-in, I left the floor to go to a press conference held by the Mayor and the police chief, displaying AK-47s and other guns illegal in the District of Columbia but that you can simply go to a gun show and buy, undermining our gun laws.

Our gun problem in cities like ours and many cities and jurisdictions across the country are not local problems. They are a national problem. That is why you see us demanding universal background checks. That is why we are demanding that Congress stop censuring the CDC from studying gun laws.

I thank the moms and dads and kids who marched to the Capitol today for overriding their denial of a vote to come here. You sent a dual message: pass gun safety legislation, and give D.C. the vote.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE NEED FOR UNIVERSAL BACKGROUND CHECKS

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, years before coming to Congress, as many of my colleagues know, I cofounded and served as the executive director of the National Network to End Domestic Violence.

Twenty years ago, we worked with a bipartisan Congress to pass the Domestic Violence Offender Gun Ban. It became law in 1996. It was known as the Lautenberg amendment, after the late Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey.

□ 1245

Since that time, we have made a lot of progress in preventing domestic violence, but, sadly, there are several Mack Truck-size loopholes that prevent the law from coming to its full effect. In fact, just last week, in a fight against the gun lobby, yet again, over these last 20 years, the Supreme Court upheld the domestic violence offender gun ban in a 6-2 decision.

As many know, leaving an abusive relationship is the most dangerous time for a domestic violence victim, and adding a firearm to that situation severely heightens the risk of injury or death. In fact, in America, the majority of fatal domestic violence homicides are committed with firearms. At least 52 percent of American women murdered with guns are killed by intimate partners or family members.

Despite impressions from media coverage, mass shootings in which at least four people are murdered with a gun

are also typically acts of domestic or family violence. An Everytown, USA, analysis of every mass shooting between 2009 and 2015 found that 57 percent were committed by intimate partners or the family of victims.

Research shows that commonsense gun laws have a marked effect on improving women's safety from gun violence. In States that require background checks for all handgun sales, 46 percent fewer women are murdered with a gun by an intimate partner. And State laws ensuring that convicted abusers or those subject to domestic violence restraining orders are separated from their firearms are also associated with reductions in gun violence against women. But because of loopholes in these laws and failures to enforce them, they do little to curb the uniquely lethal American problem of guns and violence against women.

Four gaps in the law are particularly harmful. First, Federal law does nothing to keep guns out of the hands of abusive dating partners or convicted stalkers. The Federal law prohibits domestic abusers from buying or owning guns but doesn't apply to dangerous people convicted of misdemeanor stalking offenses or to dating partners, even though more women in the U.S. are killed by their dating partners than their spouses.

Second, in 35 States, State law does not prohibit all people convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence crimes and all people subject to restraining orders from buying or using guns.

Third, and importantly, Federal law allows domestic abusers and stalkers to easily evade gun prohibitions by purchasing guns from unlicensed private sellers. That is the Mack Truck loophole. Federal law only requires background checks for gun sales at licensed dealers. Sixteen States require checks on all handgun sales, but in the remaining States, prohibited abusers seeking to avoid a background check have very little trouble purchasing a gun from an unlicensed dealer they meet online, at a gun show, or in a parking lot.

Prohibited domestic abusers know about this loophole and they have taken advantage of it to deadly effect. And, in fact, in a first-of-its-kind investigation of illegal gun sales, Mayors Against Illegal Guns found that one in four prohibited purchasers seeking guns online had a domestic violence arrest.

Finally, 41 States do not require prohibited abusers to relinquish the guns they already own, so I have joined in legislation to prohibit these guns from falling into the hands of domestic abusers. We know that a proven way to help with people who are not eligible to purchase guns, such as felons and domestic abusers, is to expand and strengthen universal background checks on all firearms sales no matter where that sale takes place. And, very tragically, our lax gun laws make it easier for abusers to acquire a firearm than it is, in fact, to purchase a box of Sudafed.

So you ask, Mr. Speaker, why do we protest? Why did we take the dramatic action of taking to the floor of this House?

It is because we have had enough, and we know that, working together, we can and must change the fact that women across this country lose their lives to gun violence by their domestic abusers.

Nine American women are shot and killed by their husbands and intimate partners every single week. We can do something about it. Let's close the gun show loophole.

BIPARTISAN GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION MEASURES

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this House's silence on preventing gun violence and keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous individuals is a betrayal of the American people.

Americans are 25 times more likely to be murdered with a gun than in any of our peer countries; and since the horrific shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School in my district, in the last 3½ years, 100,000 Americans have lost their lives to gun violence. Think about that—100,000 Americans. That is the size of a good-sized American city, every single one of them dead because of a gun. And this House—this House—has done nothing.

We are elected to respond to the needs of the American people. We are elected to keep Americans safe; and right now, felons, domestic violence abusers, even suspected terrorists can buy a gun of their choice without a background check, no questions asked.

And the bad guys are well aware of this big, gaping loophole in our laws. Here is what an al Qaeda spokesman said in a propaganda video in 2011:

"America is absolutely awash in easily obtainable firearms. You can go down to a gun show at the local convention center and come away with a fully automatic assault weapon, without a background check, and most likely without having to show an identification card. So what are you waiting for?"

The real question is: What are we, what are we in this Chamber, waiting for?

We have the no fly, no buy bill, a bipartisan bill to close the terror loophole, and we have a bipartisan bill to strengthen background checks so that they apply to all commercial sales of guns.

Now, I know many Americans assume that the laws we have on the books are strong enough, it is just a question of enforcement; but, sadly, that is not true. That is not true. Somewhere between 30 and 40 percent of all gun sales right now do not go through background checks at all, not at all, so the bad guys just have to go to an unlicensed dealer or go online.

And let's be very clear. Twenty years ago, when Congress passed the background check bill, when they passed that bill, people didn't buy guns online. People didn't buy much of anything online, so Congress didn't even have it in its head to close a loophole it wasn't aware of. But it is now this Congress', it is now our job to respond to the needs of the 100,000 Americans who have died in the last 3½ years and to take action to save lives.

Now, no single law—no single law—can end gun violence, but we do know that laws work. They work, and improved background checks save lives.

For example, in Connecticut, our permit-to-purchase law has reduced gun homicides by 40 percent. That translates into 296 lives saved over a 10-year time period.

In States that have closed background check loopholes, 46 percent fewer women are killed by domestic partners, and 48 percent fewer on-duty police officers are shot to death. That is half of those lives saved. And each one of those lives saved is precious. Each one has a family. Each one has loved ones. Sometimes we forget that when we are talking about thousands of this and hundreds of that and millions of dollars and trillions of dollars. Each and every life is important and precious, and we are sworn to help the American people.

Here is the bottom line. Better laws work, and background checks work to save lives.

The bill that the majority is bringing up this week doesn't really help. In fact, it addresses the terror gap in ways that will hamper the FBI's efforts to keep us safer.

But let me be very, very clear. Without background checks on every single gun sale, no matter what we do on closing the terror gap, it won't matter, because the bad guys will continue avoiding the law, whether it is domestic violence abusers, felons, the dangerously mentally ill, or suspected terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, there are steps we can take to make our communities safer; there are steps we can take to save lives; and I call on this House to call up, this week, the bipartisan bill to expand background checks.

ADDRESSING THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we reflected on how fortunate we are to live in a country that gives each of us a voice in our government. Today, this Congress will, once again, ignore the voices of millions of Americans by refusing to address the epidemic of gun violence in our communities.

Yesterday, we honored the courage that millions of Americans have demonstrated throughout our history by standing up in defense of their fellow citizens. But today, this Congress will

not muster the courage to hold a vote on two proposals that are supported by roughly 90 percent of this country and that can save American lives.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to be heard. They deserve a vote. If the U.S. homeland security community places a person on the FBI terrorist watch list or determines that a person is too dangerous to board an airplane, then surely we can agree that person is too dangerous to buy a firearm.

This week, the majority will introduce a bill that pretends to close this gap in our homeland security laws, but, in reality, it would create a system in which it is both legal and likely for suspected terrorists to buy a firearm.

The Republican measure takes no fly, no buy and turns it into no fly, no problem. Under their proposal, if a known or suspected terrorist attempts to buy a weapon, they will be denied that ability for a mere 3 days.

From the moment they attempt to purchase that firearm, the following things must happen, all within 72 hours, to prevent that purchase: the Attorney General must file a petition in Federal court; the court must schedule a hearing; the suspect must be provided actual notice and the opportunity to appear at that hearing with a lawyer; the court must rule on the petition. And if all those things do not occur in 3 days, the suspect is legally entitled to buy a weapon.

Not only does the Republican bill set an impossible timeline, it also requires the Justice Department to meet an extremely high burden of proof. A sale would only be prevented if the court finds probable cause that the suspect has committed or will commit an act of terrorism.

The Republican proposal is specifically designed to ensure the Justice Department fails and the suspect is allowed to buy a gun. It is a fig leaf to cover up the Republicans' refusal to take any meaningful action on gun violence. It is no surprise that this bill is supported by the gun lobby.

Instead of spending our time on toothless, ineffective proposals, we should vote on the original no fly, no buy bill that will keep guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists.

We are also demanding a vote on a bipartisan proposal to require that commercial gun purchases include a background check, background checks for all. I have yet to hear one good explanation on why this should not be the law of the land. If a dangerous person cannot pass a background check at a licensed gun dealer, they should not be able to avoid a background check by going to a gun show or purchasing a firearm over the Internet.

In States that have closed loopholes in their background check laws, 48 percent fewer on-duty police officers are shot to death—but my colleagues across the aisle still refuse to hold a vote.

Mr. Speaker, 33,000 people were killed by gun violence in America last year.

The American people deserve more than moments of silence. They deserve action to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of dangerous people.

□ 1300

They deserve to have their voices heard. They deserve to send their kids to school without fearing an assault-style weapon will be waiting for them. But, at the very least, they deserve to know where each Member of Congress stands. I am asking my Republican colleagues to find the courage to hold a vote on real gun violence prevention legislation that will save American lives.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House will finally consider legislation to make reforms to our background check system for firearm purchases. Now, Mr. Speaker, the word "reform" can either be a noun or a verb. As a noun, reform means a change for the better, improving a situation without revolutionary change, a moral improvement. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that in this instance, the reform we are about to vote upon is a verb, where it simply means to form again or to become formed again.

Americans are demanding a background check system that is a change for the better and is not riddled with loopholes. They demand a system that protects the rights of law-abiding Americans while preventing dangerous individuals from obtaining weapons. They demand a system where, to purchase a gun, you must pass a background check. Unfortunately, the bill before us, crafted by the NRA, will not deliver this to the American people.

One of the fundamental loopholes in the Brady bill, which requires background checks for most purchases, is that, if the sale is not approved after 3 days, a firearm dealer can make the sale anyway, even though the background check is still pending. Tragically, this loophole has been given a new name and nine new faces following the attack at Emanuel AME Church in Charleston on June 17, 2015.

Prior to that fateful day, the Charleston shooter was arrested in Columbia, South Carolina, on March 1, 2015, and charged with a felony drug offense. FBI Director James Comey has since confirmed that, as part of this arrest, the shooter admitted to the city of Columbia police that he was in possession of drugs. Under the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, an unlawful drug user or addict is prohibited from purchasing a firearm, and this information should have barred the shooter from the purchase.

Now, on Saturday, April 11, 2015, the shooter attempted to purchase a firearm in West Columbia, South Carolina,

and the background check process was initiated. Now, Mr. Speaker, 91 percent of FBI background checks are processed within minutes, and gun dealers are informed the buyer is either approved or denied; however, the other 9 percent require additional scrutiny by FBI examiners and are not processed immediately. The Charleston shooter's background check was marked "delayed/pending."

Though the shooter was arrested on March 1 by the city of Columbia police, he, for some reason, was taken to the Lexington County jail, and his arrest record listed the arresting agency as the Lexington County Sheriff's Office. Columbia, South Carolina, is in Richland County. This clerical error was noticed by a Lexington County corrections officer shortly after and corrected, but was only corrected internally. That correction was not given to the FBI.

On Monday, April 13, when the FBI investigator sought to get more information about the shooter's March arrest, she initially contacted the Lexington County Sheriff's Office for more information, who informed her that the case was in the city of Columbia. Not seeing a listing for Columbia on the Lexington County law enforcement list, she contacted West Columbia, who had no knowledge of the arrest.

By Thursday, April 16, the background check was still listed as delayed/pending, but three business days had passed. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, he was allowed to purchase a gun, and nine souls lost their lives because of this loophole. We should close it and do it today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members of this assembly return from days away celebrating our Nation's birth, grant them measured patience and a spirit of common purpose in addressing the pressing issues of these days.

We pray for the needs of the Nation, the world, and all of creation. Bless those who seek to honor You and serve each other and all Americans in this House through their public service.

May the words and deeds of this place reflect an earnest desire for justice, and may men and women in government build on the tradition of equity and truth that represents the noblest heritage of our people.

May Your blessing, O God, be with us this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COURTNEY 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.

FBI RECOMMENDATION NOT TO PROSECUTE

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, today FBI Director James Comey announced his recommendation not to prosecute Hillary Clinton. I am extremely disappointed with this decision. In fact, Mr. Comey said that it was extremely careless of Secretary Clinton to store public emails and classified emails on her server. There were 110 messages in 52 chains that contained information that was classified at the time, 8 of which were top secret, 36 secret, and 8 confidential.

We really need to protect our national security. The FBI Director talked about the word "intentionally." Well, if this had been defense information, some of which it may have been, the statute only requires criminal liability to show the form of gross negligence. I think extremely careless comes to gross negligence, and I encourage the FBI and prosecutors to continue to look at this and do what is right.

We need people in government who are not extremely careless. We need people who are careful.

COMMONSENSE LEGISLATION TO DISARM HATE

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the horrific events in Orlando on June 12, an extraordinary group of Americans have come together calling for commonsense gun control legislation. The Veterans Coalition for Common Sense was formed, again, within hours, and among its ranks are General David Petraeus; General Stanley McChrystal; Admiral Thad Allen, the retired commandant of the Coast Guard; and General Michael Hayden, former head of the Air Force. The list goes on and on.

And why?

General Pete Chiarelli, the former vice chief of staff of the Army, stated it very clearly: "I have seen firsthand what weapons of war can do. There is no reason we cannot close the loopholes that allow these killing machines to fall into the hands of criminals, those who are mentally ill or those who wish to do harm to innocent men, women and children."

The sit-in a couple of weeks ago was exactly about what General Chiarelli said, which is to pass the King-Thompson bills to close the loopholes and to require that people who are on the no-fly list cannot purchase weapons that go out and result in mass killings of far too many Americans.

We should listen to the people who wore the uniform of our country, those leaders who, again, protected and defended not only the Constitution but all of us, and listen to their message and pass the King-Thompson bills.

A MOMENT IN HISTORY TO DO SOMETHING SIGNIFICANT

(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, while massive terrorist acts are raging all around the world, in my district yesterday 3 people were shot and killed, one a 28-year-old father of 3. And just last week a mother shot dead her two daughters and was killed because she refused to put down a gun.

We have a moment in history—in the backdrop of the largest mass murder by guns by a bad person in Orlando, Florida, as we mourn—to be able to do something significant, Mr. Speaker, and that is to pass the Thompson-King bipartisan, commonsense, responsible gun legislation.

Let me tell you what is being offered on the floor. That bill that is being offered on the floor would not have prevented the Emanuel 9 because it allows individuals to go past, if you will, the checking because in the part of it that deals with terrorism in particular, you can ask or the prosecutors must prove that you belong on that terrorist list, and, therefore, you put a barrier to protecting the American people.

We need a no fly, no buy; on the terrorist list, you can't do it; and we need a longer period for law enforcement to check the background checks. We need to save lives.

OUR FAMILIES CANNOT AFFORD FOR US TO WAIT ANY LONGER

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to demand action to prevent gun violence. Nearly every year 30,000 Americans die from gun violence. The American Medical Association has defined the situation as a public health crisis. There are two immediate commonsense solutions: preventing known suspects who are terrorists from buying guns and strengthening our background system to keep guns away from criminals.

Everywhere I went in Minnesota last week, I heard from families who strongly support these commonsense ideas. An overwhelming majority of Americans support the ideas as well.

The American people deserve to know where their Representative stands, yet Republicans refuse to allow a vote on these solutions. Republican leadership instead is shamefully peddling a gun lobby-endorsed bill that even Republicans back home say doesn't do enough to prevent terrorists from having guns.

Our families cannot afford for us to wait any longer. We need to take action. The House must act to prevent gun violence and keep our families and communities safe.

RESPONSIBLE GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the time has long passed for Congress to act to enact responsible gun safety legislation. Mr. Speaker, bring these two bills to the floor for a vote.

GIVE US A VOTE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 3½ years since the horrific tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School. In the past 3½ years, a lot has happened. There have been 1,182 mass shootings in our country and 34,000-plus people have been killed by someone using a gun. The House has been in session for 526 legislative days, and we have held 30 moments of silence for victims of gun violence.

But what hasn't happened in the past 3½ years is a vote. That is shameful. The American people deserve a Congress that is willing to stand up to the gun lobby and do what it takes to keep our communities safe. There is bipartisan legislation that would prohibit those on the terrorist watch list from being able to purchase firearms legally in our country, and there is bipartisan

legislation to close a dangerous loop-hole in our background check system.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote.

TINA MEINS SPEAKS FOR ME

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, over and over again my colleagues have pleaded with the majority to give us a vote on legislation that will protect Americans from gun violence. Those pleas and the pleas of millions of Americans continue to be ignored.

So instead of my words, I am going to read the words of Tina Meins, whose father, Damian, was killed in San Bernardino last year: "There is room in this national debate for reason, for compromise and for compassion," she wrote. "Let us find common ground. Let's not be paralyzed because proposed solutions will not be perfect. If one person can be saved, isn't it worth the effort to fix this? Let's work together, please, for the good of everyone."

Well, Tina speaks for me, and she speaks for the thousands of families who have lost loved ones to gun violence in America.

GUN VIOLENCE MUST END TODAY

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago we gathered on this floor for another moment of silence to remember 49 victims of the mass shooting in Orlando. In the days that followed, our response was the same as it was after Sandy Hook, Umpqua Community College, and Colorado Springs—silence followed by more silence.

In the days since, we can add hundreds of names to the list of those lost in our Nation to a unique epidemic of gun violence, including the following from Massachusetts:

David Atherton, a young firefighter and veteran;

Marcus Hall, killed as his 4-year-old son sat feet away getting his haircut;

Trevor Washington, gunned down after a disagreement at a party;

Andrew Flonory, murdered less than a mile from where his sister and 2-year-old nephew had been executed 6 years earlier;

Anthony Clay, a married father of two, who died as a woman yelled "Don't leave me" over his body;

And 19-year-old Sabrina DaSilva, who had just stepped out of her apartment to grab juice out of her car for her 2-year-old daughter, a daughter who will never see her mother again.

Mr. Speaker, they are friends and neighbors who will be forever missed by the lives they touched, daughters and sons, mothers and fathers, whose families will forever live with the pain

and suffering of losing a loved one. This violence must stop.

WE MUST DO SOMETHING

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, after the historic sit-in that took place on this floor a couple weeks ago, last week I hosted a discussion on gun violence in my district. In attendance were people with a wide range of experiences with gun violence, constituents who volunteered time to advocate for better gun laws, individuals who lost family members due to gun violence, some who themselves were victims of gun violence but thankfully survived.

There were representatives from the LGBT community, public health professionals, a youth violence intervention program director, and the director of a theater production featuring people who lost loved ones to gun violence.

They came from different hometowns and different walks of life, and they have their own beliefs and world views, but they agree on one thing: we must do something to curb the tragic, persistent threat of gun violence in America.

Mr. Speaker, I don't expect all 435 Members of this body to agree on a perfect solution to this troubling issue, but I do expect them to do something that will meaningfully address it, and so do the American people.

WHEN WE SAT DOWN, WE STOOD UP

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, when my colleagues and I sat down on the floor, we stood up for millions of Americans who agree it is time for commonsense legislative action to help prevent gun violence.

When the Republican leadership ignored that call and then canceled the rest of the workweek, we took that message back to our districts. At a roundtable in my district, I met with families broken by random acts of gun violence, mothers who were moved by mass shootings, advocates calling for change, and just regular people who just wanted to see less violence. Their stories and their motivations were entirely different, but they all told me one thing: We are with you.

I refuse to let them down, and I refuse to let up until this body considers basic bipartisan, broadly supported reforms, and not shoddily crafted NRA-endorsed bills that do even less than moments of silence.

□ 1415

GIVE US A VOTE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago, the House Chaplain expressed the hope—I would imagine it is a fervent hope—that we would return to this place with "a spirit of common purpose." Those are the words that he used.

Nothing would reflect the common purpose of the American people more than allowing us to have a vote on gun safety legislation in this House. Ninety percent of Americans support universal background checks. That is common purpose. A majority of responsible gun owners in this country support universal background checks. That is common purpose. Eighty-five percent of Americans say that, if you can't fly on a plane because you are too dangerous, you shouldn't be able to buy a weapon. That is common purpose.

So, what is the problem? Why can't we bring legislation? Why can't we respond to the anguish and grief of so many families and communities around this country? The Speaker of this House will not allow legislation to come to the floor. He won't allow us to express the common purpose of the American people.

Give us a vote. Give us a chance to demonstrate that common purpose and address this scourge of violence in our country.

NO MORE EMPTY GESTURES

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the whole point of the Democratic sit-in to demand congressional action on gun violence was to say that empty gestures and moments of silence for 30 seconds, followed by the bang of a gavel and resumption of business as usual will not be tolerated anymore in the face of this national gun violence epidemic.

Yet this week, our Republican colleagues are bringing forward a bill, written and blessed by the NRA, that is yet another empty gesture—a glorified moment of silence—because it establishes a completely arbitrary and artificial 72-hour timeframe and unreasonable standards that must be met within that timeframe.

I can't get my dry cleaning back in 72 hours, yet the NRA and our Republican friends expect the Attorney General to come forward, serve process, have a defendant hire an attorney, show up at a hearing, and prove with probable cause as the standard that this individual is about to commit an act of terror? Give me a break.

No more empty gestures. No more moments of silence that are completely disingenuous, including this glorified moment of silence that Republicans are bringing forward this week.

PURSUE COMMONSENSE GUN
LEGISLATION

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to hear from the families of victims of gun violence. Each story was unique and heartbreaking. But for all the differences in their tragic circumstances, one common thread was echoed by every individual in the room: too many guns are too easily available.

One mother said: "Until we get these guns off the street, the cycle is going to continue."

One way to start to get the guns off the streets is through background checks.

My office has heard from thousands over the last 2 weeks, over the phone, over Facebook, over Twitter. We have heard that Congress can no longer bend to the will of the gun lobby and prevent the passage of commonsense legislation that could save lives.

During that meeting last week, a mother told me: "Changes can be made because I have a voice."

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to heed our constituents' call and pursue real, commonsense legislation that helps get guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

END GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the American public want us to act. They spoke loud and clear. They want an end to the gun violence that is taking place in this country.

We sat down on this House floor to stand up for those Americans who want to see Congress put on RECORD as to where they stand on this issue. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—80 percent-plus support background checks. They support no fly, no buy. Mr. Speaker, all we are asking for this week and what the American people are asking you for is a vote on these two simple principles.

The Rules Committee is going to meet tonight. We ask that you include two amendments that Democrats will bring forward: no fly, no buy—if you can't fly on an airplane, you can't buy a gun—and comprehensive, expanded backgrounds checks.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is too much for us to ask. The American people will be watching to see where their Members of Congress stand on these two important issues.

SILENCE IS DEAFENING

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, between the time that 20 little children and 6 teachers were shot at Sandy Hook Elementary School and the 49 people that were slaughtered in Orlando, we have stood on this floor 27 times for a moment of silence. We send our condolences and our thoughts and prayers, and then the gavel sounds and we go back to business as usual. Well, 2 weeks ago, the Democrats in this House said no more silence. The silence has become deafening.

In the city of Chicago, we lost 70 people in the month of June to gun deaths. There is no moment of silence for them. They are women, children, men, sons, husbands.

We have the ability in the House of Representatives to save lives—not every life, but a lot of lives—and the moments of silence, of doing nothing, have run out. It is time for us to act. We have two bills on our agenda that would begin to address the problem. Republicans have to join with us to act now. The silence is too deafening.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with all the voices that we hear today to speak to the urgent need to address the problem of gun violence in this country.

We need to consider not only mass shootings, but the daily toll of gun violence that afflicts all of our communities. In 1 year, on average, 108,000 Americans are shot in murders, assaults, suicides and suicide attempts, accidents, and police action. Approximately 32,500 of these individuals die. Nearly 12,000 are murdered—more than 31 Americans every day.

We know what will work to reduce deaths. We must act to expand background checks to close the private sale loophole and make sure those checks prevent the sale of guns to terrorists. We should come together to vote on the two bills and reduce gun violence.

PUT THE BILLS ON THE FLOOR

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, the issues are pretty clear. I came up for one simple reason: I am asking my Republican friends: What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of? You get the votes.

I ran for Congress to debate and vote on the issues of the day, vote my conscience—win some, lose some. What did you run for? Did you run to stifle democratic debate? Did you run to simply say to the American people, "We don't care what you say"?

If you believe the words you have been saying for the last week, put the bills on the floor and have a vote. That is the American way.

What are you afraid of? Are you afraid you can't control your Members? Are you afraid some of your Members may actually have to stand up, find some courage, and vote their conscience?

Put these two bills on the floor. The American people want it, the American people deserve it, and the American people are demanding it.

BIPARTISAN ACTION TO PREVENT
GUN VIOLENCE IS NEEDED

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to act to protect them. We need a tough and smart counterterrorism strategy to go after ISIS, and that has to include taking commonsense steps to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists.

In a 2011 propaganda video, an al Qaeda spokesman encouraged radicals to buy guns in the United States, saying: America is absolutely awash in obtainable firearms.

The overwhelming majority of the American people support reasonable fixes to prevent terrorists from buying guns and to expand background checks for all commercial gun sales. Yet, in the 3½ years since the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, the House has not held a single vote on legislation to prevent gun violence. In that time, gun violence has killed more than 100,000 Americans.

It took a 25-hour sit-in and thousands of Americans rising up and demanding a vote, but here we are finally voting on something. It is a step forward. Unfortunately, the bill we are voting on this week was written by the gun lobby, and it won't do anything to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous individuals.

So let's keep working. Let's send bipartisan legislation to the President's desk, because the American people are demanding action. We should listen and we should act.

IN THE SPIRIT OF ELIE WIESEL

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Elie Wiesel, one of the great human beings who graced this Earth, passed away this week. He said that sometimes we are powerless to prevent injustice, but we should never fail to protest against injustice.

JOHN LEWIS is a man in this House who is of the same caliber as Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King. He is the same caliber as Elie Wiesel. When JOHN LEWIS and other Democrats protested on this floor, they were here because they might not have been able to prevent injustice, but they needed to protest. And they did it in the spirit of Elie Wiesel.

Mr. Speaker, you said JOHN LEWIS and the Democrats' activity on the floor was a stunt. It wasn't a stunt. It was in keeping with the great tradition of people like Elie Wiesel and JOHN LEWIS who know that at sometimes, when society and the government are so far out of line, there need to be extraordinary steps to bring attention to issues and make a change. The bill you are bringing to the floor is a stunt. JOHN LEWIS does not engage in stunts.

REJECT THE GUN LOBBY BILL

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is sad that it took a 26-hour sit-in of 177 Members just to get a vote on one gun violence prevention bill this Congress. It is even sadder that Speaker RYAN still doesn't get it.

This week, we are voting on a big gun lobby bill that already failed in the Senate. It would give the Attorney General only 72 hours to determine if someone on the no-fly list should be able to purchase a gun. House rules require 3 days between a bill's introduction and a vote. Why does Speaker RYAN think that the House deserves 3 days to read a bill, but the FBI, Attorney General, and our courts should fully investigate a suspected terrorist in the same amount of time?

This isn't an attempt to address gun violence. It is a shameful attempt to claim that a vote was held, without hurting the majority's precious scorecard rating with the big gun lobby.

This isn't a game. With each passing hour, another family mourns the loss of a loved one.

I urge my colleagues to reject the gun lobby bill. I call on you, Speaker RYAN, to have the courage to call up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan King-Thompson background check bill, a real gun violence prevention measure.

□ 1430

ASSAULT WEAPONS

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

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. Speaker, in the Iraq war, my unit fought door-to-door in some of the areas now controlled by ISIL, and we did it armed with an assault rifle called the M16A4.

Why did the Marine Corps send us into battle with this weapon?

At the risk of making anyone feel uncomfortable, the simple answer is this: Because the M16 is a machine designed to kill and maim people. It is not for target shooting, or hunting deer. The M16 was refined for the sole purpose of taking enemy lives in combat.

That is why it defies explanation that Republicans believe assault rifles like the M16 or the SIG SAUER MCX used in Orlando should be carried in our communities. Weapons that Ma-

rines use to kill enemy combatants in Iraq don't belong on the streets of Phoenix.

Mr. Speaker, it is even harder to understand why Republicans apparently think known terrorists should be allowed to purchase these firearms. They plan to bring a sham bill to the floor later this week that law enforcement leaders tell us will do nothing to prevent individuals on the terrorist watch list from obtaining these deadly weapons. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, here is the bottom line. If you are too dangerous to fly on a plane, then you are too dangerous to buy the kind of weapon I carried in Iraq.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the endless gun violence happening across the country, the American people are calling desperately on Congress to act.

Under pressure from House and Senate Democrats during the historic sit-in, Republican leadership has finally agreed to allow a vote on legislation to prevent gun sales to suspected terrorists placed on the no-fly list. While it is my view that this legislation does not go far enough to prevent violence in our neighborhoods, it serves as an important step in order to continue an open dialogue on this issue.

My grandson, who is a responsible district manager in a very large corporation in this Nation, is an NRA member. He hunts and he plays golf. He asked me: "Granny, why must anybody have an AK-47? Why must these kind of weapons be sold to people? They must have background checks." Now, this is a member of the NRA.

Mr. Speaker, as Congress works to reduce gun violence and gun-related deaths throughout our country, I encourage my colleagues to immediately bring forward meaningful and comprehensive reforms.

THIS IS THE TIME TO ACT

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we celebrated Fourth of July, the 240th birthday of our Nation's independence, and the celebrations were quite vivid in my district, which includes parts of Philadelphia, the birthplace of our Nation.

One refrain I got often when walking in parades in my district yesterday, and I was really struck by it, was people calling out: "Thank you, thank you for the sit-in. I watched the sit-in. That's great."

I was really struck because, frankly, I have not had that experience of people so finely tuned to what is being broadcast on C-SPAN. It speaks to the

desire for people that we address this issue and the frustration that is out there that we just have moments of silence, and then total silence.

This is the time to act. No more Orlandos, no more Sandy Hooks, no more Auroras. Let's call up today the two bills that are supported by 90 percent of the American people.

IT IS TIME TO DO THE RIGHT THING

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am here today simply because it is time. It is time to save lives. It is time to close the gun show and Internet loophole. It is time to make sure if you are on the no-fly list, you can't buy a gun in America.

It is time for the American people to know where their representatives stand. It is time to find out who will prevail, the people of the United States, or the NRA. It is time to end moments of silence and move into legislative action to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, don't you think it is time to give the people a vote?

Mr. Speaker, it is time for you to do the right thing for all American people and help save lives throughout the United States of America. It is time to do the right thing.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS FAILED US

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time and I think it is time for the Congress and the House of Representatives to not look at diversionary issues, but to look at how the Federal Government has failed us. The Federal Government failed us in Orlando, it failed us in San Bernardino, it failed us in Boston.

The United States is under attack by extremist organizations, radicals. They have used a pressure cooker in Boston. They used pipe bombs and mechanisms they bought from plumbing stores in San Bernardino. They used weaponry that they acquired when the Federal Government failed in Orlando.

It is time that we get our watch list corrected so that we don't put people on, take them off, don't know who is on the list, who is off the list. It is time that the Federal agencies for law enforcement and protecting us connect the dots and not miss the opportunities to stop the Orlandos, the San Bernardinos and the Bostons.

THE TIME IS NOW

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the American people have

been clear: they are demanding a vote to keep Americans safe from gun violence.

When the Speaker announced a vote this week on gun violence, the American people hoped this would be a vote for families and children, a vote to honor victims and survivors of senseless gun violence, and a vote to keep Americans safe from harm. Instead, the American families have been given a bait-and-switch.

The bill we have in front of us is a vote for powerful special interests, a vote to honor the millions of dollars of the NRA's campaign spending, and a vote for a bill that does nothing to keep Americans safe from harm. This is a bill backed by the heavyhanded gun lobby that ensures it is easier for terrorist suspects to buy an assault rifle than to get on a plane.

Last week, representing half a million people, the mayors in my district came together and asked me to deliver a letter to Speaker RYAN. In part it reads:

"A strong and growing number of our constituents are deeply frustrated with the inaction of this Congress. We urge you to allow debate and votes on expanding background checks and keeping guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists."

The time is now for those votes.

IS THIS THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE?

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard Speaker RYAN say it. We have heard Majority Leader MCCARTHY say it. We have heard Leader PELOSI say it. We have heard Whip HOYER say it. We have all said it. We proudly refer to this body as the people's House.

Well, implicit in calling this the people's House is that we are responsive to what the citizens of this country want us to do. What a sham that description is when it comes to gun safety, what a total sham.

In my district, we are running at a record pace of homicide by gunfire. My constituents want to know why we can't even have a debate and a vote on sensible universal background checks which, according to a poll this week, 92 percent of the American people want.

I call on Speaker RYAN to fulfill the promise of the people's House and bring sensible gun safety legislation to this floor.

NO FLY, NO BUY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a diverse district in New York, a State whose ban on assault weapons was just upheld by the Supreme Court, and a State which just

closed, on the State level, the senseless loopholes in our Federal gun purchasing regulations that allow known criminals and domestic abusers to obtain guns.

But one group of people New York's gun safety laws cannot reach are terrorist suspects. That is because the Federal Government controls the terrorism watch list. So it is up to Congress to make sure we keep guns out of the hands of known terrorists. And the vast majority of Americans agree, so we must act.

Mr. Speaker, this body has no more important mandate than to ensure the safety of our citizens. We must pass no fly, no buy, and we must pass comprehensive background checks to close the loopholes for those that are trying to purchase guns, and we need to act now. Enough is enough.

CITIZENS ARE DEMANDING REAL ANSWERS

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, since our sit-in, led by our moral leader, JOHN LEWIS, a steady, consistent chorus of voices across the country is growing louder demanding action on gun violence. The heartfelt calls, letters, emails, and social media postings continue to flood in from my constituents.

These are grandparents, mothers, young people who are saying "enough." In Sacramento alone, 60 people have lost their lives this last year. These are people who believe in the power of democracy, who are raising their voices, and who are counting on us to listen. They are saying "enough" to Republicans not having the courage to stand up to the powerful gun lobby.

The NRA-backed Republican deal we are considering today is an empty promise to the American people. It would make it nearly impossible to stop suspected terrorists from purchasing firearms, and it would do nothing to close a loophole that allows criminals to bypass a background check by simply going online or to a gun show.

Mr. Speaker, our citizens are demanding real answers, not hollow gestures. Let's listen to them. We will not rest until you do.

MEANINGFUL GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined my Democratic colleagues from Michigan for a standing-room-only meeting of community members concerned about gun violence in our country. We were joined by representatives from law enforcement, the faith community, domestic violence advocates,

the LGBT community, and grassroots organizations.

We are at a turning point. The Speaker called our sit-down efforts a stunt. How wrong. It is the proposal that he is offering that would be a stunt instead of really addressing tragic gun violence confronting this Nation.

We should be considering the bipartisan, commonsense legislation that Americans overwhelmingly support: preventing suspected terrorists from buying guns, known as no buy, no fly, and closing loopholes that allow online and gun show sales to go forward without background checks.

There is strong public interest for action. We witnessed that last week. The Speaker must no longer stand in the way.

WE MUST PURSUE COMMONSENSE GUN VIOLENCE LEGISLATION

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we must pursue commonsense gun violence legislation, legislation that makes a real impact on the epidemic of gun violence in our country. The American people are crying out for a vote, and we have a moral obligation to take action.

Two weeks ago, Democrats stood and sat on this floor and demanded a commonsense gun violence prevention bill. We are back today to continue that fight.

The bills the Republicans are bringing to the floor this week do little to eliminate the scourge of gun violence in our communities. In fact, the Zeldin bill is supported by the National Rifle Association. I think that is all you need to know.

We need to move a real no fly, no buy bill, one that actually prevents potential terrorists from getting dangerous weapons. But our work cannot stop there because gun violence in this country does not only occur at the hands of terrorists. We need to address the issue of universal background checks, to ban assault weapons, and to conduct research on gun violence.

No more deaths. The American people deserve a Congress that votes on the issues that they most care about. Not one more death in this country.

□ 1445

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in my district, the Fourth District of Georgia, the people are tired of gratuitous gun violence. Gun violence and gun deaths have risen by 8 percent over the last decade.

Just this Friday night, a 35-year-old female was killed. Her brother had

been killed a year earlier—both by gunfire. Saturday night, a 35-year-old male was killed. His brother had been killed a year ago by gunfire—both of them. Families are being torn asunder. No family should have to live under that. A 38-year-old male not far from my office lost his life over a parking space over this past weekend.

Gratuitous gun violence has to stop. There is something that Congress can do about it. We need to take action, little, small action like closing the gun show loophole. It makes a big difference. A little action like no fly, no buy makes a big difference. But this Congress, under the control of the NRA, is unable to do so.

It is time for change.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Democrats made a clear and powerful statement that we will not stand silent as thousands of Americans are victimized by gun violence.

JOHN LEWIS, JOHN LARSON, and more than 100 other Democratic Members didn't hold this floor for 26 straight hours—and hold events with thousands of people across the country just last week—just to get a vote on legislation that won't make Americans safer. This week, Republicans will have a vote on a bill that was written by the NRA and would not address the scourge of gun violence.

The American people deserve a vote on legislation that will actually keep those under investigation for terrorism from purchasing guns legally in our country, bipartisan legislation like Republican Representative PETER KING's no fly, no buy bill. They also deserve a vote on legislation that would strengthen and make comprehensive background checks.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, if Democrats sound frustrated with the House's failure to act on gun violence, it is because we are. In New York City over this past weekend, 14 people were shot in 10 incidents. Three weeks ago, more than 100 people were shot in a single evening in a single club in Orlando, and 49 of them died.

My Democratic colleagues and I have been running through the statistics over and over again for years now—tens of thousands of deaths every year. Since we had the sit-in on the House floor just a few weeks ago, more than 1,000 Americans have died from gun violence. That is shameful.

So, yes, we are frustrated because this is the only country in the devel-

oped world with gun laws like these. Australia changed its gun laws, and as a result, they virtually have no gun homicides in that place. We just sit and mourn and do nothing.

You can order one over the Internet. We don't require background checks, and they will ship it to your house.

We are asking for no fly, no buy, and we are asking for background checks.

You can walk up to a booth at a gun show and hand a stranger a stack of cash and walk away with a semiautomatic assault rifle, no questions asked. Under current law, even if the FBI has probable cause to believe you are a terrorist, you can walk into a gun store and pass a background check. That is shameful.

We have to make a choice. We have to act. I ask my good colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and pass sensible gun control legislation.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of New Jersey's Tenth Congressional District—which suffered one-third of the State's total gun deaths last year—I know the destruction that gun violence inflicts, and I know how important it is that we do more to keep guns out of the wrong hands.

Today we stand with the vast majority of the American people in support of a very simple principle: our gun laws should uphold and protect the freedom of all Americans—that includes responsible gun owners and those Americans trying to exercise their basic right to be free from gun violence.

We stand with the vast majority of Americans who believe that, if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun; who believe that we need to keep guns from criminals, domestic abusers, and dangerously mentally ill individuals.

Mr. Speaker, on this day of action, we renew our call for Republican leadership to give the American people a vote that is bipartisan in nature on gun safety legislation. We cannot continue to have the NRA stand for “no Republican action.”

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the NRA-authored H.R. 4237, the so-called Protect America Act.

Mr. Speaker, how does this legislation protect America from gun violence? This bill would do nothing to close the terror gap that currently allows suspected terrorists to legally buy guns. This bill would do nothing to ad-

dress our anemic background check system that allows up to 40 percent of all firearm transfers to proceed without a background check. And this bill will do nothing to keep guns out of the hands of the dangerously mentally ill.

Mr. Speaker, there are steps that Congress can take to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people and to keep Americans safe from gun violence. Unfortunately, the Protect America Act would accomplish neither.

This body should be concerned with protecting Americans from gun violence, not protecting its Members from tough votes.

Mr. Speaker, let the people's House vote on real, meaningful, commonsense legislation that would keep our constituents safe.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a mother, the second best day of my life was when my son was born. The first best day was when he returned safely from war. That is because every night was almost unbearable. I prayed that I would not get that fateful knock at the door.

My son went to war, and that knock on the door—while you don't want it, it is unimaginable—but you expect it. But no parent—no parent—should worry that they are going to get that knock on the door when they put their child on a schoolbus or when their child goes to the movies or out for a celebration.

My constituent, Greg Key, got that knock. His daughter, Lindsay, age 19, went to a party and became the victim of a stray bullet.

Mr. Speaker, how many more devastated parents like Greg and the moms and dads we have heard about have to get devastating news and feel devastating pain? It is time for this Congress to do its job.

No more guns for criminals or terrorists.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we are here with a very simple plea this morning with 5-minutes and this afternoon with 1-minutes.

We know the Speaker is an honorable man. We know that the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, is an honorable man. We in the minority are just asking for two commonsense, simple votes, both that have bipartisan support and sit here waiting to be discharged. But in the minority, it is the only voice that we have.

This minority party represents, actually, a majority of the American citizens, and we can't get a vote on what

the American people are crying out for. Mr. Speaker, 85 to 95 percent—depending upon what poll you read—believe that there should be a bill that does not provide terrorists who are on the no-fly list with a gun. Also, people believe that there should be background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

There have been more than 1,000—1,000—mass murders since Sandy Hook. We cannot be silent anymore. We respectfully ask that our colleagues in the majority who control the floor allow us the simple dignity of what we take an oath here for: a vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4768, SEPARATION OF POWERS RESTORATION ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 23, 2016, THROUGH JULY 4, 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 796 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 796

Resolved, That 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. 4768) to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions. 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the

Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2016.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from June 23, 2016, through July 4, 2016—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 23, 2016, or June 24, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 4768, the Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016. I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, which I believe directly benefits the American people by ensuring unelected bureaucrats are not able to reinterpret the intent of legislation passed by this body, the United States Senate, signed by the President, or known also as lawmakers under the legislative process Article I powers that are directly elected by the people of this country.

Two weeks ago, the Rules Committee met and reported a structured rule for H.R. 4768. This rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided by the chair and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. I also want to point out that the Rules Committee asked Members to submit their ideas and amendments, and, as a result, this resolution

makes in order all of the amendments submitted that did not raise a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of these United States established three coequal branches of government, each with a clearly defined role. The separation of powers protects Americans by preventing any one branch from gaining too much power.

Unfortunately, this system is being, I believe, abused by unlawful actions by administrative agencies that are increasingly asserting lawmaking powers. This modern “Federal administrative state,” as it is called, runs counter to our Founders’ intent, outlined in our Constitution, and I believe must be reined in. That is why we are on the floor of the House of Representatives today with our ideas to move forth on behalf of the ideas that we believe should rule in law, in rulemaking, and in the way the American people find governance of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, in 1984, the Supreme Court ruled that, when a congressional statute is ambiguous, courts hearing challenges to executive actions must preemptively defer to the regulators’ interpretation of the law. The Court effectively rigged America’s regulatory and judicial system in favor of unelected bureaucrats and against the American citizens that are being targeted.

Later, in *Auer v. Robbins*, the Court required deference to agencies’ interpretations of their own regulations. This great deference to administrative agencies is particularly troubling because it effectively gives unelected bureaucrats the power to make law.

Administrative agencies issue, enforce, and settle disputes involving regulations that have the force of law in many, many respects. In every aspect of our daily life, we are impacted by these decisions. Though the courts have a duty to check the abuses of the political branches in certain appropriate cases, they too often rely on deferential doctrines in reviewing agency actions. Given the inconsistent application of Chevron deference and concerns about the separation of powers, it is imperative that Congress act.

H.R. 4768 reverses this erosion of our constitutional system that has allowed unelected bureaucrats to mandate their own interpretations of laws. The legislation overturns the Chevron and Auer doctrines by clarifying the intent of the Administrative Procedure Act. Specifically, the bill directs courts to conduct a *de novo*, or from scratch, review of all relevant questions of law, including the interpretation of constitutional and statutory provisions and the provisions of agency rules.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that, at the time we pass laws, at the time we debate intent, and at the time we pass these laws and give to the agencies the opportunity to work with us on the formation of how the laws will be played out, meaning the agencies’ rules and regulations, it should be done with the

intent of Congress. Many States have regulatory systems that require all regulations come back through their elected officials.

We find that what we are trying to do is to simply return the power of legislating to Congress and ensure the courts, not the agencies, interpret the laws, based upon the original intent of the laws. This is a critical step in restoring the constitutional balance and, I believe, limiting executive overreach to the balance that works on behalf of people for the intent of the original passage of the laws.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for the customary 30 minutes. I really want to thank him because, after what happened 2 weeks ago when we in the minority were denied any debate time on the rule or the underlying bill, I know that being given the customary 30 minutes is no longer something we should automatically assume.

Let me begin by saying I rise in strong opposition to this rule. I am going to rise in strong opposition to the rule that comes after this, and the one that comes after that.

We are debating three rules today that would provide for the consideration of legislation on the separation of powers bill, a health savings account bill that they put together, and a financial services bill. All three bills, I want my colleagues to know, are going nowhere. There are Statements of Administration Policy on all three pieces of this legislation saying the administration would veto them.

Some of these bills are so bad, I am not even sure the Senate will consider them. They are either press releases that were written in the Republican congressional campaign committee or they are bills that are so loaded up with extraneous materials and riders on all kinds of subjects that have nothing to do with the underlying legislation that, again, we are just sitting here debating bills that have no future, that are going nowhere. We are wasting the time of our colleagues, and we are wasting taxpayer money.

What we should be debating here today, and you have heard from a series of my colleagues earlier, is legislation that would provide for comprehensive background checks on anybody who wants to buy a gun, and also on legislation that says that, if you are on an FBI terrorist watch list and you cannot fly on an airplane, then you should not be allowed to go into a gun store and buy a weapon of war—or buy any gun, for that matter.

Those are the two pieces of legislation that we tried 2 weeks ago to get the Speaker of the House to give us

time to debate and a vote on them, and we are still demanding consideration of these two very basic, commonsense pieces of legislation that I believe will save lives in this country. Quite frankly, that is what we should be concerned with: how we better protect our constituents, how we better protect the American people.

The issue of gun violence is something that Democrats and Republicans, alike, care about. In fact, the two pieces of legislation that we want to bring to the floor are authored by a Republican Member. The distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) is the prime author of both of these pieces of legislation.

This problem is something that seems to worry the American people, trouble the American people, but doesn't seem to trouble the people who are in charge of this House.

Listen to this statistic from *PolitiFact*:

So many people die annually from gunfire in the United States that the death toll between 1968 and 2011 eclipses all wars ever fought by the country. There were about 1.4 million firearm deaths in that period compared to 1.2 million U.S. deaths in every conflict from the War of Independence to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, many of us came to this floor and joined with our colleagues—JOHN LEWIS, KATHERINE CLARK, JOHN LARSON, MIKE THOMPSON, and so many others—in a protest, in a sit-in. The reason we did that is because the frustration level on this side of the aisle is boiling over. This is supposed to be a deliberative body where important issues get debated and voted on. Instead, this has become a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all.

In the aftermath of the terrible tragedy in Orlando where 49 people were killed, all we could do in this House was have a moment of silence. That was it. That was what that protest was all about. That is what that sit-in was all about.

We have exhausted every other way to try to get this legislation to the floor. Every time we try to go through regular order, we are blocked, we are blocked, we are blocked, we are blocked.

Enough.

The American people overwhelmingly support the no fly, no buy bill and universal background checks. They are not going to fall for the theatrics that my Republican friends are now engaged in this week, which is to bring up an NRA-written bill, which they are going to say is no fly, no buy.

But what they are not going to tell you is that all of the loopholes still exist. It doesn't matter what this bill purports to do; you could still be on the terrorist watch list and go online and buy a gun. You could still be on the terrorist watch list and not be able to fly and go to a gun show and buy a gun.

It is pathetic that the loopholes and the background checks in our laws continue to be unaddressed. All we are trying to do is have our moment where we can debate this issue, which, again, is a bipartisan issue. It is not a partisan issue. Again, the two pieces of legislation that we want to bring to the floor are authored by a Republican Member.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going away. This issue is too important. We are not going to be silent. We are going to continue to use every means available to us to raise our voices and to demand that the leadership of this House respect not the wishes of the Democratic minority, but respect the wishes of the vast majority of the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Rules Committee

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding me the time.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 796, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4768, the Separation of Powers Restoration Act.

I want to thank not only the chairman, but the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), my friend, for introducing this legislation and bringing it through the Judiciary Committee. This is something that we have had hearings on, we have had work done on, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 4768. I am glad to see it moving forward today.

The Judiciary Committee discussed these concepts, worked on these concepts, and looked at the whole issue. Frankly, this is one that in many ways, except for the very partisan nature of what we are doing in Congress these days—and it is, and there are things that we disagree on—this one, to me, should really have been one that, frankly, shouldn't be partisan.

In regards to an administrative determination that they will veto it, I am not sure that their machine knows anything else except to send us an administrative statement saying they are going to veto it. I have been on the Rules Committee 1½ years now, and I think I have seen one bill that they thought maybe we could sign. Now, there is a balance between both, but that doesn't bother me near as much as putting forth policy that actually helps and puts forward ideas that make sense.

The Separation of Powers Restoration Act amends the Administrative Procedure Act to overturn two doctrines that call for judicial deference to agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions: the Chevron and Auer doctrines. The legalese description of the bill may sound dry, but its importance cannot be understated. Let's just put it in plain English.

The Separation of Powers Restoration Act ensures Federal bureaucrats

can't interpret the legality of their own regulations at the expense of hard-working Americans and the separation of powers.

The United States Constitution clearly defines the duties of each branch of government, but today the executive branch far too often acts as a lawmaker or a law interpreter when it is supposed to be a law enforcer. And for this Congressman, this is both parties. I do not want the executive to take this constitutional role of this body. I don't care who sits in the White House. This is not something that should be taking place. It has taken place over time. We have got to understand why this matters.

This is a serious threat to the separation of powers. I believe the administration has gone out of its way to try to ignore or to rewrite what they don't like from up here. The Chevron and Auer doctrines are helping them justify these unacceptable actions.

Executive branches should be seen not as lawmaking authorities, but instead almost as expert advisers or witnesses on regulation. But under the Chevron doctrine, agencies essentially got the power to make policy when Congress either explicitly or implicitly delegated the power.

□ 1515

Under the Chevron doctrine, or the Chevron deference, agencies are essentially free to define the meaning of statutes that they administer, and the courts defer to the agencies' interpretations.

Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, listen here. The courts have set up the Chevron doctrine and have said, basically, this may be what Congress said, and here is what unelected officials have said. We are going to side with them. At what point, in the judicial frame of reference, does that make sense when they are to be the interpreter of the law that has been written in these bodies—in this building—instead of by those down the street who have decided, in their own infinite wisdom, that they know better than those here?

They may have larger degrees; they may have longer time; they may have studied it forever. That is fine. If they want to make law, let them put their money down and run for Congress. Do not make law from the cubicle, and that is what we are seeing. Unfortunately, the courts have said: We are going to side with the executive in this.

In my opinion, this is out of the realm of what the Constitution actually states. In other words, really, what the courts are saying is, to avoid interpreting the law, they are allowing the agencies that wrote the regulations to be free to play political games and to do whatever they want to do.

The Separation of Powers Restoration Act will address this situation. It replaces the current standard of review with a requirement that the courts re-

view challenged agency decisions without their having deference or regard of the agency's legal conclusions. This will ensure that unelected bureaucrats are not left to write and interpret laws in order to achieve political gain at the expense of the American people.

Federal regulations impose more than \$1.88 trillion—that is trillion with a T—on the economy. The regulatory burden and the unelected bureaucrats who implement it have spun out of control, and it is the taxpayers of America who are left holding the bag. I am tired of it, and I know the American people are tired of it.

When I go home, one of the first things that is talked about is the overreach and the continuous burden of a bureaucracy that seems to be completely out of control. In northeast Georgia, examples of regulatory burden include everything from ill-conceived requirements for the poultry industry, to new labor requirements that impact manufacturers, to the silica rule's effect on the granite industry in Elberton. It runs across the spectrum. In fact, with that last one, the silica rule, they can't even measure what they are wanting to enforce.

Explain to me how that helps business. Explain to me how that actually helps anyone when you can't measure what you are wanting to actually enforce, except it sounds good, and it is a great press release as I have heard today. The press release is at the expense of American business and is not within the constitutional principles by which we operate.

Part of the problem is that this is just an erosion of power. In fact, last month, the D.C. Circuit Court relied heavily on the Chevron deference to uphold the Federal Communications Commission's Open Internet Order, also known as the net neutrality rule. That rule attempts to regulate our way to new innovation and is a huge blow to Internet freedom.

The FCC said it was acting in the interest of fairness and competition, but, in reality, it stifled fairness and competition. A shocker there, Mr. Speaker. What the government interferes with typically doesn't do what they intend it to do. We can go through program after program and see that.

The FCC rule would slow Internet speeds, increase consumer prices, and hamper infrastructure development, including at my home in northeast Georgia, in my home district. Rather than interpreting the legality of the rule, the court's decision basically said it was acceptable for Federal agencies to rewrite the law to suit political whims. The court deferred to the agency's interpretation of its own rule.

I wish I had the ability to say that with a Federal agency such as, maybe, the IRS. I am just going to write them a little letter and say: I interpret the law differently. I don't owe anything this year. Thanks for asking—and have the court uphold mine. Do you think they would go along with that? No. Of

course, this is the same IRS that has one person in control of almost a million people. They have one customer service agent in my district; so I don't think they care, really, about that. You see, if you go back to this right here, it is interpretation. The court said: Interpret your own rules. Do what you want to do.

The Chevron doctrine is bankrupt when it comes to the separation of powers. We have got to get back to a way that this actually does this. This simply does this, and this is not new. This is not something that is unheard of.

Importantly, the bill will also extend this requirement to not only judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act, but also to various mini APAs that are scattered throughout the United States Code. For example, the Clean Air Act includes its own individual version of the APA. This bill ensures cases like that can't escape notice.

We need to reverse the course. It is time we stopped diminishing congressional authority and handing the power over to the agencies. It is past time that we restore the checks and balances that our Founders built into this system.

Mr. Speaker, this is where it is understandable. We can have differences of opinion on this floor. In fact, that is what our country was based on. We are going to have differences of opinion and different ways to go about it; but what I cannot understand is, on this floor, when we can't even come together to say we will hold for our own authority—our own congressional, constitutional authority. We say we will happily give it, and let the courts say that the folks who have not been elected and who will be there, maybe, long after we are gone can decide that that is not what Congress really meant, whether it be a Democratic Congress or a Republican Congress, whether it be a Democratic President or a Republican President.

The Constitution was set up with three branches—three, not one. Just because the one—the executive—feels that because there is inaction on the Hill it can do whatever it wants is no excuse to not go by the law. It is even less of an excuse that the courts should turn a blind eye to the intent of Congress. That is what this is about.

We are going to hear everything else today on this rule. I just wanted to take a few minutes to talk about the actual rule before you, not about everything else. We will have plenty of time on that. This bill is a good bill. It does what it needs to do. It restores for Republicans and Democrats and the American people what it needs to have.

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

I am tired of this Republican leadership, on a regular basis, bringing meaningless bills to this floor for debate and taking up the time of the Members and wasting taxpayers' money. This bill is going nowhere, and we all know that.

I am also tired of moments of silence after every massacre that occurs in this country—Sandy Hook, San Bernardino, Orlando, Aurora, Virginia Tech, Charleston. I can go on and on and on and on. All this body can do is have a moment of silence.

We can't even have a debate on the floor on serious legislation, which is bipartisan legislation, because the NRA wouldn't like it. Too bad. Too many people are dying in this country, and we have to do something. We have to come together.

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

The Republican majority refused to even debate closing this glaring loophole for the first half of the year. Only after Democrats took action did the majority decide to offer a toothless NRA bill that will do nothing to keep our communities safer. The country, simply, cannot wait any longer for this Congress to take meaningful action to end gun violence. The American people will not be fooled by this latest—cynical—Republican capitulation to the gun lobby.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, plan to vote to defeat the previous question so we can have some debate on some gun violence prevention legislation—which is long overdue to be debated in this body. The gentleman mentioned that he is going to offer our amendment on the no fly, no buy legislation—a Republican bill, authored by Republican Congressman PETER KING from New York. I think it is essential that we do that.

I understand we are also going to introduce an amendment on the background check legislation, which is also a bipartisan measure—with the overwhelmingly bipartisan support of 187 coauthors in this body. You have got to look at a lot of bills to find one that has that many coauthors—and bipartisan coauthors at that. Also, it is a measure that has overwhelming support amongst the American people. Upwards of around 90 percent of Americans believe that we should do everything possible to make it more difficult for people who shouldn't have guns to be able to get guns. That is what our bill does. That is what our effort does. It makes it more difficult for individ-

uals who shouldn't have guns to get those guns.

I have said it before on this floor, in an attempt to try and get a vote on this critically important legislation, that, if the Republicans don't like the way we are working, work with us. Help us figure out what we can do to make our communities safer.

To my friend on the other side of the aisle, do the Republican Members really believe that it should be easy for criminals, the mentally ill, domestic abusers, or terrorists to get guns?

I know their constituents don't think that they should be able to easily get guns.

The truth of the matter is that the background check legislation that we have makes it more difficult. That is our first line of defense against criminals, the dangerously mentally ill, domestic abusers, and terrorists from being able to get guns. We should bring that bill to the floor; we should debate that bill; and we should pass it. We should be in step with the 90 percent of American people who think that comprehensive background checks should be the law of this great land.

I am a gun owner. I believe strongly in the Second Amendment. Personally, I wouldn't sell a gun to people unless I knew they weren't criminals, they weren't dangerously mentally ill, they weren't domestic abusers, and they weren't terrorists. How do you find out? If you are selling your gun to those you do not know, how do you know if they fall into one of these categories? That is why the background check is so critically important.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that 34 States do not go beyond what that Federal floor is. They allow guns to be sold at gun shows, through newspaper ads, or online without the benefit of there being a background check. We should stop that. We should make sure that we do everything we can to ensure that criminals, the dangerously mentally ill, domestic abusers, and terrorists don't get guns. Right now, some 40 percent of the firearms that are sold in our country are sold without the benefit of there being a background check. How does that make our constituents safe? How does that make America more safe?

It is shameful. We need to bring this bill to a vote. We need to pass a background check. We need to make sure that we know who it is who is buying guns. We must do everything we can to keep guns out of the hands of people who should not have guns: criminals, the dangerously mentally ill, domestic abusers, and terrorists.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, we need to act. We need to act to save lives as 100,000 Americans have died in the last 3½ years since Sandy Hook—since 6- and 7-year-olds were killed in my district. What has this House done? Nothing but hold moments of silence.

Do any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle think that moments of silence are responsive to the needs of 100,000 American families who have lost loved ones in the last 3½ years?

There is no other crisis we wouldn't be responding to. That is why that sense of frustration and urgency is what caused 150 or more of my colleagues to come to the floor 2 weeks ago to demand that we vote on two commonsense, bipartisan bills. These are bipartisan, and they will save lives.

Background checks on all commercial sales work. They have stopped over 2 million felons and domestic violence abusers from buying weapons in the last 20 years. Those are all lives that are potentially saved; so they actually work.

We also have bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation. The no fly, no buy legislation would also help keep guns out of the hands of terrorists.

With all due deference to other legislative matters, 100,000 American families have borne the ultimate loss of their loved ones while this body has failed to act. The time to act is now. We should call up these two bills and vote on them this week. We will continue to push these bills.

□ 1530

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

The purpose why we came to the floor was to support the rule and the underlying legislation. And I believe that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) spoke very clearly about how this Congress needs to stand up and speak clearly about not only the role of Congress in writing laws, but also working more carefully with agencies as they write rules and regulations.

We get that. We have oversight. We work with regulatory bodies. But what we are trying to say, as we provide the information on this bill, is that we want the courts to recognize that in the power struggle that takes place between the executive, legislative branch, and the courts, that we would like to defer to the people who originally wrote the law. What we are here to do today to talk about is exactly that.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel like they have a lot of frustration about a lot of issues. I would say to them: 2 weeks ago, that was the Zika virus; this House has tried to work its will on that. We will get to rather quickly this issue of the terrorist watch list.

What we are trying to do today are also things that are of grave importance to the American people because of the loss of jobs in this country, based upon the executive branch that

is overusing what we believe are the rules and regulations to inhibit the American people that are costly—over a trillion dollars' worth of cost—that have been placed over these years on private industry and the American citizens.

We are here today to also talk about an important aspect, and that is jobs opportunity. The American people are overburdened. We are trying to bring back the discussion today that we believe the intent of those who write the law, that the rules and regulations that are the underpinning of how those laws will be looked at, will be supported by the same effort that we wrote the law with. And so we are trying to go back to the intent that the people who wrote the laws and the agencies that are attempting to enforce the laws, that they would mirror each other to the benefit of the American people.

We have had virtually 1 percent GDP growth now during the entirety of President Obama's administration. For 7 years, America has lagged behind in its ability to catch up and be competitive with the world. And the question becomes: Why do we allow the Federal Government to be bigger and larger and put roadblocks, impediments in front of job creators?

That is why we are here today. We are here today to say we would like to balance out the process. We would like the courts to understand and the administration to understand that for America to continue to be competitive with the world, we have to go back to some balance of power that we believe directly is related to Article I; that we believe that the courts should understand that the original intent of laws come from the legislative process. And that is why we are on the floor today.

We have too many people who cannot find work, cannot find a job because of rules and regulations that are burdening industry and people who are job creators. This is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker. I think we are here doing the right thing.

We are talking about jobs, job creation, the original intent of this body, the legislation that is written by legislators with the intent and rule of law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My Republican friends have the right to talk about whatever they want to talk about no matter how inconsequential or meaningless. We all know that this stuff we are dealing with today is going nowhere.

We Democrats reserve the right to talk about matters of consequence, to talk about things that, quite frankly, our constituents are concerned about.

From every public opinion poll I have seen, the majority of Americans want us to do something about it, and that is this issue of gun violence. People don't want to have massacres become the new norm in this country. They want us to do something.

I would suggest to my colleagues that those who are resisting, allowing

us to have these debates and to have these votes are on the wrong side of not only public opinion, they are on the wrong side of history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), one of the leaders in our Caucus.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been very clear. They are demanding a vote to keep American families safe from gun violence. When the Speaker announced a vote this week on gun legislation, the American people hoped this would be the moment when the silence would end and debating and voting here in Congress on commonsense proposals to curb gun violence would begin. Instead, American families have been given a bait-and-switch. And for years, the majority of Americans have supported bipartisan, commonsense legislation that has been gathering dust on the Speaker's desk.

Over the last few weeks since the horrendous event in Orlando, whether it was a sit-in on the floor of the House, to demonstrations across this country, the American people have clearly stated they will no longer stand for capitulation to the gun lobby. Yet, instead of listening to those demands, Speaker RYAN has doubled down on the gun lobby's demands.

You, in America, are 25 times more likely to be shot to death than in any other developed country. But we know it doesn't have to be this way. We can look to my home State of Massachusetts where we rolled up our sleeves. We had tough debates with local communities, with sportsmen, with gun rights advocates, with law enforcement, moms, dads, teachers, voices from across our communities and neighborhoods. We worked together to close loopholes and enact some of the strongest gun safety bills in the country.

What happened as a result?

We in the Commonwealth are the third lowest in the country in terms of gun deaths. This wasn't easy, but we fought for it because we knew it would save lives. Most importantly, the families of victims and survivors fought to make sure their voices were heard so others would not have to endure their same pain. Massachusetts lawmakers went to work for them.

Shouldn't the American people know that their Federal lawmakers work for them, too?

So I ask the Speaker: Does this Congress work for the American people? Or are we working for the gun lobby?

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote the will of the American people, to reject a cynical bill bought and paid for by the gun lobby and that will do nothing to make Americans safe.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress to pass comprehensive background checks and to keep guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists and defeat the previous question.

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

The bill that we are debating and going to vote on is a bill that is a very important bill talking about what is essentially the power of the United States Congress as we pass laws and to have the rules and regulations that are written by agencies to conform not only with the law, but even the intent of the law.

This administration increasingly goes further and further and further and further beyond not only the original intent and narrowness of bills and laws, but they are into a power grab.

That is why we are here, Mr. Speaker, because we are concerned about the GDP growth, the lack of jobs in this country, the huge number of people who are unemployed and the strong, strong support that they are not getting from Washington, D.C., to try and say that we need a pro-growth agenda and we need less rules and regulations.

We have many, many, many laws that are already on the books. And this administration keeps pouring on more and more and more rules, taking the laws that we have passed and taking advantage by writing rules that will inhibit not only business, but job creation. That is why we are on the floor today, and this is why Republicans will pass this bill, because we are talking about the real problems today that the average American has.

Americans want to see themselves in a good job, a job that is located near their home, a job that provides good access not only for them, to provide more goods and services for their family, but for communities to survive the onslaught of rules and regulations where it seems like Washington knows better than people back home about how to provide not just jobs, but to make things better for people that are in their own environment.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here. Republicans are going to stay after this. We deeply believe that what we are doing today is offering the American people a good solution to a huge, huge problem.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I would remind my colleague that what we are doing today is considering three rules that will bring forward legislation that is going absolutely nowhere. And when the gentleman talks about the power of Congress, he is right; Congress does have power.

Congress has the power to actually pass a universal background check, to make sure that there are no loopholes in our law that allows criminals or suspected terrorists from getting weapons that they could use against our people.

Congress could pass a no fly, no buy bill, which says that if you are on an FBI terrorist watch list, then you should not be able to go to a gun store and buy a gun. So we have the power to do some important things for the American people. Unfortunately, this leadership in this House refuses to bring these important priorities to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I sense a bit of frustration in the voice of my good friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) in appealing to Democrats to focus on the issue before us.

We are focusing on the issue before us, the issue of gun violence in America today. If we learn nothing from 2 weeks ago, we should have learned this: it is no longer business as usual, and we are going to use whatever tactics we need to to get on this floor votes on no fly, no buy and on universal background checks. We are not going to settle for what is being cooked up right now as we speak in the Rules Committee, which has taken the Cornyn language in the Senate that will provide for a 3-day background check, which law enforcement has said over and over and over again will not work.

So I can understand the frustration that I'm hearing, but I have to say get used to it because you are going to be frustrated for some time longer until we get on the floor a vote on those two measures that we have asked for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while most Americans were celebrating the anniversary of our Nation's independence this last weekend, hundreds more were mourning the loss of loved ones. Because in the past 72 hours—in just these 72 hours—and since we have gotten these statistics, this number has probably grown. What we know is that 94 people died and 248 were injured due to gun violence in America. That is one person killed or injured about every 12 minutes. At the end of the day, that number will have increased at pretty much that same pace.

Now, I know we could not have prevented all of these senseless deaths and injuries, but perhaps if this House majority had allowed action in some meaningful way to improve our gun laws, we could have prevented just some of them.

Would that not have been worth it to have prevented just some of them?

Democrats in the House have been calling on Speaker RYAN and Republican leadership to, at the very least, consider, debate, and vote on the reforms we are requesting.

□ 1545

But not even the lowest common denominator, keeping firearms out of the hands of suspected terrorists, would be put to a vote on this floor. Until today maybe or maybe tomorrow. Caving in to the pressure—not that the House

Democrats bore—the House Republicans have finally decided to address this issue, sort of, kind of.

The legislation we will consider this week doesn't really make Americans safer. In fact, it does just the opposite. The bill will actually create a brand-new loophole just for terror suspects. That is right, despite Republicans' description of the bill, individuals who are being investigated for links to terrorist groups won't be kept from buying a gun under their bill. Instead, they will get the firearm they tried to buy just because their background check wasn't completed in 72 hours, even if the background check fails at hour 73.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have called this the Charleston loophole because it is how Dylan Roof, who opened fire on a Bible study group at the AME church in Charleston, South Carolina, received his gun. He failed his background check, but not within 3 days, so he got his gun. And now the terror suspects will have that same opportunity.

Now, given this, you would think the Republicans would provide the funding needed to complete background checks and make them faster, but not under the bill they have proposed.

So let's just call it what it is. More than the Charleston loophole, it is a brand-new "anywhere loophole" for terrorists. And dare I mention that all the other loopholes in our background check system will remain open under the legislation that they are stirring up in the Committee on Rules.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's be under no illusion. I get the frustration on the other side of the aisle. More frustration to come until we get a vote on this floor for universal background checks that are long enough for law enforcement to do their job and we get a vote on this floor on the no fly, no buy legislation.

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

Once again, what we are here to do today is to bring forth a bill that would bring about the constitutional authority that would give a clearer understanding and meaning to not only the legislative process, the executive process, but also the judicial process whereby there would be an understanding of the laws that are passed and rules and regulations which very understandably must be given to a branch of government, in this case the executive, to look at the law which the executive signed to determine its implementation.

The facts of the case are that years later, this administration comes in and uses that same law which was very specific, which rules and regulations were passed for, and create new and onerous roadblocks and problems for not only industry, but also the development of jobs and job creation. And it is an ap-

parent administration policy that they will use this as their advantage rule-making authority to prevent further opportunities for us to grow jobs and job creation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I really could not be here at a more genuine time and say that just last month this great country only netted adding 28,000 jobs—net 28,000 jobs—and yet we had millions and millions of young people who had just graduated from high school or college who should be seeking an opportunity to help themselves into a line of business, into a career, into an opportunity to sustain themselves, their way of life, their city, their State, and this great Nation.

But the sign is there that said: No jobs available; we are not interested; we cannot hire more people; no thank you. And the number one reason back from industry, from employers, from people who want to make America stronger is rules and regulations, rules and regulations coming out of Washington, D.C., that are harming job creation, that are impediments to effectively being able to create new jobs.

That is uncertainty. That is agency power that specifically targets all sorts of industry in this country. And they are doing it for a reason—to the demise of the free enterprise system of America on behalf of Washington, D.C., unnamed, unknown bureaucrats who hide behind their rules and regulations.

We, as Members of Congress, are getting questions: Hey, what about our generation having jobs? What about our communities that cannot have jobs and job creation?

Ask the coal industry in West Virginia. The war on West Virginia, Ohio, Virginia, people who are in an industry not only that has a lineage in this country, but who have adapted themselves very rapidly in the environment that we are in.

How about truckers, men and women who are engaged in moving goods and services back and forth? How about bankers? How about financial services people who look up and see a regulatory scheme that keeps coming after them? How about my old industry that I spent 16 years at, the telecommunications industry, that would wish to put an extra some \$18 billion a year more in investment in the ground, up in the air, and available to people, \$18 billion they would like to put into the ground for people to have better services?

No. The rules and regulations out of Washington, D.C.—and that is why you see the Democratic Party today talking about something else, because they are protecting this administration. They are protecting these people who write rules and regulations who are making sure that we only have 1 percent GDP growth and, Mr. Speaker, only 28,000 net new jobs last year in the middle of summer in 2016. Meanwhile, we look up and India is at a 7.9 percent GDP growth rate. We are minuscule. We can't sustain what we have, Mr. Speaker. That is why we are here.

I understand the Democrats are frustrated. They are frustrated because their utopia of this idea of this land that would be just a giveaway isn't working because people don't have jobs, and that is why people are shooting each other—drug gangs, drug cartels, people who we have allowed to be in this country who shouldn't be here. That is why, because there are not jobs for people to do, and they are taking it out on each other.

So we are going to stay on the floor. We are going to get our work done here on this bill, and it is about jobs and job creation, but more important, it is back to the original intent of what we believe that those people who write the rules, that the rules and the laws should better be in line with what they wrote in the original intent.

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

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

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas' defense of what I think is a lousy and meaningless piece of legislation. It is going nowhere. And just so people can put it in perspective, basically what it is about is easing up on regulations on polluters and big corporations that, quite frankly, don't care about average working people.

But be that as it may, let me make clear to my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, that when I am asking Members to defeat the previous question, you can still vote on this meaningless and lousy piece of legislation. It would just also allow us to bring up the no fly, no buy legislation as well, the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation.

The underlying bill that the gentleman from Texas is talking about is a purely partisan document. And if we want to talk about how we get this economy moving even faster, maybe we ought to talk about how we work in a bipartisan way to do that, not constantly bringing partisan documents like this to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. It has nothing to do with the bad bill, as indicated.

Mr. Speaker, for years Democrats in this House and a majority of the American people have demanded a vote on gun safety bills. After hundreds of thousands of Americans have lost their lives to a gun, Republican leadership is bringing up an NRA-written bill that does little to make our communities safer. Republicans aren't serious about gun reform, not even preventing suspected terrorists on the no-fly list, like the one in Orlando, from buying a gun.

It is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous that suspected terrorists can still buy guns at gun shows or online without completing a background check, and it is downright irresponsible for this loophole to continue to put guns in the

hands of those who shouldn't have them. It is just as irresponsible for Republicans to allow the NRA and gun manufacturers to dictate how the gun industry is regulated. That is insane.

Should we also allow the tobacco industry to write a bill regulating cigarettes?

The answer to that is no.

We should protect the people who elected us, not the interests of the gun lobby. With 33,000 friends and family members dying by a gun every year, it is truly upsetting that these bills fail on very short or real reform that would protect American lives.

During the civil rights movement, when legislation was slow in moving, Dr. Martin Luther King asked the question: How long? He said: No matter how difficult the moment or how frustrating the hour, not long.

And so today the question is: How long before someone who is on the no-fly list can no longer buy a gun?

I say not long because truth crushed to Earth will rise again.

How long before the NRA run the Republican Congress?

Not long because no lie can live forever.

How long before the Republicans keep good bills from the floor?

Not long because you shall reap what you sow.

What we have and what we will have is legislation that will help reduce gun violence because the arc of the moral universe bends toward justice, and justice requires us to have a vote that will save American lives because Americans are sick and tired of being sick and tired of gun violence.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and underlying bill. I, instead, urge consideration of H.R. 1217, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act. This bipartisan bill has the support of 186 Members of Congress and it would simply require every firearm sale to conduct a background check. It is a commonsense bill that 90 percent of Americans support and that would save lives.

Right now anyone can buy a gun online or at a gun show without a background check. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how does that make sense?

By not requiring background checks for gun shows or online purchases, we are inviting bad guys to access guns. We have a gaping hole in our system that must be closed. It is time for the House to take action on gun violence.

This week we finally have a gun bill on the floor, except that it isn't a gun violence prevention bill. It is a bill written by the big gun lobby that would give the Attorney General just 72 hours to determine if someone on the no-fly list should be able to purchase a gun. To call this a gun violence

protection bill is disrespectful and dishonors the millions of victims of gun violence.

What will it take for this House to take action on a real gun violence bill?

When Congresswoman Gabby Giffords was shot, Congress did nothing. When innocent schoolchildren were slaughtered in Newtown, this House did nothing. As thousands of Americans each month continue to fall victim to gun violence, this House does nothing.

□ 1600

This past weekend, the world lost a great man, Elie Wiesel. He famously said that the opposite of love isn't hate; it's indifference.

My Republican colleagues for too long have been indifferent to America's gun violence epidemic. They have been indifferent to grieving mothers. They have been indifferent to dying children. They have been indifferent to communities that have lost hope for their future. They are indifferent to 90 percent of the American people who want expanded background checks.

The American people are sick of this inaction. I am one of these Americans. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I can think of at least 185 other Americans in this Chamber right now who want to vote on a real gun violence prevention bill.

Mr. Speaker, call a vote on H.R. 1217. This is the people's House. The people and their Representatives are speaking. We implore you to find the courage to stand up against the gun lobby and call a vote on this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up bipartisan legislation that would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough is enough is enough. The American people demand action. We are supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is time we act like it.

Vote "no" to defeat the previous question and vote "no" on the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my friends failed to tell you that we know of not one person—not one—that has used the terrorist watch list as an excuse to buy a gun and do things.

What they are forgetting to tell you is that we do have a problem with terrorists and people in this country. The President of the United States is not, in my opinion and in many other people's opinion, taking executive and affirmative action against this. They

can't even call terrorism what it really is. That is our problem. But today, Mr. Speaker, we are on the floor trying to debate a bill which we are going to be voting on in a few minutes.

In 2014, Mr. Speaker, 224 laws were enacted by Congress during the calendar year, yet 3,554 rules were passed by agencies. That means that there were 16 rules issued for every law.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is attempting to smother, to overrun the free enterprise system in favor of administrations that are not for job creation, that are not for raising GDP. They have a 7-year history of trying to kill the free enterprise system.

We are here for the American people to talk about jobs and job creation and more investment in America. As long as you have got an administration that is all about issuing some 3,554 new rules in exactly 1 year, you have got a problem. That is why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I know what we are trying to do, and so do they. This legislation restores all Americans' basic rights and it also helps this body. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 796 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 ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and

a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 1270, RESTORING ACCESS
TO MEDICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 793 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 793

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements. 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 114-60 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 793 provides for consideration of H.R. 1270, the Restoring Access to Medication Act.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the majority and minority of the Committee on Ways and Means. Further, the rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee print considered previously during the Rules Committee hearing on this measure. As is standard with all legislation pertaining to the Tax Code, the Committee on Rules made no further

amendments in order; however, the rule affords the minority the customary motion to recommitt.

Under the rule, we will be considering commonsense policies from three different bills that empower individuals and families as healthcare consumers, while protecting taxpayer dollars. Each bill advanced through regular order and was favorably reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1270, the Restoring Access to Medication Act, would eliminate barriers created in the Affordable Care Act for those who want to purchase over-the-counter medications with funds from their health savings accounts. Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS of Kansas introduced this bipartisan, bicameral bill to cut through the bureaucratic red tape created in the President's healthcare law.

H.R. 5445, the Health Care Security Act, introduced by Congressman PAULSEN and myself, eliminates certain burdensome limitations on health savings accounts to help consumers take back control of their health spending decisions.

Finally, H.R. 4723, also introduced by Congresswoman JENKINS, protects taxpayers by recovering improper payments of Affordable Care Act subsidies.

At the end of last month, the Speaker's Task Force on Health Care Reform released the Republican plan to replace the Affordable Care Act and modernize the American healthcare system. Good policy that will stand the test of time requires hard work, compromise, and the scrutiny of the American people.

As, unfortunately, we learned during the run-up to the Affordable Care Act, policy hastily crafted by government bureaucrats behind closed doors results in devastating consequences. While we are committed to large-scale reform, real people are struggling as we speak, and we are not waiting to take action. These bills are an important example of the work that is going on right now to advance Member-driven solutions that will improve health care for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the post-Affordable Care Act world is riddled with flaws, but one of its biggest problems is the failure to promote consumer-driven health care. Expanding the use of health savings accounts could go a long way to reverse this trend.

Health savings account plans give consumers incentives to manage their own healthcare costs by coupling a tax-favored savings account used to pay medical expenses with a high-deductible health plan that meets certain requirements for deductibles and out-of-pocket expense limits. The funds in the health savings account are owned by the individual, controlled by the individual, and may be rolled over from year to year.

Health savings accounts are not a novel idea. They have been available since 2004. In fact, their precursor, the medical savings account, is enjoying

its 20th anniversary of being signed into law this month as part of the Kennedy-Kassebaum Act back in 1996.

Current HSA policy is extraordinarily restrictive, making it harder for consumers to take advantage of them. While I have spent several years in developing extensive reforms to tap the potential for health savings accounts for consumers, H.R. 5445 includes meaningful improvements that can actually get across the finish line today.

Deductibles and out-of-pocket limits have been steadily growing. Congress should be taking steps to make it easier for Americans to save, not restricting their options. Unfortunately, current law limits health savings account contributions to levels that are lower than the combined annual limits on deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses. H.R. 5445 resolves this discrepancy by raising the individual and family contribution limits for health savings accounts to equal the annual limit on deductibles and out-of-pocket costs.

Another problem in current law reduces the flexibility of HSAs for married couples. Under current law, if both spouses are HSA-eligible and age 55 or older, they must open separate HSA accounts to be able to make the maximum available contribution. Individuals should not be forced to jump through hoops just to save for their health care. H.R. 5445 would allow both spouses to deposit catch-up contributions into a single health savings account.

Finally, H.R. 5445 will take steps to ensure that HSA funds can reliably be used for medical expenses. Under current law, taxpayers may use HSA funds only for qualified medical expenses incurred after the establishment of the HSA, which might be some time after the establishment of the associated high-deductible health plan.

If, for example, the taxpayer purchases an HSA-eligible health plan and then immediately incurs medical expenses before opening the HSA, the taxpayer may not use tax-favored HSA funds to pay those expenses. H.R. 5445 would treat HSAs opened within 60 days after gaining coverage under an HSA-eligible plan as having been opened on the same day as the health plan. This would allow for a reasonable grace period between the time of coverage through an HSA-eligible plan and establishment of the actual health savings account.

H.R. 1270, the base bill, makes commonsense, patient-centered reforms to help defray costs for individuals.

Over-the-counter medications, such as allergy or cold medications, proton pump inhibitors, antibiotic ointment, or pain relievers were historically eligible expenditures for a health savings account and other similar tax-favored healthcare accounts. However, the Affordable Care Act created a requirement in Federal law that forces the accountholders to go to their doctor to obtain a prescription for these over-

the-counter medications before purchasing them with their health savings account or flexible savings account.

Individuals who fail to jump through these hoops and purchase over-the-counter medications without a prescription face a tax penalty for making a nonqualified distribution. This policy drives unnecessary utilization of doctors' services, decreases access to reasonable over-the-counter medications, and discourages people from taking control of saving for their healthcare needs.

H.R. 1270 repeals this harmful provision of the President's healthcare law, puts the consumer back in the driver's seat, and allows sufficient access to appropriate medication.

□ 1615

Last but not least, H.R. 4723 fulfills our duty as stewards of the tax dollars of hardworking Americans. Improper subsidy payments are treated to arbitrary and inconsistent standards. This is surely not good governance. The policy of H.R. 4723 will ensure that everyone who receives improper Affordable Care Act subsidy overpayments will be treated identically. This commonsense solution is a straightforward approach to saving billions of tax dollars for hardworking Americans.

Instead of empowering individuals, the Affordable Care Act erected barriers to consumer-driven health care. The combined policies in H.R. 1270 are an attempt to instill some of the rationality of a market-based system into the chaotic world of the Affordable Care Act. H.R. 1270 makes targeted but important reforms to strengthen the integrity of the healthcare system and improve access to quality care. This legislation is another example of the concrete actions that are being taken to return power to individual healthcare consumers.

I encourage colleagues to improve the state of health care in America and vote for the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1270.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I appreciate having an opportunity to debate the rule because, as we learned a couple of weeks ago, we are not always guaranteed that right.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the underlying bill that would be considered if this rule were passed, H.R. 1270, the so-called Restoring Access to Medication Act of 2015, I will insert into the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy, which says that if the President were presented with H.R. 1270, he would veto the bill.

Let me just read the first paragraph so my colleagues know why.

He says: "The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1270, which would create new and unnecessary tax breaks that disproportionately benefit high-income people,

increase taxes for low- and middle-income people, and do nothing to improve the quality of or address the underlying costs of health care.”

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1270—THE RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT OF 2015—REP. JENKINS, R-KS, AND 39 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1270, which would create new and unnecessary tax breaks that disproportionately benefit high-income people, increase taxes for low- and middle-income people, and do nothing to improve the quality of or address the underlying cost of health care.

The Affordable Care Act is working and is fully integrated into an improved American health care system. Discrimination based on pre-existing conditions is a thing of the past. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 20 million more Americans have health insurance. And under the Affordable Care Act, we have seen the slowest growth in health care prices in 50 years, benefiting all Americans.

H.R. 1270 would repeal the Affordable Care Act's provisions that limit the use of flexible savings accounts for over-the-counter drugs—provisions that help fund the law's coverage improvements and expansions. The bill also would provide additional tax breaks that disproportionately benefit those with higher income by expanding tax-preferred health savings accounts. These changes would do little to reduce health care costs or improve quality. To fund these new high-income tax breaks, H.R. 1270 would increase taxes paid by low- and middle-income families by removing the law's limit on repayment of premium tax credits available through the Health Insurance Marketplaces.

Rather than refighting old political battles by once again voting to repeal parts of the Affordable Care Act, Members of Congress should be working together to grow the economy, strengthen middle-class families, and create new jobs.

If the President were presented with H.R. 1270, he would veto the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, like the previous bill we considered, this is a bill that is going nowhere. And it is, I guess, the 64th time that we have voted and considered a bill to either repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act, but we have yet to consider one piece of legislation, not even one, to deal with the issue of preventing any additional gun violence in this country.

For some reason, the leadership of this House can't find the time to have that debate and to bring such legislation to the floor, like the legislation we have been advocating for, which is the no fly, no buy legislation, which says that if you are on the FBI terrorist watch list and you cannot fly on an airplane, that you ought not to be able to go in and buy a gun.

And the other piece of legislation would be one that would close all these loopholes that are currently in our background check laws; loopholes that say that, while you need to get a background check when you go into a licensed gun dealer, you don't need one if you buy a gun online or if you buy a gun at a gun show.

I mean, how ridiculous is that?

And for the life of me, why that kind of initiative is controversial or so dif-

ficult to get to the House floor is beyond me. I just don't get it.

The number of mass shootings in the United States of America continues to increase. There were 372 mass shootings in the United States in 2015, killing 475 people and wounding 1,870 people.

Why isn't there more alarm about those statistics by my friends on the other side of the aisle?

There were 64 school shootings in 2015. I mean, nobody should have to worry about the safety of their child when they send them to school in the morning. Nobody should have to worry about their safety if they go into a movie theater or if they go into a church or if they go into a nightclub.

Yet gun violence is at an epidemic level in this country, and we can't seem to get the leadership in this House to want to do anything about it.

Now, I guess in response to the sit-in that the Democrats did 2 weeks ago, and to the growing calls that I know my colleagues are getting from concerned citizens, they are trying to bring a bill to the floor that essentially was written by the National Rifle Association, which I guess is a sound bite. But other than that, you can't say much about it because it would still allow people on the terrorist watch list to be able to get guns.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues that they can talk all they want about bills that are going nowhere, about meaningless pieces of legislation. That is their right. But we have the right—unless my colleagues want to take that away from us, too—to speak about the issue that, quite frankly, is in the forefront of the minds of the American people.

Every public opinion poll shows that 85, 90, 95 percent, Democrats and Republicans, support the commonsense gun safety legislation that we have proposed, and yet we can't even get a vote. The greatest deliberative body in the world, and we can't deliberate on the great issues confronting our country. We have to deliberate on issues that are going nowhere, issues that amount to nothing more than a press release written in the basement of the Republican Congressional Committee. I think that is shameful.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this rule so we can bring up an amendment that will keep our constituents safe; a bill that would say if you are on the terrorist watch list, you can't buy a gun; and an amendment that says that if you buy a gun, you should have a background check.

Federal law says that if you buy a gun at a licensed dealer, you have to

get a background check. So about 60 percent of the guns that are purchased are purchased in a situation where a licensed dealer is involved, and they go through a background check. The reason for this is to make sure that criminals, the dangerously mentally ill, domestic abusers, and terrorists can't get their hands on firearms. It makes it more difficult for them to get their hands on firearms, so it is our first line of defense.

The problem is about 40 percent of the guns that are purchased are able to go around that requirement for a background check. Now, the irony is the places where they buy them. They buy them online. They buy them at gun shows. And if you go to a gun show or if you go online, there are licensed dealers that sell guns there. And if you go to the table that the licensed dealer has and try and buy a gun, you have to get a background check.

Well, if you can't pass a background check, you can go to the next table, you can find an individual selling guns at a gun show, and you can buy the same gun without going through a background check.

Thirty-four States allow guns to be sold through commercial sales without the benefit of a background check. This is tragic. Even if you are from one of the 16 States that don't allow it, all you have to do is, all a terrorist, a criminal, or a domestic abuser, all they have to do is just drive to the State next door that doesn't require background checks, buy the gun, and bring it back to your neighborhood.

Now we know this happens. We know this. I have a friend, Elvin Daniels, from Wisconsin, whose sister was threatened by her husband. She got a restraining order. The husband went to the gun store to try and buy a gun, and because there was a restraining order, he was prohibited from buying that gun. So he went online, he bought the same gun he was prohibited from buying in the gun store, killed Elvin's sister and two other people.

Background checks work. We know that in the licensed dealers arena, where you have to have a background check, 170 felons a day are prohibited from buying guns. Fifty domestic abusers a day are stopped from buying guns. Yet we allow an avenue for domestic abusers, the dangerously mentally ill, criminals, and terrorists to go straight down the road and buy a gun without the benefit of a background check.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Now, I want to emphasize there is nothing about either one of our measures—as a matter of fact, they are Republican bills that we are trying to bring to the floor—there is nothing about either one of them that is against the Second Amendment.

I am a gun owner. I believe strongly in the Second Amendment. And the Supreme Court spelled out specifically in the Heller decision that individuals have a right to own firearms. But they also said that there can be certain restrictions, restrictions such as criminals, terrorists, domestic abusers, dangerously mentally ill; they can't have guns. Well, you can't do that unless you have a background check.

Now, 70 of my friends across the aisle voted to augment the funding for the background check system, \$20 million they voted to add to the system.

How can you vote to fund a system, spend 20 million taxpayer dollars to fund a system that you won't require people to use? It is absurd.

What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of that you won't bring this bill to the floor for a vote?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people may be wondering why my colleagues and I are focusing on gun violence today and not on this financial services appropriations bill which, I should add, is loaded with poison pill riders.

The reason is simple. We refuse to continue treating gun violence as business as usual in America. Forty-nine were killed in Orlando. We took a moment of silence, then it was business as usual.

Fourteen were killed in San Bernardino. We took a moment of silence, then it was business as usual.

Nine were killed in Roseburg. We took a moment of silence, then it was business as usual.

Nine more were killed in Charleston. We took a moment of silence, then it was business as usual.

Thirty-three thousand were killed by gun violence last year. We took a moment of silence, then it was business as usual.

I cannot, in good conscience, debate a rule on an appropriations bill when so many of our communities continue to suffer from gun violence every day.

I hear my Republican colleagues say this is our democracy at work, but a Congress that rejects two gun violence prevention bills that are supported by 90 percent of Americans is not democracy at work.

I hear my Republican colleagues say we don't have the votes. Then prove it. Bring these bills to the floor. I am betting they pass.

Every day that goes by, these firearms become more powerful and our failure to act becomes more reckless. I implore my Republican friends to disobey the gun lobby, hold a vote, and let's pass legislation that will save American lives.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that when it comes time to attempt another repeal of the Affordable Care Act, House Republicans are willing to bring an unlimited number of bills to this floor, consume an almost unlimited amount of this House's resources. It seems that Congress is always ready to act and always ready to have debates and votes on their favorite issues for their favorite special interests.

But when it comes to the worsening gun violence epidemic in America, we are back to the moments of silence. We are back to the banging of the gavel, the 30 seconds, at best, of silence, followed by another bang of that gavel and the resumption of business as usual; no meaningful debates, no meaningful votes.

And we are now hearing that this week we are going to get a glorified moment of silence, a bill, written and blessed by the NRA, that would not keep guns out of the hands of terrorists or other dangerous people because it imposes a completely arbitrary 72-hour time window within which standards must be met that are simply unachievable.

The prosecutor, the U.S. attorney, the Attorney General, must somehow, within this 72-hour window, marshal evidence that meets a probable cause standard that an individual is about to commit an act of terror, serve process on this individual, make sure that individual has been able to hire an attorney, and give that individual the opportunity to show up at a hearing and present their side of the case.

□ 1630

If none of that happens within 72 hours, guess what. They get to proceed right to their gun purchase.

So this is not meaningful gun violence reform. This is window dressing. This is cosmetic. It is a glorified moment of silence.

If we defeat the previous question on the 4,000th attempt to repeal or undermine ObamaCare, we can get serious about this issue. We can show the American people that we are listening to their voices and that we take seriously the thousands of people who are killed by gun violence each and every year. We can bring forward bills that will make a difference—and that is what we should do, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will once again offer an amendment to the rule to bring up no fly, no buy, bipartisan legislation that would give the Attorney General the authority to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to solve problems. They sent us here to work together to help the American people.

Frankly, the American people are getting pretty frustrated. We noticed a little bit of frustration break out on the floor of this body 2 weeks ago, and they did that because, although we are hearing today about the consumer reigns supreme, the American people are afraid. They are afraid right now because you have to worry when you are praying in a church, when you are teaching or have your child in a first grade classroom, when you are playing in a park, walking down a street, or enjoying a Saturday night at a nightclub that a dangerous person with a gun may cut you down.

That is the most fundamental right we all have as Americans, our right to our very lives, and we have not been allowed the opportunity to even debate this matter in the 3½ years that I have been in Congress.

The time has passed. The time has passed for handwringing and for moments of silence. We have two bills. They are bipartisan bills. They will make a meaningful difference and save lives. We should call them up this week. The time is now.

If you are too dangerous to get on an airplane because you are dangerous to the national security of this country, you should not be free to buy an arsenal. We should pass no fly, no buy.

Fundamentally, we need to have expanded background checks on all sales of guns. None of this other legislation works. If we don't ask whether you are a dangerous, forbidden, prohibited person from buying a weapon, then even closing the terrorist watch list will be of no meaning because you can just go online, as so many Americans now do, and avoid the law.

It is our job to help fix problems and to make things right. We are not doing our job if we are not debating—much less even voting on—legislation that will save lives. The time has come to act. The time is now: no fly, no buy this week; expanded background checks this week.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I come to the floor again to ask my Republican colleagues to bring to the

floor two commonsense proposals that will significantly reduce gun violence in this country. We have, each day it feels like—certainly regularly—come to the floor of the House and observed moments of silence. That is what we have done. We have spent one moment, said, and done nothing as our communities continue to be ravaged by gun violence. There are many of us who believe we have a responsibility to do more than to just observe moments of silence.

So these two bills are overwhelmingly supported by the American people. The first bill says that if you are determined to be too dangerous to get on an airplane, if you are a suspected terrorist barred from getting on an airplane because it is too dangerous, then you should also be prevented from going into a gun store and buying as many guns as you want.

The American people should know this: between 2004 and 2014, over 2,000 individuals on the terrorist watch list went into a gun store and bought guns. Ninety-five percent of the American people who have been killed by terrorists since September 11 in this country were killed with a firearm. We have allowed more than 2,000 individuals on that watch list, that terrorist watch list, to go into a gun store. We must stop that.

No fly, no buy: if you are too dangerous to get on a plane, then you are too dangerous to buy a gun. We owe it to those we serve, the people who sent us here, to end this practice and close this loophole.

The second bill is to ensure that there are universal background checks. Background checks work. Every day, 171 attempted purchases by felons are stopped because of criminal background checks; 48 attempted purchases by domestic abusers and 19 attempted purchases by fugitives are stopped every single day in those sales where background checks occur. But some reports are that up to 35 percent of gun sales don't have a background check because they happen on the Internet or they happen at gun shows.

Background checks make sense. Ninety percent of the American people support universal background checks.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Universal background checks will require that all gun sales be subjected to that important safeguard.

This is about our solemn responsibility to keep our constituents safe. We can't pass a bill that is going to eliminate every single instance of gun violence, but I will tell you this: we can do a lot to significantly reduce gun violence in this country. These two bills are an important first step, broadly supported by the American people. I know that I speak for so many of my constituents when I say that we have a

moral responsibility to do something to respond to the carnage of gun violence in this country.

I had an event in Rhode Island at the National Day of Action, and a couple came up to me. They said: Congressman, we lost our son at Virginia Tech. When we saw you and your colleagues sitting down on the House floor, we thought finally someone is trying to do something about it.

Let's respond to those parents and to all the other parents who have lost a child to gun violence. Let's pass these two bills and show the American people we can get something done that will help keep them safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to bring those bills to the floor, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 141 of the Nation's leading medical and public health organizations, a letter sent to all Members of Congress that urges us to end the dramatic and chilling effect of the current rider language restricting gun violence research, which, apparently, in the wisdom of the people who run this House, thought they would prevent the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention the ability to do research into this, which shows you just how powerful the National Rifle Association is in this House of Representatives.

APRIL 6, 2016.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Vice Chairwoman, Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NITA LOWEY,
Ranking Member, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned health care, public health, scientific organizations and research universities representing over 1 million members across the country urge you to end the dramatic chilling effect of the current rider language restricting gun violence research and to fund this critical work at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

In 1996, Congress passed the so-called Dickey amendment as a rider to the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Appropriations bill. The language stated that the CDC could not fund research that would "advocate or promote gun control," and the language has remained in each subsequent annual funding bill. At the same time, Congress cut CDC funding for this research. Although the Dickey amendment does not explicitly prevent research on gun violence, the combination of these two actions has caused a dramatic chilling effect on federal research that has stalled and stymied progress on gathering critical data to inform prevention of gun violence for the past 20 years. Furthermore, it has discouraged the next generation of researchers from entering the field.

Gun violence is a serious public health epidemic resulting in the senseless deaths of an

average of 91 Americans, and another 108 gun injuries, each and every day. A central part of preventing future tragedies is through conducting rigorous scientific research as this has been a proven successful approach in reducing deaths due to other injuries.

Health care providers and public health professionals are overwhelmed in emergency departments, clinics, offices, and communities with the victims of mass shootings, homicides, suicides, accidental shootings, and firearm injuries. Medical professionals and our communities work to address the devastating and long-lasting physical and emotional effects of gun violence on victims, their families and their friends, but are hampered by the insufficient body of evidence-based research to use to point communities toward proven gun violence prevention programs and policies.

Former Representative Jay Dickey (R-AR), author of the current language that has effectively restricted gun violence research, recently noted that, "it is my position that somehow or someday we should slowly but methodically fund [gun] research until a solution is reached. Doing nothing is no longer an acceptable solution."

Here are some of the critical questions that enhanced research would help us answer:

(1) What is the best way to protect toddlers from accidentally firing a firearm? Safe firearm storage works, but what kinds of campaigns best encourage safe storage? What safe storage methods are the most effective and most likely to be adopted? What should be the trigger pull on a firearm so a toddler can't use it?

(2) What are the most effective ways to prevent gun-related suicides? Two-thirds of firearm related deaths are suicides. Are firearm suicides more spontaneous than non-firearm suicides? Do other risk factors vary by method? How do we prevent it in different populations active military, veterans, those with mental illness, law enforcement or correctional officers, the elderly, or teenagers?

(3) What is the impact of the variety of state policies being enacted? How are different policies around safe storage, mental health, public education, and background checks impacting firearm injuries and deaths?

The CDC's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control is an important part of answering these types of questions. Public health uniquely brings together a comprehensive approach connecting the complex factors that result in violence and injuries including clinical, social, criminal, mental health, and environmental factors.

The impact of federal public health research in reducing deaths from car accidents, smoking and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome has been well proven. Decades ago, we did not know infant car seats should be rear-facing. Robust research on car accidents and subsequent legislation has helped save hundreds of thousands of lives without preventing people from being able to drive. It's time to apply the same approach to reducing gun violence in our communities.

As professionals dedicated to the health of the nation and to the application of sound science to improving the lives of our fellow Americans, we urge you to take action this year. Americans deserve to know that we are working with the best tools and information in the fight to reduce gun violence deaths and injuries.

As Congress works to craft the FY 2017 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill, we urge you to provide the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with funding for research into the causes and prevention of gun violence.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with you to improve

health and protect the safety of all Americans.

Sincerely,

Academic Consortium for Integrative Medicine & Health

Academic Pediatric Association

Alameda Health System Department of Emergency Medicine

American Academy of Family Physicians

American Academy of Pediatrics

American Association for the Advancement of Science

American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy

American Association of Nurse Practitioners

American College of Emergency Physicians

American College of Emergency Physicians, California Chapter

American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine

American College of Physicians

American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

American Educational Research Association

American Geriatrics Society

American Medical Association

American Medical Student Association

American Medical Women's Association

American Pediatric Society

American Psychiatric Association

American Psychological Association

American Public Health Association

American Society for Clinical Pathology

American Society of Hematology

American Thoracic Society

American Trauma Society

Arkansas Public Health Association

Asociación de Salud Pública de Puerto Rico

Association for Psychological Science

Association of American Universities

Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairs

Association of Population Centers

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

Big Cities Health Coalition

Boulder County Public Health

Brigham Psychiatric Specialties

California Center for Public Health Advocacy

California Public Health Association-North Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientists

Central Oregon Medical Society

Champaign-Urbana Public Health District

Chicago Center for Psychoanalysis

Chicago chapter Physicians for Social Responsibility

Colorado Public Health Association

Committee of Interns and Residents/SEIU Healthcare

Congregation Gates of Heaven

Consortium of Social Science Associations

Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists

Cure Violence

Delaware Academy of Medicine/Delaware Public Health Association

Doctors Council SEIU

Doctors for America

Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma

Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences

Florida Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Inc.

Futures Without Violence

Georgia Public Health Association

Hawaii Public Health Association

Health Officers Association of California

Houston Health Department

Illinois Public Health Association

International Society for Developmental Psychobiology

Iowa Chapter Physicians for Social Responsibility

Iowa Public Health Association

JPS Health Network

Kansas Public Health Association

Koop Institute

KU Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health

Law and Society Association

Lee County Health Department

Local Public Health Association of Minnesota

Louisiana Center for Health Equity

Maine Public Health Association

Maryland Academy of Family Physicians

Minnesota Public Health Association

Montana Public Health Association

National AHEC Organization

National Association of County and City Health Officials

National Association of Medical Examiners

National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health

National Association of Social Workers

National Association of State Emergency Medical Services Officials

National Association of State Head Injury Administrators

National Black Nurses Association

National Hispanic Medical Association

National Medical Association

National Network of Public Health Institutes

National Physicians Alliance

National Violence Prevention Network

Nevada Public Health Association

New Hampshire Public Health Association

New Mexico Public Health Association

North Carolina Public Health Association

Ohio Public Health Association

Oregon Academy of Family Physicians

Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility

Oregon Public Health Association

Pediatric Policy Council

Physicians for Social Responsibility, Arizona Chapter

Physicians for a National Health Program NY Metro Chapter

Physicians for Reproductive Health

Physicians for Social Responsibility/Northeast Ohio

Physicians for Social Responsibility Wisconsin

Physicians for Social Responsibility, Arizona Chapter

Physicians for Social Responsibility/New York

Physicians for the Prevention of Gun Violence

Population Association of America

Prevention Institute

Psychonomic Society

Public Health Association of Nebraska

Public Health Association of New York City

Public Health Institute

Research!America

RiverStone Health

Safe States Alliance

San Francisco Bay Area Chapter, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Society for Adolescent Health and Medicine

Society for Advancement of Violence and Injury Research

Society for Mathematical Psychology

Society for Pediatric Research

Society for Psychophysiological Research

Society for Public Health Education

Society of Experimental Social Psychology

Society of General Internal Medicine

Southern California Public Health Association

Southwest Ohio Society of Family Medicine

Student National Medical Association

Suicide Awareness Voices of Education

Texas Doctors for Social Responsibility

Texas Public Health Association

Trauma Foundation

Tri-County Health Department

Trust for America's Health

United Physicians of Newtown

Vermont Public Health Association

Virginia Public Health Association

Washington Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics

Washington State Public Health Association

Wellness Institute of Greater Buffalo

Whiteside County Health Department

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I spoke earlier, I asked: What are you afraid of? Why won't you bring these bills to the floor?

I think back to when I met with the parents of some of the children who were killed in one of the most horrific incidents in our country, the terrible, terrible incident at Sandy Hook Elementary School, and listening to the parents and hearing their stories, and I can't help but think to myself: Are you more afraid to bring this bill to the floor for a vote than those kids were hiding for their lives in those classrooms? Are you more afraid than those movie-goers in Aurora, Colorado, who were hiding, trying not to be killed? Are the people who were praying in Charleston when they were gunned down, are you more afraid; is this more frightening than what they experienced or San Bernardino or Orlando? What is stopping you from bringing common-sense, pro-Second Amendment gun violence prevention legislation to the floor for a vote?

Gun owners are for this. I am a gun owner. I have told you that before. As a matter of fact, I am proud to say I am one of the 26 Democrats who were labeled by the rightwing media for being hypocrites because we owned guns and we want to pass gun violence prevention legislation.

As a matter of fact, I bought a gun. I bought it before the break but picked it up during the break because, in California, not only are you required to get a background check, but there is a cooling-off period that they require. You have to wait 10 days.

So before the break, I bought a gun from a very close friend of mine, someone whom I have known for over 25, 30 years, yet the law says background check. It wasn't a problem. I took it in, left the gun. My friend signed the paper. I signed the paper. Ten days later, over this last break, I came and picked it up. It is no big deal.

Why would you want to sell a gun to someone who may be a criminal, dangerously mentally ill, a domestic abuser, or a terrorist?

These bills make sense. Bring them to the floor, and let's vote.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding to me because I must rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 794 and H.R. 5485. They assault the District of Columbia's right to govern itself.

This bill contains undemocratic, harmful, Big Government riders that prohibit the D.C. government from spending its local funds, consisting of local taxes and fees, as it deems necessary.

In addition, the Republican-led Rules Committee has allowed Representative GARY PALMER to offer an amendment and interfere with my jurisdiction to keep D.C. from spending its local funds to enforce its own employment non-discrimination law.

This bill repeals the D.C. budget autonomy referendum, which allows D.C. to spend its local funds after a 30-day review period.

The Rules Committee prevented me from offering my amendments to strike the provisions in this bill that prohibit D.C. from spending its local funds on taxing and regulating marijuana sales and on abortion services for low-income women.

Let's see the results.

While recreational marijuana use is legal under D.C. law, Congress has uniquely prohibited the city from spending its local funds to set up a tax and regulatory system. This rider, therefore, has been referred to as the Drug Dealer Protection Act.

As one marijuana dealer told the press, the rider is "a license for me to print money."

Regulating marijuana, like alcohol, would allow D.C., instead of violent drug gangs, to control marijuana production, distribution, sales, and revenue collection.

Every State has the authority to spend its own funds on abortion services for low-income women, and 17 States fund these services. The rider in this bill effectively prevents low-income women in D.C. from exercising their constitutional right to abortion, just affirmed by the Supreme Court, by depriving them of necessary funds.

Republicans claim to support devolving Federal authority to State and local governments. Here is your chance. That support should not end at the D.C. border. The Constitution allows, but does not require, Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters.

The Rules Committee had a choice to allow me to offer my amendments on the floor to strike the D.C. marijuana and abortion riders as well as to block the amendment on the D.C. non-discrimination law. In our democracy in the 21st century, these decisions should not be difficult because these are purely local matters.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 2 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to again clarify what we have under consideration at this time, three different bills, a rule that would allow votes on three different bills that empower individuals and families as healthcare consumers while protecting taxpayer dollars. Each of these bills did advance through regular order and was favorably reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1270, the Restoring Access to Medication Act, would eliminate barriers created in the Affordable Care Act for those who want to purchase over-the-counter medications with funds from their health savings account. H.R. 5445, the Health Care Security Act, introduced by Congressman PAULSEN and myself, eliminates certain burdensome limitations on health savings accounts to help consumers take back control of their healthcare spending decisions. Finally, H.R. 4723, also introduced by Congresswoman JENKINS, protects taxpayers by recovering improper overpayments from subsidies awarded under the Affordable Care Act.

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

□ 1645

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my opposition to the rule being debated on the floor this evening, but also take this opportunity to remind the Speaker that the American people are waiting. They are waiting for us to bring commonsense gun violence prevention measures to this floor.

Mr. Speaker, every day in New York City and in the Borough of Brooklyn, people are hurt and killed by gun violence. Too many families hold fear and sorrow in their hearts from their experiences with senseless gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, people in my district and from all over our Nation have been demanding action. You and your Republican colleagues cannot continue to ignore their pleas and their pain.

Well, I cannot ignore their pleas and their pain, and my Democratic colleagues will not either. Enough is enough. Congress must act to protect the lives of Americans. Congress must do more than hold a moment of silence to absolve you, Mr. Speaker, of your role in the death and destruction due to gun violence.

For me and many in this Nation, gun violence is personal and it has hit home. My colleague, former New York City Councilman James E. Davis, was gunned down in the chambers of the New York City Council before me and his colleagues, the New Yorkers who visited our gallery, and the children, who were part of our audience on that infamous day. Whether it is in the legislative chamber of city hall, in a theater, an elementary school, or a night club, gun violence must end.

Mr. Speaker, I will work tirelessly, relentlessly here on Capitol Hill to protect our communities from the ever-present threat of gun violence. I will continue to stand with all people of goodwill to demand action on the legislation that puts an end to this crisis. I will be their voice here in Washington, D.C.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that it is frustrating for not only many of us on this side of the aisle, but I am sure it must be frustrating to the American people who are watching this debate that here we are debating a bill that would essentially be the 64th bill that we have debated and voted on to either repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act.

We all know this bill is not going anywhere, and I doubt very much that we will see much action in the Senate, but we know that the President will definitely veto it. This is not like the other bills that we have been dealing with in this Congress, bills that really are more designed for press releases and sound bites than for really, actually, making people's lives better.

In the aftermath of Orlando where 49—49—of our brothers and sisters were murdered, the best that the leadership of this House could do was have a moment of silence. I have to tell you, people that I have talked to in the aftermath of that moment of silence viewed that as the ultimate inaction by Congress because all we do is moments of silence when there are massacres. We don't do moments of silence after each individual loses a life to gun violence in this country because we would never have time to do anything else if we did. But people are just so angry that the people who serve in this Chamber don't seem to have the political will to do anything about it. I mean, massacre after massacre after massacre cannot be the new norm.

Last Wednesday, a number of us participated in a national day of action all across the country in an attempt to try to raise awareness of ways to prevent gun violence. I did one in Worcester, Massachusetts, where I am from. We had a grandmother, Beverly Spring, who talked about how she lost not only one grandson to gun violence, but she lost two grandchildren to gun violence.

Does anybody have any idea the heartache that this woman and mothers and fathers and grandmothers and grandfathers have gone through who have lost their loved ones to gun violence? Does anyone have any idea the pain of those family members whose loved ones were lost in Orlando or Aurora or Sandy Hook? Or I could go right down the list of massacres.

I am asking my colleagues here to give us an opportunity to have a debate and to have a vote on two commonsense gun safety legislative initiatives. One is no fly, no buy. And the other is let's have our background check system be universal so that people who have criminal backgrounds or who have a history of mental illness do not go to gun shows to buy guns or go online to buy guns.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, we could vote on the underlying bill, but we could vote on this sensible piece of

legislation. Enough is enough. Let's do something. Let's not just sit around here and continue to be indifferent. The American people expect more of us than what they have seen.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of an important bill to correct some of the most egregious changes in the Affordable Care Act that affected individuals' ability to save for their own healthcare needs. I was happy to be able to work with Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. KIND, who each contributed to the underlying legislation which will be considered by the House following the passage of today's rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 793 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 on the resolution.

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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5485, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 794 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 794

Resolved, That 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. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government 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.

SEC. 2. (a) After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 265, line 9. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided further" on page 122, line 19, through "2012" on page 122, line 22. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph.

(b) No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. 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 recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. Section 1201 of H.R. 5485 shall be considered to be a spending reduction account for purposes of section 3(d) of House Resolution 5.

SEC. 7. During consideration of H.R. 5485, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 794 provides for consideration of H.R. 5485, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2017.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The resolution also provides for consideration of 70 amendments to H.R. 5485, and provides the minority the customary motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5485, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2017, provides \$10.9 billion for the Internal Revenue Service, maintains the current \$2.1 billion level for taxpayer services, and provides a further \$290 million to improve customer service such as phone call and correspondence response times, fraud prevention, and cybersecurity.

For the past several years, the American public has viewed the Federal Internal Revenue Service as one that targets organizations for their political affiliation, slowing down approval for tax-exempt status, and attempting to chill their First Amendment-protected speech. House Republicans have exposed the many violations that have taken place at the Internal Revenue Service, and the bill before us continues to reflect the close eye that Congress continues to have on this agency, reining in their ability to fur-

ther chill speech by manipulating the Tax Code.

To achieve this, the bill includes language that prohibits the Internal Revenue Service from using funds to target specific individuals or groups exercising their First Amendment rights, and further prohibits the White House—under the current administration or the next one, from either political party—from using the Internal Revenue Service to scrutinize their political opponents. This protection of the right to freedom of speech is critical, and, of course, I urge all Members to support it.

The bill also provides \$1.5 billion for the Securities and Exchange Commission, almost an identical figure to last year's request. The bill keeps the Securities and Exchange Commission focused on critical information technology initiatives and methods to help the Commission better serve investors. It also rescinds the balance of what is known as the Securities and Exchange Commission's reserve fund, a slush fund that was created under the Dodd-Frank law that can be spent by the SEC without congressional oversight.

□ 1700

To assist Congress in its constitutionally obligated checks and balances of the executive branch, the bill includes language to increase the oversight of another creation of the Dodd-Frank Act—the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Currently, this agency is wholly unaccountable to the American people as its funding was placed in the Dodd-Frank legislation outside of the yearly appropriations process, leaving little legislative check on that agency.

As it exists today, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau draws its funds on autopilot directly from the Federal Reserve. This bill would place the CFPB into the regular, annual appropriations process and, in doing so, would increase the transparency and the accountability of its actions and allow for the appropriate oversight from Congress.

Additionally, the bill replaces the single-person leadership structure of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with a more balanced, five-person commission that mirrors those of other financial regulators, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission and the CFTC.

The bill also includes \$692 million for the Executive Office of the President, which, in addition to providing funds for White House staff, also includes critical funding for drug control efforts, such as the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas and Drug Free Communities Support Programs. In his budget request this year, the President sought to reduce funding for these programs by \$70 million. This bill keeps those important programs intact and actually increases their funding by a \$5 million mark. The bill further includes a provision that requires the Office of

Management and Budget to release information on the expected costs of executive orders and Presidential memoranda.

H.R. 5485 also includes \$725 million as the Federal payment to the Nation's Capital City, the District of Columbia, which includes funding for public safety resources and security costs as well as \$45 million for the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, which is an important program to help children in our Nation's Capital get the education they deserve and to choose the educational path that best fits their needs. The bill includes \$7 billion to the Federal court system, which will improve public safety, bolster the security of courtrooms, and improve the speed and efficiency of processing Federal cases.

The consideration of appropriations bills each year is the core function of the Congress. With the passage of today's rule, the House will be taking another step in completing that responsibility. I urge support for the rule and for the underlying bill.

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

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

I thank and appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. As we all remember, 2 weeks ago, we were not given that courtesy to have 30 minutes to debate the rule. We also had no debate on the underlying bill that was brought up 2 weeks ago. In any event, I appreciate his yielding me the time.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 5485, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act.

I hope there is a strong bipartisan vote against this rule for, among other things, in the Rules Committee, they denied my colleague, Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, the right to offer his amendment, which would prevent discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.

For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot figure out why my Republican friends think it is so controversial—or that it is a poison pill—to put in statute language that bars Federal contractors from discriminating against the LGBT community. Yet this amendment, which is perfectly germane, was not allowed to be made in order. I think that that alone should encourage both Democrats and Republicans to vote against this rule.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill is awful as it undermines key elements of the Affordable Care Act; it undermines key elements of the Dodd-Frank financial reform; it diminishes women's access to legal health services; it meddles in the District of Columbia's internal affairs; it undermines the President's Cuba policy; it prevents the fair treatment of Internet content in order to benefit the interests of a

few large corporations; and the bill rewards tax cheats, not honest, hard-working Americans, by its failing to provide sufficient funding to enforce tax law.

For all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against the underlying bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the President's Statement of Administration Policy, which says, if presented with this bill, he will veto it.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5485—FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017—REP. ROGERS, R-KY

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 5485, making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year (FY) ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.

The bill's reductions in funding for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) exacerbate the damaging reductions inflicted on the IRS since 2010, and irresponsibly cut funding for the agencies charged with implementing Wall Street reform. The bill also underfunds the Federal Trade Commission's efforts to promote economic competition.

Furthermore, the legislation includes highly problematic ideological provisions, including provisions that restrict the IRS's ability to implement the Affordable Care Act (ACA), interfere with important new regulations designed to protect consumers from risky or abusive lending, and undermine the principle of home rule for the District of Columbia. These provisions also prevent the Federal Communications Commission from promoting a free and open internet and encouraging competition in the set-top box market, impacting millions of broadband and cable customers. Furthermore, these provisions would bar Federal agency efforts to reduce the risks and costs of flood disasters. Despite these shortcomings, the Administration welcomes the bill's investments in entrepreneurship and small business financing.

In October 2015, the President worked with congressional leaders from both parties to secure the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (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 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. 5485, his 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 the Treasury

Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The Administration strongly objects to the \$766 million reduction in funding for the IRS compared to the FY 2017 Budget request. This reduction would bring IRS funding to FY 1993 levels, in real terms, hindering the agency's efforts to provide robust service to taxpayers, improve enforcement operations, and implement new statutory responsibilities. Furthermore, these reductions would negatively impact efforts aimed at deficit reduction, with en-

forcement revenues in FY 2017 estimated to be more than \$11 billion lower than if FY 2010 staffing levels had been maintained. In addition, the Administration strongly opposes sections of the bill that limit IRS funding and transfers to carry out implementation of the ACA, under which millions of individuals have signed up for coverage through the Health Insurance Marketplaces. The Administration also objects to provisions that unnecessarily encumber IRS operations with burdensome reporting requirements and that would constrain enforcement of tax laws.

Departmental Offices. The Administration appreciates the support for targeted investments in Department-wide cybersecurity enhancements. However, the Administration objects to the bill's defunding of the Department's Systems and Capital Investment Program and is disappointed that the bill fails to permit funding for oversight and administration of the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund to be paid from the Trust Fund. In total, the bill would require a \$27.4 million reduction in funding from the comparable level in the FY 2017 Budget request for core Departmental Offices Salaries and Expenses.

Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) Fund. The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for the CDFI Fund, which is funded above the FY 2017 Budget request. However, the Administration is disappointed that the bill provides neither the \$22 million requested for the Healthy Food Financing Initiative, which offers financial and technical assistance to expand the availability of healthy food options in distressed communities, nor the \$10 million requested for the Small Dollar Loan Program to expand access to small dollar loans in underserved communities and combat predatory lending. The Administration also appreciates the continuation of the CDFI Bond Guarantee Program, but is concerned about the \$250 million limitation on new commitments, which is below the program's annual average commitment level. This lower level of commitment authority would unnecessarily constrain the provision of long-term capital in low-income and underserved communities.

Office of Financial Research (OFR) and Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC). The Administration strongly opposes section 130 of the bill, which would subject OFR and FSOC to the annual appropriations process beginning in FY 2018. This language would hinder the independence of these entities and limit their ability to develop critical market analysis and improve regulator coordination if future funding shortfalls prevent information technology (IT) investments or the hiring of highly-skilled staff. The Administration also opposes onerous new procedural requirements that could effectively prohibit FSOC from formally designating nonbank financial companies whose material financial distress could pose a threat to U.S. financial stability. In addition, the Administration strongly opposes section 129 of the bill, which would require OFR to publish notice 90 days prior to issuing any report, rule, or regulation; research reports are intended to provide independent analysis of the facts, unswayed by public or political sentiment.

Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014 (DATA Act). The Administration appreciates that the Committee fully funded the FY 2017 Budget request for the Bureau of the Fiscal Service for Government-wide implementation of the DATA Act, and urges the Congress to fully fund the FY 2017 Budget request for the Department of the Treasury's own implementation of the DATA Act. This funding supports efforts to provide more transparent Federal spending data, such as updating information technology

systems, changing business processes, and linking financial and Federal award data with the Award ID.

Executive Office of the President (EOP)

EOP Funding and Operations. The Administration objects to section 621 of the bill, which would continue a prohibition on paying salaries and expenses for certain White House staff positions and impinge on the President's ability to organize EOP operations. The Administration appreciates funding for Presidential transition costs but strongly objects to the lack of funding for Unanticipated Needs, which would severely hamper the President's ability to meet unexpected requirements for the furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense. The Administration also objects to the funding level in the bill for the National Security Council, which is \$2.1 million below the FY 2017 Budget request.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The Administration strongly opposes the funding level in the bill for OMB, which is \$10 million below the FY 2017 Budget request. This reduction would significantly diminish OMB's ability to carry out its mission. The Administration also objects to continuation of bill language that would require burdensome OMB cost estimates to accompany the issuance of all Executive Orders, as well as language that requires OMB to submit a report to the Congress estimating the costs of implementing the Dodd-Frank Act, an onerous and duplicative report of limited value.

Information Technology Oversight and Reform (ITOR). The Administration strongly opposes the funding level in the bill for the ITOR account, which is \$10 million below the FY 2017 Budget request. ITOR funds important efforts to improve the most critical public-facing Federal digital services through the application of best practices in product design and engineering by the U.S. Digital Service and its agency partners. The ITOR fund also supports efforts to protect Federal systems through implementation of leading solutions to address new and constantly evolving advanced, persistent cyberthreats, drive value in Federal IT investments, and implement the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act. The bill's reductions to these initiatives would undermine efforts to secure the Nation's highest value information targets and build on successful reforms to the Federal Government's management of IT resources, which have resulted in about \$3.6 billion in cost savings and avoidance.

General Services Administration (GSA)

Overall GSA Funding. Funding for GSA is an integral part of supporting agencies in their performance of critical missions. The bill's funding level would undermine GSA's ability to deliver services, impacting agencies Government-wide.

Federal Buildings Fund (FBF). The Administration finds the bill's funding level for the FBF unacceptable at nearly \$934 million below the FY 2017 Budget request and the anticipated level of rent collections from other Federal agencies in FY 2017. The bill also denies critical construction funding for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Headquarters project and the next phase of the Department of Homeland Security's headquarters consolidation at St. Elizabeths, Washington, D.C. Since FY 2011, the Committee has chosen to fund the FBF at levels billions below what GSA collects in rent from agencies. Underfunding construction and renovation is particularly damaging, as the Government must be a good steward of its own assets, able to take advantage of opportunities to save money over the long term and maintain its buildings adequately

to avoid more costly failures in the future. Further, the practice of chronically underfunding the FBF is unfair to other Federal agencies, who are no longer receiving the space and services that they are paying for, as well as to the other appropriations subcommittees who are providing funds that are never used for their intended purpose.

FBI Headquarters. The Administration strongly urges the Congress to provide the full request in the FY 2017 Budget for the new consolidated FBI headquarters facility. The bill provides only \$200 million, \$559 million below the FY 2017 Budget request for GSA for construction of the new FBI headquarters. In total, the FY 2017 Budget requests \$1.4 billion for the FBI headquarters project—\$646 million for FBI and \$759 million for GSA's Federal Building Fund. Full funding of the FY 2017 Budget request is required for GSA to award a design and construction contract for the project this year. Absent a new, modern, and secure headquarters facility, the ability of the FBI to fully support its critical national security and law enforcement missions may be compromised.

Information Technology (IT) Modernization Fund. The Administration is concerned that the Committee does not provide the requested \$100 million for the IT Modernization Fund (ITMF), part of a larger \$3.1 billion request in the FY 2017 Budget that creates a revolving fund to retire and replace legacy IT systems across Government. Absent funding for the ITMF, the cost to operate and maintain legacy systems, as well as security vulnerabilities and other risks, would continue to grow.

Unified Shared Services Management (USSM). The Administration urges the Congress to support the \$5 million requested in the FY 2017 Budget for the establishment of the USSM, a new organization housed in GSA that would serve as an integration body for the shared services environment. The funding is needed to give the USSM a stable funding source.

Small Business Administration (SBA)

SBA Support for Businesses. The Administration appreciates the strong support for small businesses through the bill's robust funding for the SBA's business loan and entrepreneurial development programs. The SBA's business loan programs would support over \$46 billion in lending to small businesses in FY 2017, and the increased funding for technical assistance and development programs would ensure business owners can effectively deploy capital to grow their businesses and create good jobs. However, the Administration opposes the elimination of funding for Regional Innovation Cluster grants and Growth Accelerators, as these innovative programs help regions leverage their unique assets to create jobs by turning entrepreneurial ideas into sustainable high-growth small businesses.

Disaster Loans Program. The Administration urges the Congress to utilize the disaster relief cap adjustment authorized in the Budget Control Act of 2011 to fund the \$159 million FY 2017 Budget request for SBA's administrative costs associated with major disasters. By not utilizing the cap adjustment, the bill makes unnecessary reductions to other programs to accommodate this line of support to small businesses after a disaster has struck.

Other Independent Agencies

Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). The Administration strongly objects to the funding level of \$1.55 billion for SEC, which is \$226 million below the FY 2017 Budget request. The bill would hinder SEC's enforcement, examination, and market oversight functions and undercut investor protections strengthened by Wall Street Reform that

benefit both consumers and Main Street. The bill would also shortchange SEC's core programs by mandating that funding for IT initiatives increase by \$50 million over the FY 2016 enacted level and prohibiting authorized IT spending from the agency's mandatory Reserve Fund. Taken together, these provisions would inhibit SEC's ability to improve oversight and examination functions in a way that investors expect and deserve. The SEC is fee-funded and its funding level has no impact on the deficit, nor does it impact the amount of funding available for other agencies.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). The Administration strongly opposes sections 502 and 503 of the bill that subject CFPB to annual appropriations and politicizes its leadership, which would severely weaken its independence and undermine its ability to serve the most vulnerable consumer populations. In addition, the Administration strongly opposes sections 506, 637, 638, and 639 of the bill that undermine key consumer protections by preventing the CFPB from finalizing or implementing payday lending and arbitration regulations and would amend the Truth in Lending Act to deny borrowers protections from certain high-cost loans. These are problematic, ideological provisions that are beyond the scope of this bill.

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). The Administration objects to the total funding level of \$120 million for CPSC, an \$11 million reduction below the FY 2017 Budget request. This funding level would significantly impede CPSC's public safety mission intended to safeguard consumers, particularly children, from hidden hazards that continue to cause death and severe injuries, including its ability to expand the import surveillance program through which CPSC identifies hazardous products that can cause injury or death before these goods can enter the U.S. market. In addition, the Administration objects to section 510 of the bill that would continue to prohibit CPSC from using funds to finalize or implement mandatory standards for recreational off-highway vehicles (ROVs) until CPSC commissions and completes a study with the National Academy of Sciences. This provision could indefinitely delay CPSC's ability to complete rulemaking on ROVs, potentially compromising public safety. The language also would undermine the Commission's statutory independence and authority to write public safety regulations, interfering with its regulatory independence and public safety mission.

Election Assistance Commission (EAC). The Administration urges the Congress to provide the full \$9.8 million requested for EAC in the FY 2017 Budget, including \$1.5 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The \$4.9 million provided in the bill is half of the funding requested in the FY 2017 Budget. Such a significant reduction would severely limit EAC's ability to assist State and local entities administer Federal elections, test and certify voting equipment, and provide information about voting system standards.

Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The Administration strongly opposes the deep reductions to the funding level for FCC, which is \$53 million, or 14 percent, below the FY 2017 Budget request. These reductions unnecessarily force FCC to scale back important work on public safety and wireless spectrum, delay efforts to modernize IT systems, and undermine efforts to save the taxpayers money by consolidating office space and improving oversight of the Universal Service Fund. The Administration objects to the \$106 million cap on auction program funding, which is \$18 million, or 15 percent, below the

FY 2017 Budget request. This would severely harm the FCC's efforts to modernize its auction infrastructure to support the increasingly complex auctions of the future, which have the potential to return tens of billions of dollars to the U.S. Treasury.

FCC, Open Internet Order. The Administration strongly objects to sections 630, 631, and 632 that aim at delaying or preventing implementation of FCC's net neutrality order. The order, which was issued after a lengthy rulemaking process that garnered input from four million Americans, ensures a level playing field that is increasingly vital to the future of the Nation's digital economy and online competition. For almost a century, U.S. law has recognized that companies who connect Americans to the world have special obligations not to exploit the monopoly they enjoy over access in and out of Americans' homes or businesses. It is common sense that the same philosophy should guide any service that is based on the transmission of information—whether a phone call, or a packet of data. The FCC's rules recognize that broadband service is of the same importance, and must carry the same obligations as so many of the other vital services do. These carefully-designed rules have already been implemented in large part with little to no impact on the telecommunications companies making important investments in the U.S. economy, and would ensure that neither the cable company nor the phone company would be able to act as a gatekeeper, restricting what Americans can do or see online. The appropriations process should not be used to overturn the will of both an independent regulator and millions of Americans on this vital issue.

FCC, Set-top Rule. The Administration opposes section 636 that aims at delaying the FCC from adopting or enforcing new rules to open the video set-top box market to additional competition. Currently, 99 percent of cable and satellite TV consumers rent set-top boxes directly from the cable providers, costing households an average of \$230 per year. The FCC is already committed to a lengthy, thorough rulemaking process that would establish a robust record of comment and analysis from companies, non-profit organizations, and academics. The current provision unnecessarily interferes with these long-established processes by requiring a delay of at least 270 days, and probably much longer, and a redundant, potentially costly study.

Federal Trade Commission (FTC). The Administration is concerned that the Committee is underfunding the efforts by the FTC and the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Antitrust Division to protect American consumers from criminal cartel practices—such as price fixing, fraud, and currency manipulation—and anticompetitive mergers. Since 2010, the number of proposed \$1 billion "mega mergers" reviewed annually by the FTC and DOJ's Antitrust Division has more than doubled. Anticompetitive mergers can harm American consumers significantly by raising prices, reducing quality, limiting output, restricting consumer choice, and stifling innovation in markets such as healthcare and pharmaceuticals, defense contracting, energy and petroleum, cable television and internet, cell phones and service, airline travel, appliances, and common food items. The bill provides \$317 million for the FTC, \$25 million below the FY 2017 Budget request.

United States Postal Service. The Administration strongly opposes new language in the bill that would roll back cost saving measures implemented by the Postal Service over the last four years. The Administration is also disappointed that language under the Payment to the Postal Service Fund account

would prohibit the Postal Service from modifying its delivery schedule to better adapt to its current business environment. Each year, the President's Budget has proposed balanced reforms to provide the Postal Service with the operational flexibility to continue to meet its universal service obligation and implement structural changes that would help put it on a sustainable trajectory. While the Congress has failed to act, the Postal Service has undertaken significant administrative reforms under existing authority to reduce expenses. Despite these efforts, since FY 2012 the Postal Service has been forced to default each year on scheduled payments to reduce its unfunded liability for retiree health benefits and is expected to default on an additional \$5.8 billion due during FY 2016. The Postal Service estimates that reversing four years of service changes would increase its operating deficit by roughly \$1.5 billion annually and impose an additional \$500 million in one-time costs.

Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB). The Administration objects to the funding level of \$8.3 million in the bill for the PCLOB, which is \$1.8 million, or more than 17 percent, below the FY 2017 Budget request. The funding level provided would impair PCLOB's ability to maintain sufficient staff to independently and robustly assess the multi-billion dollar counterterrorism enterprise's efforts to balance privacy and civil liberties. The Congress and the Executive Branch have asked the Board to analyze a number of complex issues that are subject to ongoing public debate, including electronic surveillance. The impact of the funding reduction on the Board's staffing would hinder its ability to satisfy these requests.

Udall Foundation. The Administration opposes the elimination of funding requested in the FY 2017 Budget for the Udall Foundation, which provides education and research resources to American Indians and Alaska Natives. In addition, through the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, the Foundation provides mediation services for conflicts involving Federal agencies or interests. The Administration urges the Congress to fully fund the Udall Foundation at the \$5 million level included in the FY 2017 Budget request.

District of Columbia (D.C.)

D.C. Local Budget Autonomy. The Administration does not object to the one-year shutdown exemption in section 816 of the bill, which would allow D.C. to spend local funds in the event of a lapse in appropriations in FY 2018. However, the Administration strongly objects to section 817 of the bill, which repeals the D.C. Local Budget Autonomy Act of 2012. The residents of the District and their elected leaders deserve to have the same ability as other U.S. residents and elected leaders to determine how to use their local revenues. Such authority is fundamental to a well-functioning democracy and the denial of such authority is an affront to the residents and leaders of the District. The Administration urges the Congress to adopt provisions included in the FY 2017 Budget request that would permanently allow the District to use local funds without congressional action.

Restrictions on the District's Use of Local Funds. The Administration strongly opposes language in the bill that bars the elected leaders of the District of Columbia from determining how to use local revenues. Specifically, the Administration strongly opposes section 810 of the bill, which prohibits the District from using both Federal and local funds for abortion services for low-income women. Longstanding policy prohibits Federal funds from being used for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest, or when the

life of the woman would be endangered, but restrictions on the District's use of local funds for abortion services is contrary to the principle of home rule. In addition, the Administration strongly opposes the restriction in section 809(b) of the bill on the use of both Federal and local funds for regulatory or legislative activity pertaining to recreational use of marijuana, which was approved by D.C. voters. The Administration urges the Congress to adopt the provisions in the FY 2017 Budget request that limit the abortion and recreational marijuana restrictions to Federal funds.

D.C. Syringe Services Program. The Administration strongly opposes the restriction in the bill on the use of Federal funds for the District's syringe services program. This is contrary to current law, which prohibits the use of Federal funds for syringe services programs only in locations where local authorities determine such programs to be inappropriate.

D.C. Education Funding. The Administration strongly opposes the \$20 million funding level in the bill for the Tuition Assistance Grant Program (TAG), which is \$20 million below the FY 2017 Budget request level. TAG provides grants of up to \$10,000 per year to District residents to cover the difference between in-State and out-of-State tuition at public colleges and universities and helps to make college affordable for many low-income District residents. In addition, the Administration opposes the \$30 million funding level in the bill for D.C. public schools, which is \$10 million below the FY 2017 Budget request, and the Administration strongly opposes the additional \$12 million the bill provides for the Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP), a private school voucher program. The Administration appreciates the bill's support for evaluation and administration of OSP and will continue to use available OSP funds to support students returning to the program until they complete school, but strongly opposes additional funding for more vouchers. The Administration remains focused on improving the quality of public schools for all children rather than supporting a handful of students in private schools.

D.C. Water and Sewer Authority. The Administration opposes the bill's lack of funding for D.C. Water and urges the Congress to provide the \$14 million included in the FY 2017 Budget request for ongoing work on the combined sewer overflow project.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Here we are again, Mr. Speaker, for the third time, talking about a rule to consider a bill that is going nowhere. We are doing this at a time when a vast majority of our constituents want us to do something about preventing more gun violence in this country. Mass shootings have become unacceptably commonplace in the United States of America, and we have a responsibility to do more to keep guns out of the wrong hands. The shooting in Orlando was the largest mass shooting in our country's history. This is a moment of truth, and we cannot have another moment of silence without some action.

We are pleading with the Speaker of the House, and we are pleading with our Republican colleagues to allow us to bring two bipartisan bills to the floor for consideration so that we can debate them and vote on them. One is the no fly, no buy legislation. If you are too dangerous to fly on an airplane because you are on the terrorist watch

list, according to the FBI, then you are too dangerous to buy a gun. It shouldn't be controversial. The second is to eliminate the loopholes in our background check system, which says that you have to go through a background check if you go to a licensed gun dealer but that you can get around that by going to a gun show or by buying a gun online.

Overwhelming numbers of Democrats and Republicans, according to the latest public opinion polls, think both of these ideas are smart, commonsense approaches. The only thing that is standing in the way is the Republican leadership in this House.

Mr. Speaker, please schedule these bills for a vote. No, we will not be satisfied with the NRA bill that you want to bring to the floor this week that, basically, is nothing but a press release but will not keep guns out of the hands of people who are suspected of being terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can reach some sort of accommodation with our Republican friends. We are not going away. This issue is too important, and it is about time we acted. Silence and indifference can no longer be tolerated in this Chamber.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up no fly, no buy. It is bipartisan legislation that will give the Attorney General the authority to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those who are on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate what it is we are trying to do by defeating the previous question and bringing up commonsense, pro-Second Amendment, gun violence prevention legislation.

We don't think that terrorists, criminals, or the dangerously mentally ill should have easy access to firearms. We believe that we should do everything possible to make sure that terrorists, criminals, and the dangerously mentally ill can't get their hands on firearms. That is why it is so important to pass the no fly, no buy and to pass the background check legislation.

We know that background checks work. Every day, 170 felons are prevented from buying a gun because of the background check, and 50 domestic abusers are prevented from buying a gun because of the background check. That is every day. The bill that we are talking about expands the background checks to include all commercial sales.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts just explained, there are loopholes. In some States, you can go online and buy a gun without having a background check. In some States, you can go to a gun show and buy a gun without having a background check. That is absolute foolishness.

Now, we are not talking about requiring family members to do background checks. We are not talking about requiring your next-door neighbor to do a background check. We are not talking about requiring your hunting buddy or your shooting buddy to get a background check.

We are talking about gun sales through commercial sales—gun shows, newspaper ads, online sales—because we know it works. It is our first line of defense against the criminals, terrorists, and the dangerously mentally ill from being able to easily access firearms.

It was once explained that the Federal Government set up a system to screen these folks to make sure that the criminals, the terrorists, the domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill didn't get firearms. What they said is, if you buy it from a licensed dealer, you have to have a background check, but if you buy it from a gun show or if you buy it online, you don't have to have one.

The juxtaposition has been made that this is a lot like setting up a screening system after 9/11 that says that all passengers have to go through a metal detector so they don't bring guns, knives, and explosives on the airplane, but only 60 percent of you have to do that. The other 40 percent can go around—you can get on the airplane with whatever you have in your pocket. Then you choose which one goes in the 40 percent line and which one goes in the 60 percent line.

It doesn't make sense. We need to have background checks to make sure that criminals, that the dangerously mentally ill, that domestic abusers, and that terrorists don't get their hands on weapons.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that our friends on the other side of the aisle want criminals, terrorists, and the dangerously mentally ill to have easy access to firearms. As a matter of fact, there was an amendment on this floor that beefed up the funding for the system that checks on the background checks, and 76 Republicans voted to increase the funding by \$20 million—a \$20 million funding augmentation to the NICS system. Now you are telling us, "Well, we supported the funding, but we don't want people to use the system." That is an out-and-out waste of taxpayer money.

Not bringing these bills up is an out-and-out shameless ordeal on the part of the leadership. You need to bring these

bills to the floor. We need to have a vote. We need to do everything we can to make sure our constituents are safe—safe in places of worship, safe in the movie theater, safe in school. We need to make sure that we do all we can to keep our constituents safe. Bring it up for a vote.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, people who are watching may wonder: What are these folks talking about? They are talking about a rule. What is this about? If you just tuned in, I will tell you what it is about.

One hundred thousand Americans have died from guns in the last 3½ years, and this body—this House of Representatives, this U.S. House of Representatives, the people's House—has done nothing, nothing at all, not one little thing. The time has long passed for marking the deaths of Americans by guns when we could help to prevent them. The time has passed for moments of silence. We need to take action, and the action needs to be now because, while we wait, Americans die.

What makes the news are the mass shootings. Sadly, they are becoming more horrific. Every single day, Americans are dying in small towns, in big cities. They are dying in bedrooms, dying in domestic violence arguments, dying on the streets of Hartford and Chicago. It often doesn't even make the news, but, believe me, those families know their loved ones are gone. Their friends know—their friends at church, those in the neighborhood.

It is in the ripple of those deaths that we could do something that has us here—that has us here all day, that had us here all night 2 weeks ago. We will keep raising our voices because the American people depend on us to not just talk but to take action, and that is within our power.

□ 1715

Ninety-three percent of the American people support background checks. Ninety-three percent. That is more probably than like chocolate ice cream. We can do this. More than that support, keeping guns out the hands of terrorists, there is nothing controversial about these proposals.

It seems to have become an article of faith that, if the gun lobby is opposed to it, that it is too dangerous for politicians to act.

I will tell you what is too dangerous. It is too dangerous to our constituents for us not to act. It is too dangerous for them to have this institution not listen to their cries, to their weeping, to their pleading.

It is time for us to be strong, to be resolute. And whether it is the gun lobby or whatever it is that keeps you from protecting American lives with passing bipartisan commonsense legis-

lation, it is time to let go of those fears because the fears of the American people depend on us relieving them, and we can only do that by taking action. We are the body that is elected to do that. And the States are trying, but they can't get the job done without our help.

It is up to us to do what our sworn duty is to do, to protect and defend the American people. We can't defend them from all harms, but we can do our job with this.

Background checks work. They save lives. They save uniform police officers. They save folks in domestic violence situations. It is time for us to do our job.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule and to speak about a critical issue. We must stop the senseless gun violence in this country.

Last Wednesday, at my SpeakOut to stop gun violence, a courageous young man stood up to tell his story. Josh Stepakoff here was the victim of a mass shooting when he was 6 years old and miraculously survived it. He was finishing a game at his home away from home, the North Valley Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles. He assumed that the strange man in front of him was a construction worker and that what he held at his hip was a power drill.

How could he know that this man was a neo-Nazi carrying a semiautomatic weapon and hundreds of rounds of ammunition intent on killing as many people as he could?

Two of those bullets hit Josh, barely missing his spine and vital organs. The physical and mental damage changed Josh's life forever, and now he and his mother have devoted their lives to stopping gun violence.

The NRA is saying that the way to keep people safe is by making more guns available to everybody. If this is the solution, the U.S. would be the safest place in the world. Instead, we face danger from guns everywhere, even movie theaters, elementary schools, and churches.

Enough is enough. We must pass commonsense gun violence prevention laws now. Now is the time to pass no fly, no buy and the comprehensive background check bills.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to the rule, to this flawed financial services bill, but that is not why I have risen to speak.

I have risen to speak today because the American people are crying out. They are crying out for a vote on legislation that makes a real impact on the

epidemic of gun violence in our country.

Last week, in my district, Stratford, Connecticut, I stood in front of the Victoria Soto School, demanding commonsense gun violence legislation.

When the gunman began firing at Sandy Hook Elementary, Vicki Soto hid her students in the closet. She died protecting them. The AR-15 was on the floor by her body. She was a hero. She committed her time, her effort, and her life to protecting and caring for children.

The school is a fitting tribute to Vicki and her life's work. There, children can be children. But it is also a stark reminder of the real and heart-breaking cost of gun violence, and it is a visible reminder of what is at stake and why we need comprehensive gun violence legislation now.

We must take action for Victoria, for the Soto family. I watch how her parents suffer and her siblings suffer every single day, but we need to do that for the Soto family and for every family like them who know grief most of us will never understand.

We must now act for the families in Aurora, the families in Newtown, the families in San Bernardino, the families in Orlando, and the families of those who are killed every single day on the streets of every city in this Nation.

You know, we cannot heal the hole in their heart, but what we can do is what we have been charged to do in this institution, and that is to vote on public policy that makes a difference in the lives of the people that we have sworn to serve to uphold their rights.

That is why I urge commonsense gun legislation; universal background checks; and no fly, no buy. Let's keep guns out of the hands of terrorists.

I would go further. I would ban assault weapons. I want to see gun violence prevention research done. I want to see the mental health services that we need additionally to protect people in this Nation from gun violence. But I think that what we can conclude is that not one more death.

While moments of silence are good things to do, we cannot just have one more moment of silence. The American people deserve real, concrete gun violence prevention legislation. That is what our job is to do. We can do it. That is what we have been elected to do.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), my colleague.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is an African proverb that says: "When you pray, move your feet."

But this Congress meets our gun violence crisis with only deadly silence. Forty-nine people massacred on a dance floor, silence. First graders and their teachers shot in their elementary

school, silence. Students and professors shot in their college classrooms, silence. Parishioners shot after Bible study in their church, silence. Social workers and disabled clients shot at a holiday party, silence. Moviegoers shot watching a film, silence. Our colleague shot while meeting with constituents, silence. Neighborhood sidewalks and parks transformed into blood-soaked memorials, silence.

Over the past 12 years, gun violence has claimed more American lives than war, AIDS, and illegal drug overdoses combined. Since Newtown, tens of thousands of lives have been lost to this deadly crisis.

Yet the number of bills that have been debated and passed by this Congress to help prevent such deaths, to put an end, to start to slow this violence: zero.

Inaction is a choice. Inaction is costing lives, and that is why I am asking this House to have a vote that we perform our basic responsibilities as Members of Congress and members of our communities. Let's debate and vote on two commonsense measures to curb gun violence. Let's vote on expanding background checks and preventing suspected terrorists from being able to buy a gun.

Why is this so paralyzing? It is widely supported by the American people. Why is the only proposal scheduled for a vote drafted by the NRA?

Does House leadership really believe that our Constitution and liberties are so fragile that we have to tolerate carnage like we saw in Orlando rather than risk a vote?

These proposals are widely supported by people of all types of political ideologies. The American people get it. They understand we could protect our constitutional rights and take reasoned steps to reduce gun violence.

Moments of silence should be where the action begins. Sadly, in this Congress, it is the only action ever taken.

No more silence. I urge us to bring up these two practical proposals for a vote. Our communities and our democracy deserve that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago, something extraordinary happened on this House floor. Members violated the rules, and they sat in.

Some folks asked me the question: "Peter, why did you do that? Why did you join in that?"

I had to think hard about it because it is not something that should be done in anything close to normal circumstances.

The reason was that, since Newtown, when there have been one mass shooting after another—San Bernardino; Orlando the most recent—Congress has responded with a moment of silence followed by complete and utter inaction.

Congress is not doing its job. The issue of what gun legislation we should pass is debatable.

Why won't we debate it? Why won't Congress face the fact that the job of Congress is to come up with policies that are going to provide protection to American citizens from this gun violence?

There is legislation out there. Two things that are very sensible: if you are on a terrorist watch list, you can't buy a gun; if you are subject to a background check, you can't evade it by all the loopholes. We should debate those. And then those of our citizens who disagree with us, they can vote against us or they can vote for us.

What we have no right to do is to fail to do our job, so I joined with other Members of Congress sitting here basically saying: Let's debate, let's discuss, but let's act. Let's not run the other way in cowardly disrespect of our responsibilities in the expectation that our citizens who sent us here rightly have that we address the issue of gun violence and be held accountable by them for at least making an effort, honestly, to do the job they have given us to do.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in strong opposition to the rule, but I would like to speak to the two pieces of legislation that we are imploring our colleagues to bring to the floor: the no fly, no buy and universal background checks.

Since the House adjourned on June 23, at least 522 more Americans have been killed in incidents of gun violence just since we adjourned; men, women, children, sons, daughters, fathers, and mothers. We dishonor the lives of those we have lost to gun violence with this NRA-written bill that we are taking up this week rather than the two commonsense gun safety proposals pending before the Congress.

Just in case anyone doesn't understand, we have a gun violence epidemic in this country, different from every other country in the world. We kill each other with guns at a rate 297 times higher than Japan, 49 times higher than France, and 33 times higher than Israel, just to give you an example.

So far this year, more than 6,300 people have been killed and more than 13,000 wounded in incidents of gun violence, and that includes 1,600 children. On average, 31 Americans are murdered with guns every single day and 151 are treated for gun assaults in an emergency room.

This issue of making sure terrorists or suspected terrorists don't have access to guns and making sure there are universal background checks is not controversial anywhere else in America except in Congress. It is widely supported by the American people, 85 and

90 percent. These are commonsense proposals to keep guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them.

Behind each of the numbers I just mentioned, each of those statistics, are real families who have been crushed and heartbroken by gun violence. Let's do the right thing. Bring these bills to the floor, debate them, make your arguments, and take a vote.

□ 1730

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we lose over 30,000 people a year to gun violence. We must never forget that that number is made up of thousands of individual stories: a family grieving over the death of a child, a teenager missing a friend at school, a son who must get used to spending holidays every year without a parent.

One of my constituents in Sacramento lost her cousin and her cousin's son to gun violence right before Christmas. She wrote to me and said, "I would like to see a world where such crime is minimized . . . if not erased. Gun control is an important and essential step in the path toward non-violence."

We must listen to these stories that have become all too common. Just over the weekend, another person in my community was shot and killed. Every moment we don't act matters. Must we feel vulnerable in our churches, sending our children to theaters or to the schools?

We are not going to accept this bloodshed any longer. We must disarm the hate and vote on real solutions for the American people. Democrats are calling for a vote on two pieces of bipartisan, commonsense legislation. We must not wait any longer to answer the call for action.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule, but I also want to join my colleagues in urging the Speaker to bring forward a vote on these two commonsense gun reforms.

I took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution and to protect my constituents. And while we were home over the holiday recess, going to parades and celebrating our independence and celebrating our history, time after time I spoke with constituents from all different backgrounds. I am from a rural district. Hunting is important to us. People hunt for their food. They want to protect their family. I respect the Second Amendment, and I respect their right.

But the question that I got is people do not understand why we cannot have a debate in this hallowed Hall about

protecting our constituents. People watched as an entire community was massacred simply going out to dance and enjoy the evening. The American people watched as children died in schools, as one of our colleagues was shot in a shopping center, as people died in a church. We should be able to go to Bible study; we should be able to go to the movies; we should be able to go to the shopping centers; and certainly, our children should be able to go to school.

My constituents, Mr. Speaker, who are gun owners, who care about protecting their families and their homes, who care about their right to enjoy hunting with their families, my constituents are asking, Mr. Speaker: Please bring these two commonsense issues to the floor so that we can protect our families.

When someone has taken an oath of allegiance to ISIS and has evil intent in their heart, help us to protect our constituents.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the rule—the underlying bill is terribly flawed—but I also urge my colleagues to work with us to try to bring two commonsense pieces of legislation to the floor. The first is the no fly, no buy legislation. If you are on a terrorist watch list and you are too dangerous to fly, then you ought to be too dangerous to buy a gun.

Just so my colleagues understand this, according to the Government Accountability Office, since 2004, nearly 2,500 suspects on the FBI terrorist watch list have successfully purchased weapons in the United States. Ninety-one percent of all suspected terrorists who attempted to purchase guns in the last 12 years walked away with the weapon that they wanted. That should trouble every single person in this Chamber.

The other piece of legislation is to strengthen our background checks so we get rid of these loopholes so that everybody who wants to buy a gun goes through a background check; they can't escape going through a background check by going to a gun show or buying a gun online.

That is it. That is all we are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, we had 9 people murdered in Charleston, 12 in Aurora, 14 in San Bernardino, 26 in Sandy Hook, and 49 innocent people murdered in Orlando. Maybe the numbers are getting too big for some of my colleagues to fully comprehend how horrendous this all is. Sometimes I feel that with all these numbers that some of us are losing the human ability to feel what is happening here. These people had families. These people's lives were cut short for no good reason.

We can do something about it. The legislation that we have proposed here

is not going to solve everything, but if it could save one life, then it is worth it. But inaction and indifference and silence can no longer be tolerated. We will not have business as usual in this House until we address some of these issues.

The American people want us to do this. They are waiting for us. Please, Mr. Speaker, schedule these pieces of legislation for debate and vote. No, we are not going to be satisfied with the NRA bill that will come up to the floor under a closed rule that you want us to take. That is just unacceptable. Give us a vote on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can have that vote.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind Members that today's rule provides for the consideration of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2017. This is an important piece of legislation to fund the Federal Government. I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and bill. The rule and bill are assaults on the District of Columbia's right to govern itself. This bill contains three undemocratic, harmful, big-government riders that prohibit the D.C. government from spending its local funds, consisting of local taxes and fees, as it deems necessary. In addition, the Republican-led Rules Committee has allowed Representative GARY PALMER to offer an amendment to block D.C. from spending its local funds to enforce a local employment non-discrimination law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act.

The bill repeals D.C.'s budget autonomy referendum, which allows D.C. to spend its local funds after a 30-day congressional review period. Astonishingly, House Republicans appear to be so afraid of a local jurisdiction spending its local funds without the approval of a federal body, the U.S. Congress, that they will be voting for a second time in a little over a month to repeal the referendum. I will offer an amendment to strike the repeal of the referendum.

However, the Rules Committee prevented me from offering my amendments to strike the provisions in this bill that prohibit D.C. from spending its local funds on taxing and regulating marijuana sales and on abortion services for low-income women.

Four states have legalized the possession of marijuana for recreational use, and they either have set up a tax and regulatory system or are in the process of doing so. While recreational use is legal under D.C. law, Congress has uniquely prohibited D.C. from spending its local funds to set up a tax and regulatory system.

This rider has been referred to as the Drug Dealer Protection Act. As one marijuana dealer told the press, the rider is "a license for me to print money." Regulating marijuana like alcohol would allow D.C., instead of violent drug gangs, to control marijuana production, distribution, sales and revenue collection.

Every state has authority to spend its own funds on abortion services for low-income

women, and 17 states fund these services. This rider effectively prevents low-income women in D.C. from exercising their constitutional right to abortion by depriving them of necessary funds.

Remarkably, this bill could have been even more harmful to the District of Columbia. Three amendments were filed to block D.C. gun safety laws, but they were not made in order. There was no way the Republican leadership could bring these deadly amendments to the floor so soon after Orlando. Representative Thomas Massie filed two amendments. One would have allowed handguns, shotguns and rifles to be carried, openly or concealed, on the streets of the nation's capital. The other would have blocked D.C. from enforcing its enhanced penalties for carrying a gun in schools and other places where children congregate. Representative DAVID SCHWEIKERT filed an amendment that would have allowed people to get a concealed carry permit without demonstrating a "good cause" for needing one.

These amendments presented a threat not only to D.C. residents, but also to the millions who visit the nation's capital and the high-ranking federal officials and foreign dignitaries who travel around the city daily.

Republicans claim to support devolving federal authority to state and local governments. That support should not end at the D.C. border. The Constitution allows, but does not require, Congress to legislate on local D.C. matters. The Rules Committee had a choice to allow me to offer my amendments on the floor to strike the D.C. marijuana and abortion riders, as well as to block the Palmer amendment. In our American democracy in the 21st century, that choice should not have been difficult.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 794 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 8. 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. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

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 30, 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 30, 2016 at 3:01 p.m.:

That the Senate relative to the death of Pat Summitt S. Res. 516.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PATIENT ACCESS TO DURABLE
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5210) to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5210

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 "Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016" or the "PADME Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASING OVERSIGHT OF TERMINATION OF MEDICAID PROVIDERS.

(a) INCREASED OVERSIGHT AND REPORTING.—(1) STATE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1902(kk) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(kk)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

“(8) PROVIDER TERMINATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on July 1, 2018, in the case of a notification under subsection (a)(41) with respect to a termination for a reason specified in section 455.101 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on November 1, 2015) or for any other reason specified by the Secretary, of the participation of a provider of services or any other person under the State plan (or under a waiver of the plan), the State, not later than 21 business days after the effective date of such termination, submits to the Secretary with respect to any such provider or person, as appropriate—

“(i) the name of such provider or person;

“(ii) the provider type of such provider or person;

“(iii) the specialty of such provider’s or person’s practice;

“(iv) the date of birth, Social Security number, national provider identifier, Federal taxpayer identification number, and the State license or certification number of such provider or person;

“(v) the reason for the termination;

“(vi) a copy of the notice of termination sent to the provider or person;

“(vii) the date on which such termination is effective, as specified in the notice; and

“(viii) any other information required by the Secretary.

“(B) EFFECTIVE DATE DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘effective date’ means, with respect to a termination described in subparagraph (A), the later of—

“(i) the date on which such termination is effective, as specified in the notice of such termination; or

“(ii) the date on which all appeal rights applicable to such termination have been exhausted or the timeline for any such appeal has expired.”.

(2) CONTRACT REQUIREMENT FOR MANAGED CARE ENTITIES.—Section 1932(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–2(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) CONTRACT REQUIREMENT FOR MANAGED CARE ENTITIES.—With respect to any contract with a managed care entity under section 1903(m) or 1905(t)(3) (as applicable), no later than July 1, 2018, such contract shall include a provision that providers of services or persons terminated (as described in section 1902(kk)(8)) from participation under this title, title XVIII, or title XXI be terminated from participating under this title as a provider in any network of such entity that serves individuals eligible to receive medical assistance under this title.”.

(3) TERMINATION NOTIFICATION DATABASE.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) TERMINATION NOTIFICATION DATABASE.—In the case of a provider of services or any other person whose participation under this title, title XVIII, or title XXI is terminated (as described in subsection (kk)(8)), the Secretary shall, not later than 21 business days after the date on which the Secretary terminates such participation under title XVIII or is notified of such termination under subsection (a)(41) (as applicable), review such termination and, if the Secretary determines appropriate, include such termination in any database or similar system developed pursuant to section 6401(b)(2) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc note; Public Law 111–148).”.

(4) NO FEDERAL FUNDS FOR ITEMS AND SERVICES FURNISHED BY TERMINATED PROVIDERS.—Section 1903 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b) is amended—

(A) in subsection (i)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) beginning not later than July 1, 2018, under the plan by any provider of services or person whose participation in the State plan is terminated (as described in section 1902(kk)(8)) after the date that is 60 days after the date on which such termination is included in the database or other system under section 1902(11); or”; and

(B) in subsection (m), by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) No payment shall be made under this title to a State with respect to expenditures incurred by the State for payment for services provided by a managed care entity (as defined under section 1932(a)(1)) under the State plan under this title (or under a waiver of the plan) unless the State—

“(A) beginning on July 1, 2018, has a contract with such entity that complies with the requirement specified in section 1932(d)(5); and

“(B) beginning on January 1, 2018, complies with the requirement specified in section 1932(d)(6)(A).”.

(5) DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM TERMINOLOGY FOR REASONS FOR PROVIDER TERMINATION.—Not later than July 1, 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in consultation with the heads of State agencies administering State Medicaid plans (or waivers of such plans), issue regulations establishing uniform terminology to be used with respect to specifying reasons under subparagraph (A)(v) of paragraph (8) of section 1902(kk) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(kk)), as amended by paragraph (1), for the termination (as described in such paragraph) of the participation of certain providers in the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act or the Children’s Health Insurance Program under title XXI of such Act.

(6) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1902(a)(41) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(41)) is amended by striking “provide that whenever” and inserting “provide, in accordance with subsection (kk)(8) (as applicable), that whenever”.

(b) INCREASING AVAILABILITY OF MEDICAID PROVIDER INFORMATION.—

(1) FFS PROVIDER ENROLLMENT.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (77) the following new paragraph:

“(78) provide that, not later than January 1, 2017, in the case of a State plan (or a waiver of the plan) that provides medical assistance on a fee-for-service basis, the State shall require each provider furnishing items and services to individuals eligible to receive medical assistance under such plan to enroll with the State agency and provide to the State agency the provider’s identifying information, including the name, specialty, date of birth, Social Security number, national provider identifier, Federal taxpayer identification number, and the State license or certification number of the provider.”.

(2) MANAGED CARE PROVIDER ENROLLMENT.—Section 1932(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–2(d)), as amended by subsection (a)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) ENROLLMENT OF PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than January 1, 2018, a State shall require that, in order to participate as a provider in the network of a managed care entity that provides services to, or orders, prescribes, refers, or certifies eligibility for services for, individuals who are eligible for medical as-

sistance under the State plan under this title (or under a waiver of the plan) and who are enrolled with the entity, the provider is enrolled with the State agency administering the State plan under this title (or waiver of the plan). Such enrollment shall include providing to the State agency the provider’s identifying information, including the name, specialty, date of birth, Social Security number, national provider identifier, Federal taxpayer identification number, and the State license or certification number of the provider.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed as requiring a provider described in such subparagraph to provide services to individuals who are not enrolled with a managed care entity under this title.”.

(c) COORDINATION WITH CHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2107(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397gg(e)(1)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), (M), (N), and (O) as subparagraphs (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (M), (N), (O), (P), (Q), and (R), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) Section 1902(a)(39) (relating to termination of participation of certain providers).

“(C) Section 1902(a)(78) (relating to enrollment of providers participating in State plans providing medical assistance on a fee-for-service basis).”;

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (K) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)) the following new subparagraph:

“(L) Section 1903(m)(3) (relating to limitation on payment with respect to managed care).”; and

(D) in subparagraph (P) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)), by striking “(a)(2)(C) and (h)” and inserting “(a)(2)(C) (relating to Indian enrollment), (d)(5) (relating to contract requirement for managed care entities), (d)(6) (relating to enrollment of providers participating with a managed care entity), and (h) (relating to special rules with respect to Indian enrollees, Indian health care providers, and Indian managed care entities)”.

(2) EXCLUDING FROM MEDICAID PROVIDERS EXCLUDED FROM CHIP.—Section 1902(a)(39) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(39)) is amended by striking “title XVIII or any other State plan under this title” and inserting “title XVIII, any other State plan under this title (or waiver of the plan), or any State child health plan under title XXI (or waiver of the plan)”.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as changing or limiting the appeal rights of providers or the process for appeals of States under the Social Security Act.

(e) OIG REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2020, the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the amendments made by this section. Such report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the extent to which providers who are included under subsection (1) of section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) (as added by subsection (a)(3)) in the database or similar system referred to in such subsection are terminated (as described in subsection (kk)(8) of such section, as added by subsection (a)(1)) from participation in all State plans under title XIX of such Act (or waivers of such plans).

(2) Information on the amount of Federal financial participation paid to States under section 1903 of such Act in violation of the

limitation on such payment specified in subsections (1)(2)(D) and (m)(3) of such section, as added by subsection (a)(4) of this section.

(3) An assessment of the extent to which contracts with managed care entities under title XIX of such Act comply with the requirement specified in section 1932(d)(5) of such Act, as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section.

(4) An assessment of the extent to which providers have been enrolled under section 1902(a)(78) or 1932(d)(6)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(78), 1396u-2(d)(6)(A)) with State agencies administering State plans under title XIX of such Act (or waivers of such plans).

SEC. 3. REQUIRING PUBLICATION OF FEE-FOR-SERVICE PROVIDER DIRECTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (80), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (81), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (81) the following new paragraph:

“(82) provide that, not later than January 1, 2017, in the case of a State plan (or waiver of the plan) that provides medical assistance on a fee-for-service basis or through a primary care case-management system described in section 1915(b)(1) (other than a primary care case management entity (as defined by the Secretary)), the State shall publish (and update on at least an annual basis) on the public Website of the State agency administering the State plan, a directory of the physicians described in subsection (mm) and, at State option, other providers described in such subsection that—

“(A) includes—

“(i) with respect to each such physician or provider—

“(I) the name of the physician or provider;

“(II) the specialty of the physician or provider;

“(III) the address at which the physician or provider provides services; and

“(IV) the telephone number of the physician or provider; and

“(ii) with respect to any such physician or provider participating in such a primary care case-management system, information regarding—

“(I) whether the physician or provider is accepting as new patients individuals who receive medical assistance under this title; and

“(II) the physician’s or provider’s cultural and linguistic capabilities, including the languages spoken by the physician or provider or by the skilled medical interpreter providing interpretation services at the physician’s or provider’s office; and

“(B) may include, at State option, with respect to each such physician or provider—

“(i) the Internet website of such physician or provider; or

“(ii) whether the physician or provider is accepting as new patients individuals who receive medical assistance under this title.”.

(b) DIRECTORY PHYSICIAN OR PROVIDER DESCRIBED.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a), as amended by section 2(a)(3), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(mm) DIRECTORY PHYSICIAN OR PROVIDER DESCRIBED.—A physician or provider described in this subsection is—

“(1) in the case of a physician or provider of a provider type for which the State agency, as a condition on receiving payment for items and services furnished by the physician or provider to individuals eligible to receive medical assistance under the State plan, requires the enrollment of the physi-

cian or provider with the State agency, a physician or a provider that—

“(A) is enrolled with the agency as of the date on which the directory is published or updated (as applicable) under subsection (a)(82); and

“(B) received payment under the State plan in the 12-month period preceding such date; and

“(2) in the case of a physician or provider of a provider type for which the State agency does not require such enrollment, a physician or provider that received payment under the State plan (or waiver of the plan) in the 12-month period preceding the date on which the directory is published or updated (as applicable) under subsection (a)(82).”.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to apply in the case of a State (as defined for purposes of title XIX of the Social Security Act) in which all the individuals enrolled in the State plan under such title (or under a waiver of such plan), other than individuals described in paragraph (2), are enrolled with a medicaid managed care organization (as defined in section 1903(m)(1)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(m)(1)(A))), including prepaid inpatient health plans and prepaid ambulatory health plans (as defined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services).

(2) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this paragraph is an individual who is an Indian (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1603)) or an Alaska Native.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR STATE LEGISLATION.—In the case of a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation in order for the respective plan to meet one or more additional requirements imposed by amendments made by this section, the respective plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet such an additional requirement before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session shall be considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF THE TRANSITION TO NEW PAYMENT RATES FOR DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall extend the transition period described in clause (i) of section 414.210(g)(9) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, from June 30, 2016, to September 30, 2016 (with the full implementation described in clause (ii) of such section applying to items and services furnished with dates of service on or after October 1, 2016).

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study that examines the impact of applicable payment adjustments upon—

(i) the number of suppliers of durable medical equipment that, on a date that is not before January 1, 2016, and not later than September 1, 2016, ceased to conduct business as such suppliers; and

(ii) the availability of durable medical equipment, during the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on September 1, 2016, to individuals entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or enrolled under part B of such title.

(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the following definitions apply:

(i) SUPPLIER; DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.—The terms “supplier” and “durable medical equipment” have the meanings given such terms by section 1861 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x).

(ii) APPLICABLE PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT.—The term “applicable payment adjustment” means a payment adjustment described in section 414.210(g) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, that is phased in by paragraph (9)(i) of such section. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a payment adjustment that is phased in pursuant to the extension under subsection (a) shall be considered a payment adjustment that is phased in by such paragraph (9)(i).

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, not later than September 10, 2016, submit to the Committees on Ways and Means and on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, a report on the findings of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 5. EXCLUSION OF PAYMENTS FROM STATE EUGENICS COMPENSATION PROGRAMS FROM CONSIDERATION IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR, OR THE AMOUNT OF, FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments made under a State eugenics compensation program shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for, or the amount of, any Federal public benefit.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFIT.—The term “Federal public benefit” means—

(A) any grant, contract, loan, professional license, or commercial license provided by an agency of the United States or by appropriated funds of the United States; and

(B) any retirement, welfare, health, disability, public or assisted housing, postsecondary education, food assistance, unemployment benefit, or any other similar benefit for which payments or assistance are provided to an individual, household, or family eligibility unit by an agency of the United States or by appropriated funds of the United States.

(2) STATE EUGENICS COMPENSATION PROGRAM.—The term “State eugenics compensation program” means a program established by State law that is intended to compensate individuals who were sterilized under the authority of the State.

SEC. 6. DEPOSIT OF SAVINGS INTO MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$0” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill, including an exchange of letters between the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan bill before us accomplishes several important objectives. Since 2003, the durable medical equipment, DME, competitive bidding program has required DME suppliers in certain large, densely populated areas to compete for contracts to serve Medicare beneficiaries in those areas. This market-based competition has saved the Medicare program and beneficiaries billions of dollars in savings and reduced cost sharing.

Since 2009, CMS has had the authority to expand the program to additional areas, and in 2014 the agency published a final rule that will expand competitive bidding to all areas of the country. Beginning January 1, 2016, CMS began phasing in new regional reimbursement rates for noncompetitive bid areas using a 50-50 blend of old and new rates. Starting July 1, rates will be based on the new calculations.

To ensure we have a full appreciation of the impact of the phase-in, the bill continues the 50-50 blend payment for an additional 3 months. It also requires HHS to report to Congress on any access issues caused by the blended rate before the full rate change can go into effect.

The bill also improves access to quality healthcare providers for vulnerable Medicaid patients and includes legislation that recently passed the House 406-0.

In this legislation, we again reiterate the House's support to address two important issues that plague Medicaid beneficiaries: first, State Medicaid programs too often suffer from waste, fraud, and abuse; and, second, too many Medicaid patients may have a hard time finding a doctor.

The bill would ensure healthcare providers terminated from Medicare or one State's Medicaid program for reasons of fraud, integrity, or quality are also terminated from other State Medicaid programs. The Office of Inspector General at HHS has previously found that 12 percent of terminated providers were participating in a State Medicaid program after the same provider was terminated from another State Medicaid program. It is critical that fraudulent providers are not allowed to defraud taxpayers or harm patients across the board.

The bill also requires State Medicaid programs to provide beneficiaries served under fee-for-service or primary care case management programs an electronic directory of physicians participating in the program. This important effort will address a critical challenge of Medicaid patients in accessing certain types of care, such as obtaining specialty care or dental care. Medicaid patients would now have better information by simply applying requirements similar to those in place for Medicaid-managed care plans to fee-for-service and/or primary care case management programs.

Finally, the bill includes legislation by Mr. McHENRY and Mr. BUTTERFIELD that ensures that payments made under a State eugenics compensation program cannot be considered as income in determining eligibility for any Federal public benefit. Simply put, the bill prevents any funds from such a compensation program to be counted as income for purposes of receiving any Federal benefits.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 5210, as amended, would be completely offset over the budget window. We will provide more time to understand the impact of DME payment changes on Medicare beneficiaries. We will also enact common-sense reforms that help protect Medicaid beneficiaries, improve access to care, and enact an important clarification for those eligible for certain State compensation programs.

I want to thank Ranking Member PALLONE and his staff as well as the Committee on Ways and Means for their work on this compromise, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5210, as amended.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2016.

The Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I am writing concerning H.R. 5210, the "Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016," on which the Committee on Ways and Means was granted an additional referral.

In order to allow H.R. 5210 to move expeditiously to the House floor, I agree to waive formal consideration of this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration on H.R. 5210 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2016.

The Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5210, the "Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016," on which the Committee on Ways and Means was granted an additional referral.

I appreciate your agreeing to waive formal consideration of H.R. 5210 in order to allow the bill to move expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that by foregoing consideration on H.R. 5210 at this time, the Committee on Ways and Means does not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward. I also agree that the Committee reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and I will support any such request.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

I thank my colleague, Mr. PITTS. It is a pleasure to be working with him and with Mr. PALLONE and Mr. UPTON.

This legislation, as Mr. PITTS indicated, is going to give some relief to communities, particularly rural communities, from the imposition of changes in how charges are made in competitive bidding processes that have a significant potential to make inaccessible durable medical equipment.

I was a cosponsor, but the lead sponsor is here, Dr. PRICE, a good colleague and a really good doctor. Dr. PRICE, Legislator PRICE, came up with a pretty good bill that is going to help Georgia but also help rural Vermont, so I appreciate that.

□ 1745

The bottom line, the DME Competitive Bidding Program was created in 2003. It was aimed at a goal all of us have. It was trying to lower spending on durable medical equipment. It was well-intended, but it has had some serious consequences, especially for rural providers, like in Vermont, and I am sure parts of Georgia and other rural parts of the country.

By the way, when we do something, it can have a good intention, it can even accomplish some of its goals, but I think it always makes sense for us on both sides to step back after there is some history—this went in in 2003—and take a look, kick the tires. What are some of the improvements that we can make so that we get back to the original intention and don't do harm that is unnecessary? And that is what the Price legislation is doing.

In January 2016, the Competitive Bidding Program began its nationwide rollout. That was under the new CMS guidelines. As a result, the rural areas saw significant cuts. It really does jeopardize access to this important equipment for beneficiaries.

The CMS continued its rollout in July with a second round of cuts. It further slashed reimbursement rates for DME across rural America, including Vermont.

In Vermont, we have an excellent equipment provider, Yankee Medical, that is reasonable in its price and incredibly good in its service. It will

bring equipment to people all across rural Vermont. That is such a benefit for folks who can't get out of their homes.

The rural areas do have different challenges than urban areas. It is much more challenging for stakeholders to absorb these cuts. For instance, a small business in rural Vermont in a noncompetitively bid area may not have a large amount of Medicare-related businesses and, therefore, might not be able to afford the prices that a business in a much larger populated area could offer.

So this legislation is going to put on hold for 3 months what these prices will be. It is going to allow time for some adjustment and, hopefully, for us to consider other positive reforms that will be helpful to maintaining access to important healthcare equipment for folks in rural Vermont and rural America.

The bill contains a couple of other provisions, one of which I will speak about. My colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. BUCSHON, was the lead sponsor and I was his co-sponsor. As a way to pay for this—and that was cracking down on this Medicare fraud, where there has been a failure administratively—when a provider is found to be fraudulent in one district, that fraud is not then communicated to all other districts or States, so that fraudulent provider tries to just take their operation elsewhere. This is going to require that notification and it is going to shut down that fraud much more quickly, saving money, and then helping us to pay for this.

So this is practical legislation, the result of a compromise by the chairman and ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. PITTS, and some of my colleagues. Mr. LOEBACK of Iowa played a very, very active role in this legislation. Of course, Dr. PRICE did as well.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the distinguished Budget Committee chairman.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his work on this and his interest and passion for healthcare issues and the work that we do in this House. I also want to thank the gentleman from Vermont for his kind words and the work he has done on this; and the gentleman from Iowa as well, who has been instrumental in moving this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, many Medicare beneficiaries rely on a set of healthcare products and services that are classified as durable medical equipment, or DME. DME is often life-improving or lifesaving; things like blood sugar monitors, canes, crutches, hospital beds, power wheelchairs, and even things like oxygen supplies and tanks. Without access to these items, many

Medicare beneficiaries would not be able to survive or would see their quality of life greatly diminished.

In January 2016, Medicare started to slash reimbursement rates for these products and services as part of a nationwide rollout of their Competitive Bidding Program.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this program is neither competitive nor is it a real bidding process. CMS now wants to extend these substandard rates and this substandard program to other areas, as you have heard, including rural regions of our Nation, where these new rates will oftentimes not even cover the cost of the delivery of the item or the service, which means they just won't happen.

In addition, this CMS program has failed to hold bidders to account. It has failed to produce rates that are financially sustainable for those who are trying to provide these service and items to patients.

The National Minority Quality Forum has data that demonstrates this program is driving up costs through avoidable hospital bills and inpatient admissions, increasing out-of-pocket payments by patients, and has led to increased mortality rates. Mr. Speaker, that is more people dying in our Nation because of this program.

In just my home State of Georgia, there has been a 20 percent decrease in the number of DME suppliers between 2013 and 2016. The number of medical equipment supply stores in our State has similarly decreased by nearly 40 percent.

The legislation we have before us today, H.R. 5210, would provide a 3-month delay in the cuts, hopefully allowing for work to be done to come up with a real solution.

This legislation represents a bipartisan commitment to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries continue receiving critical care provided through durable medical equipment, particularly those living in the rural areas of our Nation who would be disproportionately harmed by cuts in reimbursements.

Again, this delay will, hopefully, provide policymakers additional time to come up with a consensus on a long-term solution. Every effort must be made to protect access to quality health care for seniors.

I want to thank, again, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work on this issue. I want to, once again, commend Chairman PITTS for his work on this issue.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bipartisan bill, H.R. 5210.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a delay in the expansion of the competitive bidding program. Competitive bidding for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) has saved the Medicare program billions of dollars. And lowering costs for the Medicare program means lower copayments for Medicare beneficiaries.

Over the years, it has been widely documented by the HHS Office of Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office that Medicare payments for DMEPOS far exceeded reasonable costs. This is why Congress passed legislation requiring competitive bidding for DMEPOS incrementally. Since 2011, CMS has closely monitored all beneficiaries in the competitive bidding areas, and there have been no access concerns. Health outcomes are steady compared to before Medicare began the competitive bidding program. CMS will continue to monitor health outcomes, and until we see any concerns, I do not believe we should stop the progress in saving money for both beneficiaries and the Medicare program.

That said, the Medicaid policies in this legislation were passed by the House in March of this year, 406-0, after consideration by the House Energy and Commerce Committee. The first policy, the Medicaid DOC Act, is an initiative first introduced by Reps. COLLINS and TONKO and would require states that participate in fee-for-service Medicaid to publish electronic provider directories. It's important for patients to know what providers participate in the Medicaid program. States are required to provide electronic directories in managed care, but the same requirement does not exist across the full Medicaid program. The Committee worked throughout the legislative process to streamline this policy with current federal provider directory regulations in Medicaid managed care. The legislation details the minimum items that must be included in a provider directory, but also allows states to go beyond these standards.

The second policy is an initiative first introduced by Reps. BUCSHON, WELCH, and BUTTERFIELD and would provide CMS with critical tools to keep patients safe, protect taxpayer dollars, and protect the integrity of the Medicaid program. The ACA included a provision that prohibited disqualified providers from Medicare or one state Medicaid program from simply crossing state lines and receiving payments in another state Medicaid program. Unfortunately, as drafted, the law has been hard to implement, because states don't have a consistent or standardized way of knowing when a specific provider has been terminated by Medicare or another state. States are not currently required to report this information, and if it is reported, it is in many differing formats, limiting the data's usability. This provision would require all states to report information on fraudulent providers to the Secretary for inclusion in a currently existing termination database that is accessible to all states. The legislation also requires the Secretary to develop uniform criteria for states to use when submitting information. I supported both of these commonsense policies in the past, and I continue to support them today.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5210, the Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act, delays the implementation of recent changes to durable medical equipment payments.

For the past several years, Medicare has been reforming how we pay for DME, including items like oxygen tanks, walkers, or hospital beds.

In much of the country, CMS uses competitive bidding to determine how much DME costs. But in some communities, primarily in rural areas, CMS pays under the DME fee

schedule. Under this payment system, there is no competitive market to drive prices down.

Nonpartisan, independent experts, including MedPAC and the Government Accountability Office, have warned us that Medicare is overpaying for DME through the fee schedule.

To address this problem, CMS has been phasing in new payments that will reduce DME costs under the fee schedule based on competitive bidding pricing. These lower payments are scheduled to be fully phased in by July.

Getting DME costs under control is critical. Higher prices result in increased Medicare spending and, even more importantly, they force beneficiaries to pay more out of pocket.

At the same time, some DME suppliers and beneficiary groups have expressed concerns that lowering the price for DME too far could hinder beneficiary access to important equipment.

To address this issue, the bill before us provides a compromise that will institute a temporary delay of the lower DME fee schedule payments for three months. This pause will allow us to gather more data on how the new payment rates impact beneficiary access.

That being said, it's not entirely clear that this delay is necessary. CMS has already been carefully monitoring access to DME. Just this month, the agency released data showing that payment cuts have not caused any harm to suppliers or to beneficiaries.

Even as we have significantly reduced spending, suppliers continue to accept the reformed payment rates, and there is no evidence that beneficiary access to high quality DME has been hindered.

This bill will give us three more months to verify that this is the case. This is only a short-term freeze, and if the evidence continues to show that the new payment rates are working, there will be no reason for us to delay any longer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5210, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING AMERICA'S INNOVATORS ACT OF 2016

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4854) to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4854

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 "Supporting America's Innovators Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. INVESTOR LIMITATION FOR QUALIFYING VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.

Section 3(c)(1) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "one hundred persons" the following: "(or, with respect to a qualifying venture capital fund, 250 persons)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) The term 'qualifying venture capital fund' means any venture capital fund (as defined pursuant to section 203(1)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(1)(1)) with no more than \$10,000,000 in invested capital, as such dollar amount is annually adjusted by the Commission to reflect the change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4854, Supporting America's Innovators Act of 2016; and I want to thank the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that 7 years after our last recession apparently ended, our economy continues to trudge along at historically weak rates of growth and job creation.

Three points: The most recent jobs report showed that only 38,000 jobs were created during the month of May. That was the worst report since 2010;

New business startups in the country are near a 20-year low;

And, finally, American families and small businesses are finding it extremely difficult to obtain credit in order to expand their businesses or purchase a home.

More than ever, Mr. Speaker, Americans are looking at us, their elected Representatives in Congress, to help get our economy back on track and create opportunities for people that have struggled for too long.

Fortunately, over the last 5 years, the Financial Services Committee has stepped up to the plate and passed a number of bipartisan pieces of legislation. Most notably, in 2012, Congress passed the JOBS Act, which is one of the few bright spots. In April, the Capital Markets and GSE Subcommittee held a hearing to examine the positive impacts that the JOBS Act has had, and to consider further ways that we can work across the aisle to promote

job growth. But for just about every measure the JOBS Act has been a resounding success, there is more that Congress can be doing.

So today, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a couple of measures that will build upon the success of the JOBS Act. The first is this one. This measure is Supporting America's Innovation Act of 2016.

What will the bill do?

First, it would fix what is known as the 99 investor problem. That is, under current securities law, once a venture capital fund gains more than 99 investors, it would have to become registered with the SEC under the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Just in case there is any confusion, registering with the SEC isn't free. It creates a number of costs and regulatory burdens on small venture funds that hinder the ability to deploy vital capital for startup businesses.

What is more, the current investor cap was put in place way back in 1940, at a time when nobody had ever heard of Silicon Valley, and venture capital did not play anywhere near the role it does today.

So while the JOBS Act raised the registration threshold for private companies from 500 to 2,000 investors, it did not concurrently raise the threshold for investors acting as a coordinated group.

As Kevin Laws, COO of AngelList, told our subcommittee back in April:

With online fundraising and general solicitation becoming more common because of the JOBS Act, companies are bumping up against the limit more frequently. The limit of 99 investors now acts as a brake on the amount of capital that they can raise.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the solution envisioned under this legislation is simple. It simply bumps the number from 100 to 250, and it clarifies that registration would not be triggered until the fund crossed a threshold of \$10 million invested in a particular company.

This legislation is simple. It is straightforward. It would allow venture capital funds to continue to play the important role they do in our economy without any of the burden having to deal with any unnecessary regulation.

So, once again, I thank the sponsor of the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this bill, H.R. 4854, is an example of how the two sides can work together. I worked with Mr. MCHENRY on this legislation. It just goes to show that when the opposite side of the aisle is not focused on trying to destroy and undo Dodd-Frank, we can get to doing some credible legislation.

So I am very, very pleased about this legislation. It is another piece of legislation intended to help our Nation's

startups and the venture capitalists who take a chance on them by providing a targeted exemption for certain venture capital funds.

It is also a piece of legislation that appropriately balances the ability of a startup to raise capital with the need to protect investors in the startup. When we fail to strike this balance, investors suffer, small businesses suffer; and when taken to the extreme, our entire economy can suffer.

During consideration of this bill in committee, Mr. MCHENRY and I offered an amendment to create a new exemption for qualifying venture capital funds that have no more than 250 investors and only \$10 million in invested capital. These smaller funds will allow angel investor groups to better pool their resources among more accredited investors to make targeted, high-impact investments in the very companies they create the most jobs: startups.

This structure is used today by AngelList, a company that matches investors meeting certain income and asset thresholds to pool their money into a special purpose fund and invest together in startup companies.

□ 1800

Importantly, both the companies and the investors benefit from this structure, compared with making hundreds of smaller direct investments. A company, for example, only has a single point of contact, the angel fund advised by fiduciary, rather than hundreds of investors who all must individually approve corporate actions such as acquisitions and expanding ownership.

Investors also like this structure because they can delegate monitoring the startups they invest in to the investment adviser to fund. Such monitoring may be significant, considering that investors typically diversify among 30 to 80 companies.

H.R. 4854, as amended, is appropriately tailored to only certain venture capital funds, which must invest at least 80 percent of their committed capital in the equity of small companies. Under the bill, those funds must have no more than 250 investors and no more than \$10 million in this invested capital, ensuring that they are small enough that investors are able to monitor and manage their investments with the funds.

This language ensures that we aren't creating a loophole for other investment companies, like mutual funds, to avoid regulation, nor are we providing relief to other private funds, like hedge funds or private equity funds, that have very little restrictions and investor protections.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation of Mr. MCHENRY's efforts to make changes to this bill addressing some of the concerns of investor advocates, like the Consumer Federation of America and Americans for Financial Reform. His efforts have made this a good bill that deserves our support.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee, and I rise today to support the Supporting America's Innovators Act.

Mr. Speaker, these days, American small businesses are facing a capital crisis. This is particularly true for early-stage companies and startups.

Despite the headlines from Silicon Valley, the truth is that the vast majority of early-stage companies are not securing venture capital funding. Indeed, almost 80 percent of startup investment goes to just three States in these United States.

Meanwhile, angel investing for these early-stage companies is challenging. Investing in startup companies is inherently risky, which is why the wealthy investors who qualify to become angels often shy away from it.

This is why we need to address the challenges facing angel investing. This is accomplished by changing our mindset and creating a regulatory framework that encourages innovation and growth, while ensuring that shareholder and investor protections remain strong.

Ranking Member WATERS and I proposed an amendment that would increase the cap of investors from 100 to 250 for accredited investors of angel funds, and this would only apply to qualifying venture funds narrowly tailored to early-stage investing.

What we have before us in the full House is a great work of compromise, and I thank the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for her diligent work, working with my staff and her staff together over many long hours to come up with this compromise that we have that will, I believe, garner bipartisan support like it did in the Financial Services Committee. I do thank the ranking member for working diligently to make this outcome possible.

The result of our proposed amendment and what we have before us allows for early-stage companies to raise the capital they need by opening up angel investing to more accredited investors.

This is a good bill. It is a compromise bill, and I am pleased that this legislation enjoyed wide support. I urge my colleagues to support it and vote for it, and let's get this thing done and signed by the President.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker and Members, again, I am very pleased to join with Mr. MCHENRY on this legislation. I really have no further requests for time, and I am going to yield back the balance of my time because I am so looking forward to getting back to the discussion that we are going to have later on this evening on guns and gun violence.

I want my constituents to know I have not abandoned that issue. Others have not abandoned that issue. We look forward to really debating whether or not we are going to make sure that people who are on the no-fly list certainly can't buy guns, and we want universal background checks. I know this has nothing to do with this bill, but I will just take this opportunity to say that.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because of the economic importance of what we are doing. We are trying to help grow the economy, create jobs across this country in a more fruitful way than just in pockets of prosperity across this country. In areas that are like my district in rural western North Carolina or the ranking member's district that is an urban district, we want to have prosperity in all 50 States, in all communities, and the economic opportunities that our constituents are desirous of, and I urge the adoption of this bill to help expand economic opportunity.

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

Again, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the bipartisan nature of what we are doing here on the floor this evening with this legislation and the two pieces of legislation that follow. It shows the American public that this House, when we work together across the aisle and focus our attention on these important economic issues, can get things done.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4854, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FIX CROWDFUNDING ACT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4855) to amend provisions in the securities laws relating to regulation crowdfunding to raise the dollar amount limit and to clarify certain requirements and exclusions for funding portals established by such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4855

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 “Fix Crowdfunding Act”.

SEC. 2. CROWDFUNDING VEHICLES.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.—The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 4A(f)(3), by inserting “by any of paragraphs (1) through (14) of” before “section 3(c)”;

(2) in section 4(a)(6)(B), by inserting after “any investor” the following: “, other than a crowdfunding vehicle (as defined in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940).”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(55) The term ‘crowdfunding vehicle’ means a company—

“(A) whose purpose (as set forth in its organizational documents) is limited to acquiring, holding, and disposing securities issued by a single company in one or more transactions and made pursuant to section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933;

“(B) which issues only one class of securities;

“(C) which receives no compensation in connection with such acquisition, holding, or disposition of securities;

“(D) no associated person of which receives any compensation in connection with such acquisition, holding or disposition of securities unless such person is acting as or on behalf of an investment adviser registered under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 or registered as an investment adviser in the State in which the investment adviser maintains its principal office and place of business;

“(E) the securities of which have been issued in a transaction made pursuant to section 4(a)(6) of the Securities Act of 1933, where both the crowdfunding vehicle and the company whose securities it holds are co-issuers;

“(F) which is current in its ongoing disclosure obligations under Rule 202 of Regulation Crowdfunding (17 C.F.R. 227.202);

“(G) the company whose securities it holds is current in its ongoing disclosure obligations under Rule 202 of Regulation Crowdfunding (17 C.F.R. 227.202); and

“(H) is advised by an investment adviser registered under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 or registered as an investment adviser in the State in which the investment adviser maintains its principal office and place of business.”; and

(2) in section 3(c), by adding at the end the following:

“(15) Any crowdfunding vehicle.”.

SEC. 3. CROWDFUNDING EXEMPTION FROM REGISTRATION.

Section 12(g)(6) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l(g)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Commission” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”;

(2) by striking “section 4(6)” and inserting “section 4(a)(6)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) TREATMENT OF SECURITIES ISSUED BY CERTAIN ISSUERS.—An exemption under subparagraph (A) shall be unconditional for securities offered by an issuer that had a public float of less than \$75,000,000 as of the last business day of the issuer’s most recently completed semiannual period, computed by

multiplying the aggregate worldwide number of shares of the issuer’s common equity securities held by non-affiliates by the price at which such securities were last sold (or the average bid and asked prices of such securities) in the principal market for such securities or, in the event the result of such public float calculation is zero, had annual revenues of less than \$50,000,000 as of the issuer’s most recently completed fiscal year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and enter in extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4855. This is the Fix Crowdfunding Act. Once again, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY), the sponsor of the bill, which also passed the Financial Services Committee in June with a vote of 57–2.

Let’s get into it, Mr. Speaker.

Title III of the JOBS Act, known as the crowdfunding title, is one of the most promising provisions of that law, and so, by opening the door for equity crowdfunding to literally millions of Americans, people who want to invest in companies that they believe in, title III has the potential to further democratize our capital markets, and doing so will create opportunities for Main Street to generate wealth.

Unfortunately, in part due to provisions added by the Senate during conference negotiations and in part due to problems with the SEC’s implementation of title III, equity crowdfunding in the United States may never reach its full potential.

As SEC Commissioner Mike Piwowar noted in his dissent to the SEC’s rules that came out last year, he said: “The rules will spin a complex web of provisions and requirements for compliance . . . Such burdens will spook many small businesses from pursuing crowdfunding as a viable path to raising capital.”

Fortunately, once again, the Financial Services Committee has stepped up to the plate to address these problems; and fortunately, we have Mr. McHENRY here, who has put forward his Crowdfunding Act to fix it.

The Fix Crowdfunding Act would address some of these issues, and it does so in two important ways. First, the bill would enable special purpose vehicles, as defined by the bill, to be considered an authorized investor in crowdfunding offerings.

What does this mean?

Well, this means a group of investors can basically come together and pool the resources and then invest alongside some more sophisticated investors in these new, growing startup businesses.

As I tell you this, it is important to note that, under current regulations, unless you are, well, extremely wealthy, you are typically prohibited from investing in private businesses here in the United States.

Secondly, Mr. McHENRY’s Fix Crowdfunding Act increases the amount that a company can raise through this mechanism of crowdfunding before it has to go and register with the SEC.

So while these things may be just technical fixes to a complicated set of security laws, at the end of the day, what they will do is break down what we say is historical barriers that prevented startup companies and businesses from connecting with literally millions of Americans and investors across the country.

So the Fix Crowdfunding Act that we are seeing here today will address many of the problems that currently exist with the crowdfunding regulations.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and also my colleagues on the Financial Service Committee for their support.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from North Carolina for his efforts to work with me to craft this bipartisan legislation. H.R. 4855 is an example of how Congress can assist startups to finance their operations while still protecting the investors who entrust their hard-earned funds to those companies.

Equity crowdfunding, through which startup companies sell stock to hundreds or even thousands of everyday people, has been and will always be a high-risk, high-reward investment.

The sad reality is that most new businesses fail. As a result, Congress and the Securities and Exchange Commission have put in place guardrails to prevent less-sophisticated investors from suffering financial ruin.

In 2012, Congress cautiously approached equity crowdfunding by creating a number of investor protections in the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, or JOBS Act. The SEC followed our directions and finalized a crowdfunding rule that protects investors by setting reasonable investment limits based on income and provides helpful disclosures for investors to weigh the risk. Last month, those rules went live, with hundreds of businesses successfully raising capital that, in turn, funds American jobs.

H.R. 4855, as amended in committee, seeks to enhance the investor and company experience in crowdfunding. The bill would authorize crowdfunding portals to pool investors together in order

to make a joint investment in a business. These vehicles would only make investments in one company and would be advised by a registered investment adviser with a fiduciary duty to the fund. Importantly, the investors would have the same rights to sue the company as if they had directly invested in the company itself.

This provision will also aid companies as they will be able to more efficiently make financial decisions, provided that the investment adviser agrees that they are in the best interest of the fund's investors.

H.R. 4855 also clarifies that as long as a crowdfunding company continues to make ongoing disclosures to investors required under the SEC's rules, it would not have to make the more detailed public reports until it had either a \$75 million value or \$50 million in revenue. This change is consistent with the levels set under Regulation A, another exempt offering sold to retail investors.

I am pleased that the amended bill no longer includes problematic provisions that were opposed by advocates like the Consumer Federation of America. Instead, the bill is now crafted to make target improvements to crowdfunding for all investors and startups.

□ 1815

Now, although crowdfunding should be viewed as a highly risky investment, especially for retail investors, both of the changes in H.R. 4855 will ensure a longer choice of high-quality crowdfunding companies and a higher degree of finance savvy for investors.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I had reservations about crowdfunding. I had real concerns, but I am very pleased that I was able to work with Mr. MCHENRY, and he was so very cooperative in dealing with those concerns that made me feel even better about crowdfunding than I had been feeling. So I am just so hopeful that this works and it works well, and that even though there is some risk involved in this, that we have the opportunity for people who want to take a little risk to go out there and to be able to organize the kind of funding that perhaps can make them reap substantial profits in a real credible way.

So I want to thank, again, Mr. MCHENRY for his cooperation and for the work and the time that he has put into this.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina was able to bring about that hope and change to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take this moment to not only thank the subcommittee chair, but thank the ranking member and Congressman MCHENRY for their bipar-

tisan work on this bill and bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that many—too many—communities are still trying to pull themselves up after the past 8 years of economic stagnation. Some have succeeded, but the current system has left millions of people behind with a long road of recovery left to go.

Now, the House is not blind to it, and we recognize, like so many others, that an anticompetitive state is depriving us of our ability to prosper. That is why we started the Innovation Initiative and why this bill is so important.

Four years ago, Congress came together to pass the JOBS Act, a bill that provided small businesses and entrepreneurs more ways to raise capital investment.

Now, this wasn't a banker's bill. It was a bill that opened the door for members of our communities to invest in ideas that could create good-paying jobs, provide goods and services, and increase the quality of life for the American people in their community.

After all, it is small businesses that have created two-thirds of all net new jobs since the 1970s. But while small businesses remain the cornerstone of our economy, the Federal Government has made it harder and harder to start one.

The entry of new businesses in the United States has declined by nearly 44 percent since the late 1970s. Starting a business has been especially hard in recent years. The policies today, after 7½ years under President Obama, are not a roadmap for those looking for a better way.

The JOBS Act was a good start to creating a more dynamic economy. But it was never followed through after the bill's initial success. These bills today are targeted fixes to restore the original spirit of the JOBS Act: to harness innovation and bring together millions of Americans with potential new businesses through crowdfunding.

These new businesses could become the next Apple or Under Armour. They could revitalize the most downtrodden communities who were hardest hit by the recession and faced the slowest recovery.

Now, a couple of weeks ago, I was in Baltimore visiting a cybersecurity startup. The work they do to protect cyber networks is growing more important by the day. By engaging with the changing world—using the power of innovation to improve our security—this startup also lifted up a community and helped it to thrive.

Today, ZeroFOX has ushered in a new era for their southern Baltimore community. That community is part of the future helping our country become a better place.

This is the power of the innovation economy. This is what we are voting to support. This is how America has a better and brighter future.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am sure there are those who wonder why we on the opposite side of the aisle work so hard to pay attention to our constituents as it relates to investment and why we work so hard to pay attention to our consumers. I will tell you why.

Everyone recognizes what happened in 2008 in this country. We literally had a meltdown. We went into a recession—almost a depression. Why did we do that?

We went into a recession and almost a depression because our regulatory agencies were not paying attention and people were being taken advantage of. We had a very difficult time trying to explain to the people of this country why we had so many foreclosures, why people were losing their homes, and why communities were so displaced.

But we recognized that our regulatory agencies who had the responsibility for oversight and who had the responsibility for making sure people weren't taken advantage of just had not been doing their jobs. I want you to know that with Dodd-Frank reforms, we have gone a long way to correct that. In addition to looking at our markets and looking at Wall Street, we created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that is doing a magnificent job in looking out for our consumers and making sure that what happened that led up to the 2008 meltdown does not happen again in America.

So I am very pleased that the Obama administration in the last 75 months has had consecutive job growth. It looks as if it is about 14.5 million private-sector jobs. Of course, when Mr. Obama took over, we know that about 800 jobs per month were being lost. So we don't take our job lightly, and we don't play with this.

We want to make sure that there is capital available for startups because we support business and we absolutely support small business. We want to make sure they have access to capital. But what we don't want is we don't want, then, to be tricked or fooled or to be led into so-called opportunities that are really not opportunities at all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, I will say that I agree with the gentlewoman that prior to 2008 and the crisis, the regulators were not doing their jobs. They were not monitoring as they were supposed to be. So true to form to the Washington way of dealing with things at that time, this administration was able to pass through a 2,000-page Democratic-inspired and -crafted piece of legislation called the Dodd-Frank legislation—2,000 pages and 400 regulations. It did as Washington normally does: give those failed regulators raises, more authority, and bigger and fancier buildings.

What was the result of that?

Well, some jobs were created since 2008. We have had one of the slowest recoveries on record. As I said before, the most recent jobs report showed that only 38,000 jobs out of 300-plus million people in this country—think about that—were created during the month of May. That was the worst jobs record since 2010. New business startups in this country are at a 20-year low. Think about that if you are waiting to get a new job from a new business—a 20-year low.

So because of that, because Dodd-Frank did not fix the problem, because those 2,000 pages and those more highly paid bureaucrats in Washington didn't solve the problem, American families and small businesses are finding it extremely difficult to find credit to expand their businesses and to hire more people.

So thank goodness we have this legislation here today and the work by the gentleman from North Carolina not only on this bill, but the previous bill that he was able to accomplish in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) to explain the bill in more detail.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fix Crowdfunding Act.

Mr. Speaker, these days, small businesses are struggling to find the financing investment that they need to start up and to grow. That affects jobs. It certainly does.

Recently in my district, we have read reports that smaller counties in America, which used to lead the Nation in the growth of new businesses, now have actually lost more businesses than they have created.

The reason why the ranking member and I are actually able to work together on an important piece of legislation like this in a very logjammed discussion point about appropriate regulation—a lot of stuff gets locked up in partisan debate—what unites our conversation is a rural issue and an urban issue, and it is about capital deserts in America.

Now, everybody talks about food deserts. If you think about this, if you are not close to a grocery store, then you can't get fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, and you can't get foodstuffs for your family.

But we have capital deserts in America. Capital deserts are about those areas that are not Boston, Austin, and Silicon Valley. It is the rest of America that is struggling to get the capital they need so they can start a business, so they can grow a business.

I am not talking about the next Google or Facebook—maybe it is. I am talking about a lawn service. I am talking about a coffee shop. I am talk-

ing about a baker who wants to sell her goods on a wider scale so that she can provide for her family. Those are the concerns that are real and that we can address in a real way before Congress today—tonight—in this vote.

Investment crowdfunding is one way we can reverse this disturbing trend. What this bill does is allow us to expand what you are able to do through investment crowdfunding.

Five years ago in the JOBS Act, we had a revolutionary change to the way we allowed individuals to invest a little bit of money in their fellow men. It allowed men or women in local communities to invest in a local coffee shop. You didn't have to be a wealthy investor to get these great opportunities. You could be the average, everyday investor like me or like many of my constituents.

But in the JOBS Act and in the investment crowdfunding part of that bill that I wrote 5 years ago, out of that, the Securities and Exchange Commission wrote four regulations, and they created a couple of major challenges as a result of that. One is the 12(g) problem. Let me explain this.

What the 12(g) problem is is that, in essence, you are subjecting very low fundraising to very expensive regulatory disclosures. That is a problem. It is a problem because it is costly. It is economically costly and restricts economic opportunity. We fixed that in the Fix Crowdfunding Act.

Another significant problem for crowdfunding is that under SEC rules, single-purpose funds are not permitted. Let me explain this. Single-purpose funds are like this: you have somebody who has a fiduciary responsibility, meaning that I am going to look out for your best interests on this investment and we are able to create a fund in order to pool those resources, that investor acumen, if you will, and work together with them. So it allows unsophisticated people to get sophisticated advice if we allow special purpose vehicles.

So these two very important provisions, understood at a very simple level, if we fix these things we will provide more economic opportunity, we will have better investor advice, and we will be able to expand and make real the utility of crowdfunding.

The essence of this is that we believe in the capacity of individual Americans to make decisions for themselves and to take a little bit of risk for themselves. It is a powerful thing. It is a powerful, meaningful step forward.

Now, it doesn't solve the greater debate that we are having here in Washington on so many challenging issues of policy where perhaps the left and the right don't see eye to eye. But on this, we came together and we were able to create a small opening of economic opportunity and try to get those resources out into the community. It is a meaningful step forward.

I thank the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee. I thank

Ranking Member WATERS for her active engagement on this. She helped improve our original bill that came through the Financial Services Committee 5 years ago, and she has helped work through this compromise before us on the House floor tonight.

□ 1830

While we may not agree on so many other issues of policy, we have worked together on two substantive areas of policy here in recent weeks. I think that is a hopeful sign. I think it is a positive sign.

What we are doing here today will expand that opportunity for millions of Americans to have that little bit of investment that they would like to make in their fellow man and their fellow woman to create new jobs to provide new economic opportunity.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask and encourage your support for the Fix Crowdfunding Act, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am so pleased that the gentleman from New Jersey recognized that the regulatory agencies were not doing their job. We don't agree on much, but he did indicate just a moment ago that he agreed that the regulatory agencies had not protected consumers or our small business people—or anybody—and that is why we ended up with the Dodd-Frank reform. We may disagree about Dodd-Frank reform, but I think with that recognition I am sure he would logically conclude that something had to be done, and so I am very pleased about that.

Let me just say to Mr. MCHENRY again, I want to thank him for the work that he has done and the leadership that he has provided. He is absolutely correct, whether it is in the cities or in urban areas, we need to have access to capital for our small businesses and our start-ups. In addition, he has led the way for us to make investing and venture capital, et cetera, more accessible. I think we still have more work to do.

One of the things we are going to have to take a very close look at is why our bigger banks and financial institutions are not investing in these communities and why they are not welcoming small businesses in to the banks and to these financial institutions and listen to their dreams and their ideas about businesses and provide the capital for that.

Again, I am very pleased about what he has done, his leadership, and the work that we are doing.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this very important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4855, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4361, FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS SAFEGUARDS ACT OF 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-666) on the resolution (H. Res. 803) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4361) to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security of Federal information systems, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 796;

Adopting House Resolution 796, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 793;

Adopting House Resolution 793, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 794;

Adopting House Resolution 794, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4854 and H.R. 4855.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4768, SEPARATION OF POWERS RESTORATION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 796) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4768) to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regu-

latory provisions; providing for proceedings during the period from June 23, 2016, through July 4, 2016; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 168, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—168

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

NOT VOTING—33

Adams	DeGette	Marino
Black	Duckworth	Nadler
Brown (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Nugent
Buchanan	Fincher	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Grijalva	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Gutiérrez	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Harper	Rush
Clawson (FL)	Hastings	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Hudson	Takai
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Westmoreland
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Young (AK)

□ 1855

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. CLEAVER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas 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 230, noes 168, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—230

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

NOES—168

Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Ashford	Bustos	Cleaver
Bass	Capps	Clyburn
Beatty	Capuano	Cohen
Becerra	Cárdenas	Connolly
Bera	Carney	Conyers
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Costa
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Boyle, Brendan F.	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Brady (PA)	Cicilline	Cummings
	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny

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

NOT VOTING—35

Adams	Duckworth	Nugent
Black	Ellmers (NC)	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Fincher	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Grijalva	Rooney (FL)
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Rush
Byrne	Harper	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter (TX)	Hastings	Takai
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Tsongas
Clay	Kaptur	Westmoreland
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Whitfield
DeFazio	Marino	Young (AK)
DeGette	Nadler	

□ 1902

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1270, RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 793) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 168, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—231

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

NAYS—168

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

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—169

Aguilar Cárdenas Courtney
 Ashford Carney Crowley
 Bass Carson (IN) Cuellar
 Beatty Cartwright Cummings
 Becerra Castor (FL) Davis, Danny
 Bera Castro (TX) Delaney
 Beyer Chu, Judy DeLauro
 Bishop (GA) DelBene DeSaulnier
 Blumenauer Clark (MA) Deutch
 Bonamici Clarke (NY) Dingell
 Boyle, Brendan Cleaver Doggett
 F. Clyburn
 Brady (PA) Cohen Doyle, Michael
 Brownley (CA) Connolly F.
 Bustos Conyers Edwards
 Capps Cooper Ellison
 Capuano Costa Engel

Eshoo Lipinski Ruiz
 Esty Loeb sack Ruppertsberger
 Farr Lofgren Ryan (OH)
 Foster Lowenthal Sanchez, Linda
 Frankel (FL) Lowey T.
 Fudge Lujan Grisham Sarbanes
 Gabbard (NM) Schakowsky
 Gallego Luján, Ben Ray Schiff
 Garamendi (NM) Schrader
 Graham Lynch Scott (VA)
 Grayson Maloney, Scott, David
 Green, Al Carolyn Serrano
 Green, Gene Maloney, Sean Sewell (AL)
 Hahn Matsui Sherman
 Heck (WA) McCollum Sinema
 Higgins McDermott Sires
 Himes McGovern Slaughtner
 Hinojosa McNeerney Smith (WA)
 Honda Meeks Speier
 Hoyer Meng Swalwell (CA)
 Huffman Moore Takano
 Israel Moulton Thompson (CA)
 Jackson Lee Murphy (FL) Thompson (MS)
 Jeffries Napolitano Titus
 Johnson (GA) Neal Tonko
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan Torres
 Jones Norcross Tsongas
 Keating O'Rourke Van Hollen
 Kelly (IL) Pallone Vargas
 Kennedy Pascrell Veasey
 Kilmer Payne Pelosi Vela
 Kind Perlmutter Velázquez
 Kuster Peters Visclosky
 Langevin Pingree Walz
 Larsen (WA) Pocan Wasserman
 Larson (CT) Polis Schultz
 Lawrence Quigley Waters, Maxine
 Lee Rangel Watson Coleman
 Levin Rice (NY) Welch
 Lewis Richmond Wilson (FL)
 Lieu, Ted Roybal-Allard Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—35

Adams Duckworth Nugent
 Black Ellmers (NC) Price (NC)
 Brown (FL) Fincher Rohrabacher
 Buchanan Grijalva Rooney (FL)
 Butterfield Gutiérrez Rush
 Byrne Harper Sanchez, Loretta
 Carter (TX) Hastings Takai
 Clawson (FL) Hudson Walker
 Clay Kaptur Westmoreland
 Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick Whitfield
 DeFazio Marino Young (AK)
 DeGette Nadler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

□ 1920

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

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 will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 172, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—227

Abraham Bishop (MI) Brooks (IN)
 Aderholt Bishop (UT) Buck
 Allen Blackburn Buehler
 Amodei Blum Burgess
 Babin Bost Calvert
 Barletta Boustany Carter (GA)
 Barr Brady (TX) Chabot
 Barton Brat Chaffetz
 Benishek Bridenstine Coffman
 Bilirakis Brooks (AL) Cole

Collins (GA) Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
 Collins (NY) Jenkins (WV) Reed
 Comstock Johnson (OH) Reichert
 Conaway Johnson, Sam Renacci
 Cook Jolly Ribble
 Costello (PA) Jordan Rice (SC)
 Cramer Joyce Rigell
 Crawford Katko Roby
 Crenshaw Kelly (MS) Roe (TN)
 Culberson Kelly (PA) Rogers (AL)
 Curbelo (FL) King (IA) Rogers (KY)
 Davidson King (NY) Rokita
 Davis, Rodney Kinzinger (IL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Denham Kline Roskam
 Dent Knight Ross
 DeSantis Labrador Rothfus
 DesJarlais LaHood Rouzer
 Diaz-Balart LaMalfa Royce
 Dold Lamborn Russell
 Donovan Lance Salmon
 Duffy Latta Sanford
 Duncan (SC) LoBiondo Scalise
 Duncan (TN) Long Schweikert
 Emmer (MN) Loudermilk Scott, Austin
 Farenthold Love Sensenbrenner
 Fitzpatrick Lucas Sessions
 Fleischmann Luetkemeyer Shimkus
 Fleming Lummis Shuster
 Flores MacArthur Simpson
 Forbes Marchant Smith (MO)
 Fortenberry McCarthy Smith (NE)
 Foxx McCaul Smith (NJ)
 Franks (AZ) McClintock Smith (TX)
 Frelinghuysen McHenry Stefanik
 Garrett McKinley Stewart
 Gibbs McMorris Stevens
 Gibson Rodgers Stutzman
 Gohmert McSally Thompson (PA)
 Goodlatte Meadows Thornberry
 Gosar Meehan Tiberi
 Gowdy Messer Tipton
 Granger Mica Trott
 Graves (GA) Miller (FL) Turner
 Graves (LA) Miller (MI) Upton
 Graves (MO) Moolenaar Valadao
 Griffith Mooney (WV) Wagner
 Grothman Mullin Walberg
 Guinta Mulvaney Walden
 Guthrie Murphy (PA) Walker
 Hanna Neugebauer Walorski
 Hardy Newhouse Walters, Mimi
 Harris Noem Weber (TX)
 Hartzler Nunes Webster (FL)
 Heck (NV) Olson Wenstrup
 Hensarling Palazzo Westerman
 Herrera Beutler Palmer Williams
 Hice, Jody B. Paulsen Wilson (SC)
 Hill Pearce Wittman
 Holding Perry Womack
 Huelskamp Pittenger Woodall
 Huizenga (MI) Pitts Yoder
 Hultgren Poe (TX) Yoho
 Hunter Poliquin Young (IA)
 Hurd (TX) Pompeo Young (IN)
 Hurt (VA) Posey Zeldin
 Issa Price, Tom Zinke

NOES—172

Aguilar Connolly Grayson
 Amash Conyers Green, Al
 Ashford Cooper Green, Gene
 Bass Costa Hahn
 Beatty Courtney Heck (WA)
 Becerra Crowley Higgins
 Bera Cuellar Himes
 Beyer Cummings Hinojosa
 Bishop (GA) Davis, Danny Honda
 Blumenauer Delaney Hoyer
 Bonamici DeLauro Huffman
 Boyle, Brendan DelBene Israel
 F. DeSaulnier Jackson Lee
 Brady (PA) Deuth Jeffries
 Brownley (CA) Dingell Johnson (GA)
 Bustos Doggett Johnson, E. B.
 Capps Doyle, Michael Jones
 Capuano F. Keating
 Cárdenas Edwards Kelly (IL)
 Carney Ellison Kennedy
 Carson (IN) Engel Kildee
 Cartwright Eshoo Kilmer
 Castor (FL) Esty Kind
 Castro (TX) Farr Kuster
 Chu, Judy Foster Langevin
 Cicilline Clark (MA) Larsen (WA)
 Clarke (NY) Gabbard Larson (CT)
 Cleaver Gohmert Lawrence
 Clyburn Garamendi Lee
 Cohen Graham Lewis

Lieu, Ted	O'Rourke	Sherman	Blum	Garrett	Lummis	Schiff	Stutzman	Walker
Lipinski	Pallone	Sinema	Blumenauer	Gibbs	MacArthur	Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Walorski
Loebback	Pascarell	Sires	Bonamici	Gibson	Maloney,	Schweikert	Takano	Walters, Mimi
Lofgren	Payne	Slaughter	Bost	Gohmert	Carolyn	Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Boustany	Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Scott, Austin	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Lowey	Perlmutter	Speier	Boyle, Brendan	Gosar	Marchant	Scott, David	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Lujan Grisham	Peters	Swalwell (CA)	F.	Gowdy	Massie	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Waters, Maxine
(NM)	Peterson	Takano	Brady (PA)	Graham	Matsui	Serrano	Tiberi	Watson Coleman
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pingree	Thompson (CA)	Brady (TX)	Granger	McCarthy	Sessions	Tipton	Weber (TX)
(NM)	Pocan	Thompson (MS)	Brat	Graves (GA)	McCaul	Sewell (AL)	Titus	Webster (FL)
Lynch	Polis	Titus	Bridenstine	Graves (LA)	McClintock	Sherman	Tonko	Welch
Maloney,	Quigley	Tonko	Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McCollum	Shimkus	Torres	Wenstrup
Carolyn	Rangel	Torres	Brooks (IN)	Green, Al	McHenry	Shuster	Trott	Westerman
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Tsongas	Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	McKinley	Simpson	Tsongas	Williams
Massie	Richmond	Van Hollen	Buck	Grothman	McMorris	Sinema	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	Bucshon	Guinta	Rodgers	Sires	Upton	Wilson (SC)
McCollum	Ruiz	Veasey	Burgess	Guthrie	McNerney	Slaughter	Valadao	Wittman
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Vela	Bustos	Hahn	McSally	Smith (MO)	Van Hollen	Womack
McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Calvert	Hanna	Meadows	Smith (NE)	Vargas	Woodall
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	Vislosky	Capps	Hardy	Meehan	Smith (NJ)	Veasey	Yarmuth
Meeks	T.	Walz	Cárdenas	Harris	Meeks	Smith (TX)	Vela	Yoder
Meng	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Carney	Hartzler	Meng	Smith (WA)	Velázquez	Yoho
Moore	Schakowsky	Schultz	Carson (IN)	Heck (NV)	Messer	Speier	Vislosky	Young (IA)
Moulton	Schiff	Waters, Maxine	Carter (GA)	Heck (WA)	Mica	Stefanik	Wagner	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Watson Coleman	Cartwright	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Stewart	Walberg	Zeldin
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Welch	Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Stivers	Walden	Zinke
Neal	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)	Castro (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar			
Nolan	Serrano	Yarmuth	Chabot	Higgins	Mooney (WV)			
Norcross	Sewell (AL)		Chaffetz	Hill	Moore			
			Chu, Judy	Himes	Moulton			
			Cicilline	Hinojosa	Mullin			
			Clark (MA)	Holding	Mulvaney			
			Clarke (NY)	Honda	Murphy (FL)			
			Cleaver	Hoyer	Murphy (PA)			
			Clyburn	Huelskamp	Napolitano			
			Coffman	Huffman	Neal			
			Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer			
			Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Newhouse			
			Collins (NY)	Hunter	Noem			
			Comstock	Hurd (TX)	Nolan			
			Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Norcross			
			Connolly	Israel	Nunes			
			Conyers	Issa	O'Rourke			
			Cook	Jackson Lee	Palazzo			
			Cooper	Jeffries	Pallone			
			Costa	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer			
			Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Pascrell			
			Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen			
			Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Payne			
			Crawford	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce			
			Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Jolly			
			Crowley	Jones	Perlmutter			
			Cuellar	Jordan	Perry			
			Culberson	Joyce	Peters			
			Cummings	Katko	Peterson			
			Davidson	Keating	Pingree			
			Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Pittenger			
			Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Pitts			
			Delaney	Kelly (PA)	Pocan			
			DeLauro	Kennedy	Poe (TX)			
			DeBene	Kildee	Poliquin			
			Denham	Kilmer	Polis			
			Dent	Kind	Pompeo			
			DeSantis	King (IA)	Posey			
			DeSaulnier	King (NY)	Price, Tom			
			DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley			
			Deutch	Kline	Rangel			
			Diaz-Balart	Knight	Ratcliffe			
			Dingell	Kuster	Reed			
			Doggett	Labrador	Reichert			
			Dold	LaHood	Renacci			
			Donovan	LaMalfa	Ribble			
			Doyle, Michael	Lamborn	Rice (NY)			
			F.	Lance	Rice (SC)			
			Duffy	Langevin	Richmond			
			Duncan (SC)	Larsen (WA)	Rigell			
			Duncan (TN)	Larson (CT)	Roby			
			Edwards	Latta	Roe (TN)			
			Ellison	Lawrence	Rogers (AL)			
			Emmer (MN)	Lee	Rogers (KY)			
			Engel	Levin	Rokita			
			Eshoo	Lewis	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Esty	Lieu, Ted	Roskam			
			Farenthold	Lipinski	Ross			
			Farr	LoBiondo	Rothfus			
			Fitzpatrick	Loebback	Rouzer			
			Fleischmann	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard			
			Fleming	Long	Royce			
			Flores	Loudermill	Ruiz			
			Forbes	Love	Ruppersberger			
			Fortenberry	Lowey	Russell			
			Foster	Lucas	Ryan (OH)			
			Foxx	Luetkemeyer	Salmon			
			Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda			
			Franks (AZ)	(NM)	T.			
			Frelinghuysen	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanford			
			Fudge	(NM)	Sarbanes			
			Gallego		Scalise			
			Garamendi					

NOT VOTING—34

Adams	Duckworth	Nugent
Black	Ellmers (NC)	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Fincher	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Grijalva	Rooney (FL)
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Rush
Byrne	Harper	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter (TX)	Hastings	Takai
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Westmoreland
Clay	Kaptur	Whitfield
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Young (AK)
DeFazio	Marino	
DeGette	Nadler	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1927

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.

SUPPORTING AMERICA'S
INNOVATORS 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. 4854) to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company, 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 New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 9, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

YEAS—388

Abraham	Barletta	Bera
Aderholt	Barr	Beyer
Aguilar	Barton	Bilirakis
Allen	Bass	Bishop (GA)
Amodei	Beatty	Bishop (MI)
Ashford	Becerra	Bishop (UT)
Babin	Benishek	Blackburn

Blum	Garrett	Lummis	Schiff	Stutzman	Walker
Blumenauer	Gibbs	MacArthur	Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Walorski
Bonamici	Gibson	Maloney,	Schweikert	Takano	Walters, Mimi
Bost	Gohmert	Carolyn	Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Boustany	Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Scott, Austin	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Boyle, Brendan	Gosar	Marchant	Scott, David	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
F.	Gowdy	Massie	Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Waters, Maxine
Brady (PA)	Graham	Matsui	Serrano	Tiberi	Watson Coleman
Brady (TX)	Granger	McCarthy	Sessions	Tipton	Weber (TX)
Brat	Graves (GA)	McCaul	Sewell (AL)	Titus	Webster (FL)
Bridenstine	Graves (LA)	McClintock	Sherman	Tonko	Welch
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McCollum	Shimkus	Torres	Wenstrup
Brooks (IN)	Green, Al	McHenry	Shuster	Trott	Westerman
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	McKinley	Simpson	Tsongas	Williams
Buck	Grothman	McMorris	Sinema	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Bucshon	Guinta	Rodgers	Sires	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Burgess	Guthrie	McNerney	Slaughter	Valadao	Wittman
Bustos	Hahn	McSally	Smith (MO)	Van Hollen	Womack
Vela	Hanna	Meadows	Smith (NE)	Vargas	Woodall
Calvert	Hardy	Meehan	Smith (NJ)	Veasey	Yarmuth
Capps	Harris	Meeks	Smith (TX)	Vela	Yoder
Cárdenas	Hartzler	Meng	Smith (WA)	Velázquez	Yoho
Carney	Heck (NV)	Messer	Speier	Vislosky	Young (IA)
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Mica	Stefanik	Wagner	Young (IN)
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Stewart	Walberg	Zeldin
Cartwright	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Stivers	Walden	Zinke
Castor (FL)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar			
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Mooney (WV)			
Chabot	Hill	Moore			
Chaffetz	Himes	Moulton			
Chu, Judy	Hinojosa	Mullin			
Cicilline	Holding	Mulvaney			
Clark (MA)	Honda	Murphy (FL)			
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Murphy (PA)			
Cleaver	Huelskamp	Napolitano			
Clyburn	Huffman	Neal			
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer			
Cole	Hultgren	Newhouse			
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Noem			
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Nolan			
Comstock	Hurt (VA)	Norcross			
Conaway	Israel	Nunes			
Connolly	Issa	O'Rourke			
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Palazzo			
Cook	Jeffries	Pallone			
Cooper	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer			
Costa	Jenkins (WV)	Pascrell			
Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen			
Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Payne			
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce			
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Jolly			
Crenshaw	Jones	Perlmutter			
Crowley	Jordan	Perry			
Cuellar	Joyce	Peters			
Culberson	Katko	Peterson			
Cummings	Keating	Pingree			
Davidson	Kelly (IL)	Pittenger			
Davis, Danny	Kelly (MS)	Pitts			
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Pocan			
Delaney	Kennedy	Poe (TX)			
DeLauro	Kildee	Poliquin			
DeBene	Kilmer	Polis			
Denham	Kind	Pompeo			
Dent	King (IA)	Posey			
DeSantis	King (NY)	Price, Tom			
DeSaulnier	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley			
DesJarlais	Kline	Rangel			
Deutch	Knight	Ratcliffe			
Diaz-Balart	Kuster	Reed			
Dingell	Labrador	Reichert			
Doggett	LaHood	Renacci			
Dold	LaMalfa	Ribble			
Donovan	Lamborn	Rice (NY)			
Doyle, Michael	Lance	Rice (SC)			
F.	Langevin	Richmond			
Duffy	Larsen (WA)	Rigell			
Duncan (SC)	Larson (CT)	Roby			
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Roe (TN)			
Edwards	Lawrence	Rogers (AL)			
Ellison	Lee	Rogers (KY)			
Emmer (MN)	Levin	Rokita			
Engel	Lewis	Ros-Lehtinen			
Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Roskam			
Esty	Lipinski	Ross			
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Rothfus			
Farr	Loebback	Rouzer			
Fitzpatrick	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard			
Fleischmann	Long	Royce			
Fleming	Loudermill	Ruiz			
Flores	Love	Ruppersberger			
Forbes	Lowey	Russell			
Fortenberry	Lucas	Ryan (OH)			
Foster	Luetkemeyer	Salmon			
Foxx	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda			
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	T.			
Franks (AZ)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanford			
Frelinghuysen	(NM)	Sarbanes			
Fudge		Scalise			
Gallego					
Garamendi					

NAYS—9

Amash	Gabbard	McDermott
Capuano	Griffith	McGovern
Cohen	Lynch	Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—36

Adams	DeGette	Marino
Black	Duckworth	Nadler
Brown (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Nugent
Buchanan	Fincher	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Grayson	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Grijalva	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Gutiérrez	Rush
Clawson (FL)	Harper	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Hastings	Takai
Curbelo (FL)	Hudson	Westmoreland
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Whitfield
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1933

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.

FIX CROWDFUNDING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4855) to amend provisions in the securities laws relating to regulation crowdfunding to raise the dollar amount limit and to clarify certain requirements and exclusions for funding portals established by such Act, as amended, on which the yeas

Babin Farenthold
 Barletta Farr
 Barr Fitzpatrick
 Barton Fleischmann
 Bass Fleming
 Beatty Flores
 Becerra Forbes
 Benishek Fortenberry
 Bera Foster
 Beyer Foxx
 Bilirakis Frankel (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Franks (AZ)
 Bishop (MI) Frelinghuysen
 Bishop (UT) Fudge
 Blackburn Gabbard
 Blum Gallego
 Blumenauer Garamendi
 Bonamici Garrett
 Bost Gibbs
 Boustany Gibson
 Boyle, Brendan F. Gohmert
 Brady (PA) Gosar
 Brady (TX) Gowdy
 Brat Graham
 Bridenstine Granger
 Brooks (AL) Graves (GA)
 Brooks (IN) Graves (LA)
 Brownley (CA) Graves (MO)
 Buck Grayson
 Bucshon Green, Al
 Burgess Green, Gene
 Bustos Griffith
 Calvert Grothman
 Capps Guinta
 Cárdenas Guthrie
 Carney Hahn
 Carson (IN) Hanna
 Carter (GA) Hardy
 Cartwright Harris
 Castor (FL) Hartzler
 Castro (TX) Heck (NV)
 Chabot Heck (WA)
 Chaffetz Hensarling
 Chu, Judy Herrera Beutler
 Cicilline Hice, Jody B.
 Clark (MA) Higgins
 Clarke (NY) Hill
 Cleaver Himes
 Clyburn Hinojosa
 Coffman Holding
 Cole Honda
 Collins (GA) Hoyer
 Collins (NY) Huelskamp
 Comstock Huffman
 Conaway Huiזengα (MI)
 Connolly Hultgren
 Conyers Hunter
 Cook Hurd (TX)
 Cooper Hurt (VA)
 Costa Israel
 Costello (PA) Issa
 Courtney Jackson Lee
 Cramer Jeffries
 Crawford Jenkins (KS)
 Crenshaw Jenkins (WV)
 Crowley Johnson (GA)
 Cuellar Johnson (OH)
 Culberson Johnson, E. B.
 Cummings Johnson, Sam
 Curbelo (FL) Jolly
 Davidson Jones
 Davis, Danny Jordan
 Davis, Rodney Joyce
 Delaney Katko
 DeLauro Keating
 DeBene Kelly (IL)
 Denham Kelly (MS)
 Dent Kelly (PA)
 DeSantis Kennedy
 DeSaulnier Kildee
 DesJarlais Kilmer
 Deutch Kind
 Diaz-Balart King (IA)
 Dingell King (NY)
 Doggett Kinzinger (IL)
 Dold Kline
 Donovan Knight
 Doyle, Michael F. Kuster
 Duffy Labrador
 Duncan (SC) LaHood
 Duncan (TN) LaMalfa
 Edwards Lamborn
 Ellison Lance
 Emmer (MN) Langevin
 Engel Larsen (WA)
 Eshoo Larson (CT)
 Esty Latta
 Lawrence Roe (TN)

Lee Rogers (AL)
 Levin Rogers (KY)
 Lewis Rokita
 Lieu, Ted Ros-Lehtinen
 Lipinski Roskam
 LoBiondo Ross
 Loebsack Rothfus
 Lofgren Rouzer
 Long Roybal-Allard
 Loudermilk Royce
 Love Ruiz
 Lowenthal Ruppertsberger
 Lowey Russell
 Lucas Ryan (OH)
 Luetkemeyer Salmon
 Lujan Grisham Sánchez, Linda T.
 Luján, Ben Ray Sanford
 Gibbs Sarbanes
 Gibson Scalise
 Gohmert Schakowsky
 Goodlatte Maloney, Carolyn
 Gosar Schradler
 Gowdy Schweikert
 Graham Scott (VA)
 Granger Massie
 Graves (GA) Matsui
 Graves (LA) McCarthy
 Graves (MO) McCaul
 Grayson McClintock
 Green, Al McCollum
 Green, Gene McGovern
 Griffith McHenry
 Grothman McKinley
 Guinta McMorris
 Guthrie Rodgers
 Hahn McNeerney
 Hanna McSally
 Hardy Meadows
 Harris Meehan
 Hartzler Meeks
 Heck (NV) Meng
 Heck (WA) Messer
 Hensarling Mica
 Herrera Beutler Miller (FL)
 Hice, Jody B. Miller (MI)
 Higgins Mooleenaar
 Hill Mooney (WV)
 Himes Moore
 Hinojosa Moulton
 Holding Mullin
 Honda Mulvaney
 Hoyer Murphy (FL)
 Huelskamp Murphy (PA)
 Huffman Napolitano
 Huiזengα (MI) Neal
 Hultgren Neugebauer
 Hunter Newhouse
 Hurd (TX) Noem
 Hurd (VA) Nolan
 Israel Norcross
 Issa Nunes
 Jackson Lee O'Rourke
 Jeffries Olson
 Jenkins (KS) Palazzo
 Jenkins (WV) Pallone
 Johnson (GA) Palmer
 Johnson (OH) Pascarell
 Johnson, E. B. Paulsen
 Johnson, Sam Payne
 Jolly Pearce
 Jones Pelosi
 Jordan Perlmutter
 Joyce Perry
 Katko Peters
 Keating Peterson
 Kelly (IL) Pingree
 Kelly (MS) Pittenger
 Kelly (PA) Pitts
 Kennedy Pocan
 Kildee Poe (TX)
 Kilmer Poliquin
 Kind Polis
 King (IA) Pompeo
 King (NY) Posey
 Kinzinger (IL) Price, Tom
 Kline Quigley
 Knight Rangel
 Kuster Ratcliffe
 Labrador Reed
 LaHood Reichert
 LaMalfa Renacci
 Lamborn Ribble
 Lance Rice (NY)
 Langevin Rice (SC)
 Larsen (WA) Richmond
 Larson (CT) Rigell
 Latta Roby
 Lawrence Roe (TN)

NAYS—4
 Ashford Cohen
 Capuano Lynch

NOT VOTING—35
 Adams Duckworth
 Black Ellmers (NC)
 Brown (FL) Fincher
 Buchanan Grijalva
 Butterfield Gutierrez
 Byrne Harper
 Carter (TX) Hastings
 Clawson (FL) Hudson
 Clay Kaptur
 Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick
 DeFazio Marino
 DeGette McDermott

□ 1941
 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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5580

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5580.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on additional motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

TULE RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION LAND TRUST, HEALTH, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4685) to take certain Federal lands located in Tulare County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tule River Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4685
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 “Tule River Indian Reservation Land Trust, Health, and Economic Development Act”.

SEC. 2. LANDS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), valid, existing rights, and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest (including improvements and appurtenances) of the United States in and to the approximately 34 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map titled “Proposed Lands to be Held in Trust for the Tule River Tribe” and dated May 14, 2015, are hereby held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tule River Indian Tribe.

(b) EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—For the purposes of subsection (a), valid, existing rights include any easement or right-of-way for which an application is pending with the Bureau of Land Management on the date of the enactment of this Act. If such application is denied upon final action, the valid, existing right related to the application shall cease to exist.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection at the office of the California State Director, Bureau of Land Management.

(d) CONVERSION OF VALID, EXISTING RIGHTS.—

(1) CONTINUITY OF USE.—Any person claiming in good faith to have valid, existing rights to lands taken into trust by this Act may continue to exercise such rights to the same extent that the rights were exercised before the date of the enactment of this Act until the Secretary makes a determination on an application submitted under paragraph (2)(B) or the application is deemed to be granted under paragraph (3).

(2) NOTICE AND APPLICATION.—Consistent with sections 2800 through 2880 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall notify any person that claims to have valid, existing rights, such as a management agreement, easement, or other right-of-way, to lands taken into trust under subsection (a) that—

(A) such lands have been taken into trust; and

(B) the person claiming the valid, existing rights has 60 days to submit an application to the Secretary requesting that the valid, existing rights be converted to a long-term easement or other right-of-way.

(3) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall grant or deny an application submitted under paragraph (2)(B) not later than 180 days after the application is submitted. Such a determination shall be considered a final action. If the Secretary does not make a determination within 180 days after the application is submitted, the application shall be deemed to be granted.

(e) RESTRICTION ON GAMING.—Lands taken into trust pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered to have been taken into trust for, and shall not be eligible for, class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

□ 1945

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Tule River Indian Tribe are constituents of mine, and I believe that they have a right to self-governance and local control.

This bill is about putting some unused Federal land in trust for the tribe. More fundamentally, this is about giving the people who actually live in a place more control over that land.

This is a good, practical rule of thumb when it comes to governance. People at the local level govern themselves best. That is definitely the case when it comes to Native American tribes. My principle is that Indian tribes will use their land better than a distant Federal Government, and we should let them.

Today's legislation transfers a relatively small piece of land, only about 34 acres, but it will allow the Tule River Tribe to unify their property, giving them the freedom to live as they choose. And that freedom has more value than any amount of acreage.

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

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Tule River Tribe are descendants of the original inhabitants of the San Joaquin Valley that occupied the territory along the rivers and creeks flowing from the Sierra Nevada Mountains and Tulare Lake in south-central California.

Like many other tribes in California and around the country, the Tule River people have suffered many injustices and inequities over the years, including forced removal and relocation of the tribe to the roughly 54,000-acre reservation which they have resided in for 140 years.

H.R. 4685, and Mr. MCCARTHY, will add to that existing land base by deem-

ing that approximately 34 acres of Bureau of Land Management land be held in trust for the tribe. It is a small amount of acreage in the bigger picture. This land is situated between the tribal fee land and the reservation land, near the only entrance to the reservation, and it is entirely cut off from Federal lands in the vicinity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very small amount of land, as I said, but as the vice chairman of the tribe stated in testimony before the committee, "every acre of land is important" to the Tule River people.

I want to commend the sponsor of the bill, Majority Leader Mr. MCCARTHY, for bringing this legislation to the floor. It passed by unanimous consent. I urge its quick adoption.

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

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to commend my colleague, Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, for his work on this important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4685.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4685.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FOUNDATION ACT

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3844) to establish the Energy and Minerals Reclamation Foundation to encourage, obtain, and use gifts, devises, and bequests for projects to reclaim abandoned mine lands and orphan oil and gas well sites, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3844

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 "Bureau of Land Management Foundation Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

- (1) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the Board of Directors of the Foundation.
- (2) BLM.—The term "BLM" means the Bureau of Land Management.
- (3) CHAIRMAN.—The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the Board.
- (4) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means an individual member of the Board.
- (5) FOUNDATION.—The term "Foundation" means the Bureau of Land Management Foundation established by this Act.
- (6) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.
- (7) NATIONAL CONSERVATION LANDS.—The term "National Conservation Lands" means

the system of lands established by section 2002 of the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7202).

(8) WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS.—The term "wild free-roaming horses and burros" has the same meaning that term has under section 2(b) of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses And Burros Act Of 1971 (16 U.S.C. 1332(b)).

(9) ORPHANED OIL AND GAS WELL SITES.—The term "orphaned oil and gas well sites" means all onshore oil and gas wells in the United States that have no responsible or liable parties and that—

(A) are located on federally managed lands;

(B) are located on lands or minerals that were federally managed at the time oil and gas operations were initiated; or

(C) adversely impact the health or productivity of Federal lands.

(10) ABANDONED MINE LANDS.—The term "abandoned mine lands" means all hard rock mines in the United States that were abandoned before January 1, 1981, and all coal mines in the United States that were abandoned before August 3, 1977, and that—

(A) are located on federally managed lands;

(B) are located on lands or minerals that were federally managed at the time mining operations were initiated; or

(C) adversely impact the health or productivity of Federal lands.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT FOUNDATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Bureau of Land Management Foundation as a charitable and nonprofit corporation that shall not be considered an agency or establishment of the United States.

(b) PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The purposes of the Foundation are to—

(A) encourage, accept, obtain, administer, and use private gifts of money, devises, and bequests of real and personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the activities and services of the BLM described in subparagraph (B);

(B) undertake, conduct, and encourage programs and activities that support—

(i) educational, technical, scientific, and other assistance or activities that support the management of BLM lands in regard to—

(I) wild free-roaming horses and burros;

(II) fish and wildlife and their habitats;

(III) National Conservation Lands;

(IV) recreation resources; and

(V) cultural and historic resources; and

(ii) activities that support the reclamation and remediation of—

(I) abandoned mine lands;

(II) orphaned oil and gas well sites; or

(III) public lands impacted by development connected to mineral exploration and development activities.

(2) INCLUDED RECLAMATION ACTIVITIES.—Reclamation activities under paragraph (1)(B) should include, but not be limited to, the remediation of soil and water contamination, the restoration of wildlife habitat in order to restore the natural, scenic, historic, cultural, and ecological values of such areas, or the promotion of the economic potential of such areas.

(c) ACTIVITIES OF THE FOUNDATION AND THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.—The activities of the Foundation authorized under this Act shall be supplemental to and shall not preempt any authority or responsibility of the BLM under any other provision of law.

(d) RANGE OF FOUNDATION ACTIVITIES.—The activities and grants made by the Foundation under subsection (b)(1)(B) that are not subject to limitations under section 5(d)(4) shall be undertaken in equal proportion under clauses (i) and (ii) of subsection (b)(1)(B).

SEC. 4. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.**(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foundation shall have a governing Board of Directors, which shall consist of no more than 9 members, each of whom shall be a United States citizen.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS OF MEMBERS.**—Of the appointed members of the Board—

(A) at least 3 shall have education or experience in natural, cultural, conservation, or other resource management, law, research, or advocacy;

(B) at least 3 shall have education or experience in energy and minerals development, reclamation, or remediation; and

(C) up to 3 shall be appointed as at-large members.

(3) **EX OFFICIO MEMBER.**—The Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or a designee of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall be an ex officio non-voting member of the Board.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND TERMS.—

(1) **INITIAL APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the members of the Board in accordance with paragraph (6) who, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), shall be appointed for terms of 6 years.

(2) **STAGGERED APPOINTMENTS.**—In appointing the initial members of the Board, the Secretary shall appoint, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary—

(A) one-third of the members to serve an initial term of 2 years;

(B) one-third of the members to serve an initial term of 4 years; and

(C) one-third of the members to serve an initial term of 6 years.

(3) **VACANCY.**—A vacancy on the Board shall be—

(A) filled not later than 60 days after the vacancy occurs, in the manner of which the original appointment was made; and

(B) for the balance of the term of the individual who was replaced.

(4) **REMOVAL.**—A Director may be removed from the Board by a majority vote of the Board if the individual misses 3 consecutive regularly scheduled meetings.

(5) **TERM LIMIT.**—In no case may an individual serve more than 12 consecutive years on the Board.

(6) **NOMINATIONS.**—The Secretary shall publish a solicitation in the Federal Register seeking nominations from the public of individuals for appointment to the Board. Such solicitation shall be open for a period of 30 days. Nominations submitted shall not be binding, but the Secretary shall give consideration to the names received. Within 30 days after the end of such period, the Secretary shall appoint members who comply with the requirements of subsection (a)(2), and publish the names and backgrounds of those appointed in the Federal Register.

(7) **REPRESENTATION OF DIVERSE AREAS OF EXPERTISE.**—In appointing the members of the Board the Secretary shall seek to appoint, and may give preference to, individuals who have experience with State or local government partnerships and represent diverse areas of expertise.

(c) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman—

(1) shall be elected by the Board from its members for a 2-year term; and

(2) may be reelected as Chairman while serving as a Director.

(d) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the current voting membership of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(e) **MEETINGS.**—The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman at least once a year.

(f) **REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.**—Serving as a Director shall not constitute employ-

ment by the United States Government for any purpose. Members of the Board shall serve without pay other than reimbursement for the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred in the performance of their duties for the Foundation in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) **GENERAL POWERS.**—The Board may complete the organization of the Foundation by appointing officers and employees, adopting a constitution and bylaws consistent with the purposes of the Foundation and this Act, and undertaking other such acts as may be necessary to function and to carry out the provisions of this title.

(h) **OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.**—Officers and employees of the Foundation may not be appointed until the Foundation has sufficient funds to pay them for their service. Appointment as an officer or employee of the Foundation shall not constitute employment by the United States.

(i) **LIMITATION AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—**

(1) **PROHIBITION ON POLITICAL CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY.**—The Foundation shall not participate or intervene in a political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

(2) **CONFLICT OF INTEREST.**—No Director, officer, or employee of the Foundation shall participate, directly or indirectly, in the consideration or determination of any particular matter before the Foundation affecting—

(A) the financial interests of that Director, officer, employee, or an immediate family member of such Director, officer, or employee; or

(B) the interests of any corporation, partnership, entity, or organization in which such Director, officer, employee, or an immediate family member of such Director, officer, or employee—

(i) is an officer, director, or trustee; or

(ii) has any direct financial interest.

(3) **LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURE.**—Starting in the fifth fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, of the amounts available to the Foundation for expenditure each fiscal year, not more than 15 percent may be used for administrative expenses.

SEC. 5. POWERS AND OBLIGATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foundation—

(1) shall have perpetual succession; and

(2) may conduct business throughout the several States, territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) **NOTICE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—The Foundation shall at all times maintain a designated agent in the District of Columbia authorized to accept service of process for the Foundation. The serving of notice to, or service of process upon, the agent required under this subsection, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be treated as service upon or notice to the Foundation.

(c) **SEAL.**—The Foundation shall have an official seal selected by the Board, which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) **POWERS.**—In addition to powers otherwise authorized under this Act, to carry out its purposes the Foundation shall have the usual powers of a not-for-profit corporation in the District of Columbia, including the power to—

(1) accept, receive, solicit, hold, administer, and use any gift, devise, or bequest, either absolutely or in trust, of real or personal property or any income therefrom or other interest therein;

(2) acquire by donation, gift, devise, purchase, or exchange, and dispose of, any real or personal property or interest therein;

(3) sell, donate, lease, invest, reinvest, retain, or otherwise dispose of any property or

income therefrom unless limited by the instrument of transfer;

(4) accept, receive, solicit, hold, administer, and use any gift, devise, or bequest, at the request of the donor thereof, strictly and exclusively for any purpose set forth in section 3(b), and such use shall include the expenditure of funds or use of property for reasonable administrative expenses related to actions to carry out the bequest;

(5) borrow money and issue bonds, debentures, or other debt instruments;

(6) sue and be sued, and complain and defend itself in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that the Directors of the Board shall not be personally liable, except for gross negligence;

(7) enter into contracts or other arrangements with public agencies, private organizations, and persons and to make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the purposes thereof; and

(8) do any and all acts necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the Foundation.

(e) **PROPERTY.—**

(1) **ACCEPTANCE OF PROPERTY.**—A gift, devise, or bequest of real property may be accepted by the Foundation even though it is encumbered, restricted, or subject to beneficial interests of private persons if any current or future interest therein is for the benefit of the Foundation.

(2) **REFUSAL OF PROPERTY.**—The Foundation may, in its discretion, decline any gift, devise, or bequest of real or personal property.

(3) **TITLE AND INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY.**—For the purposes of this Act, an interest in real property shall be treated as including mineral and water rights, rights-of-way, and easements, appurtenant or in gross.

(4) **CONDEMNATION OF REAL PROPERTY PROHIBITED.**—No lands or waters, or interests therein, that are owned by the Foundation shall be subject to condemnation by any State or political subdivision, or any agent of instrumentality thereof.

(5) **LIMITATION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—The Foundation shall not use any funds to purchase real property, unless such property is to be used by the Foundation for administrative or other support purposes or is an easement for right-of-way access necessary to utilize, manage, or otherwise dispose of any bequest or gift of real property to the Foundation.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND SUPPORT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT SUPPORT.**—For fiscal years 2017 through 2019, the Foundation may accept Federal funds from a Federal agency under any other Federal law for use by the Foundation for the purposes of assisting the Foundation in establishing an office and meeting initial administrative, project, and other expenses in conformance with this Act.

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.**—The Secretary may provide personnel, facilities, equipment, and other administrative services to the Foundation with such limitations and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall establish. The Foundation may reimburse the Secretary for any support provided under this subsection, in whole or in part, and any reimbursement received by the Secretary under this subsection shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations then current and chargeable for the cost of providing the services.

SEC. 7. VOLUNTEERS.

The Secretary may accept, without regard to the civil service classification laws, rules, and regulations, the services of the Foundation, the Board, and the offices, employees, or agents of the Foundation, without compensation from the Department of the Interior, as volunteers for the performance of the

functions under section 307(d) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1737(d)).

SEC. 8. AUDITS AND REPORTS REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **AUDITS.**—For purposes of section 10101 of title 36, United States Code, the Foundation shall be treated as a corporation in part B of subtitle II of such title.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Foundation shall transmit at the end of each fiscal year a report to Congress of its proceedings and activities during that fiscal year, including—

(1) a full and complete statement of its receipts, expenditures, and investments;

(2) a description of all acquisition and disposal of real property by the Foundation;

(3) a detailed statement of the recipient, amount, and purpose of each grant made by the Foundation; and

(4) a copy of any audit prepared for the Foundation in the previous fiscal year.

SEC. 9. UNITED STATES RELEASE FROM LIABILITY.

The United States shall not be liable for any debts, defaults, acts, or omissions of the Foundation, nor shall the full faith and credit of the United States extend to any obligations of the Foundation.

SEC. 10. RELIEF WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FOUNDATION ACTS OR FAILURE TO ACT.

The Attorney General may petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for such equitable relief as may be necessary or appropriate if the Foundation engages in any act, practice, or policy that is inconsistent with this Act or the by-laws of the Foundation.

SEC. 11. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.

Nothing in this Act authorizes the Foundation to perform any function the authority for which is exclusively provided to the BLM under any other provision of law.

SEC. 12. LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.

Amounts available to, or provided by, the Foundation shall not be used for—

(1) any activity the purpose of which is to influence legislation pending before Congress; or

(2) any activity inconsistent with this Act.

SEC. 13. CLARIFICATION ON FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the author of H.R. 3844, the Bureau of Land Management Foundation Act. This legislation is one part of the Natural Resources Committee's response to the complex, technical, legal, educational,

and funding-related challenges for abandoned mine lands, also referred to as AML, as well as orphan oil and gas sites across the country. These issues were highlighted last year with the EPA's Gold King and Standard Mine spills in Colorado's Animas River.

I am happy to present this piece of legislation as part of a comprehensive response to the Gold King spill and am glad that it comes less than 1 year from the anniversary of that disaster. I hope the other bills, H.R. 3734, authored by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY), and H.R. 3843, authored by Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee Chairman LAMBORN, will also be considered by the House soon.

H.R. 3844 seeks to address part of the funding-related challenge for abandoned mine lands and orphan oil and gas well sites by creating a foundation. Based on other successful models for the national park system, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Forest Service, this foundation would solicit private contributions to remediate sites that were abandoned prior to the enactment of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 and the implementation of the Bureau of Land Management's mining regulation of January 1, 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank the ranking member of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee, Mr. LOWENTHAL of California, for his willingness to work in a bipartisan manner to help sharpen the focus of the foundation, while also allowing the foundation to solicit private donations to help aid the broader mission of the Bureau of Land Management. I strongly believe that this bill represents our collective ability to work in a bipartisan manner at a time when many people say we can't do so, so I thank the gentleman very much for his cooperation and input.

In addition to reclamation of mines and wells, the foundation would also supplement educational, technical, scientific, and other assistance or activities that support the management of wild free-roaming horses and burros, fish and wildlife and their habitats, National Conservation Lands, recreation resources, and cultural and historic resources.

Those individuals who donate to the foundation will be able to direct how they would like their money to be used, and any general donations would be divided equally amongst the two areas of the foundation. This, in turn, grows the pie and the slice that will go toward fixing legacy mine sites.

I am pleased that the end product of our bipartisan work will greatly involve the private sector in ways that will help us prevent future events like the EPA spill in Colorado. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3844.

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

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

H.R. 3844 is a bipartisan bill that I am proud to have worked cooperatively on with Mr. HICE and the Natural Resources Committee.

H.R. 3844 would establish a charitable foundation to support the mission and activities of the Bureau of Land Management. Congress has chartered a number of similar foundations to serve as partners to our land management agencies, including the National Park Foundation, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and the National Forest Foundation.

By establishing a Bureau of Land Management Foundation, H.R. 3844 will provide the BLM with an important partner and allow private individuals and corporations to support the Bureau's diverse mission, which includes activities such as managing wild horses, protecting cultural resources, and cleaning up abandoned mines.

Again, I join with my colleague, and I would like to commend my colleague, Mr. HICE, and the committee for working with me so that we, together, could put together this final bipartisan language that was adopted in the Natural Resources Committee and that we are voting on today.

The establishment of a Bureau of Land Management Foundation is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to say a huge thank you to the ranking member for his willingness to work with us. It has been an honor, indeed, to work with him.

I am pleased with this end product, and I urge the support of our colleagues and the passage of H.R. 3844.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3844, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish the Bureau of Land Management Foundation to encourage, obtain, and use gifts, devises, and bequests for projects for the benefit of, or in connection with, activities and services of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENIOR SAFE ACT OF 2016

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4538) to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4538

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 “Senior Safe Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. IMMUNITY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act—

(1) the term “Bank Secrecy Act Officer” means an individual responsible for ensuring compliance with the requirements mandated by subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code;

(2) the term “broker-dealer” means a broker or dealer, as those terms are defined, respectively, in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a));

(3) the term “covered agency” means—

(A) a State financial regulatory agency, including a State securities or law enforcement authority and a State insurance regulator;

(B) each of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies;

(C) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(D) a law enforcement agency;

(E) and State or local agency responsible for administering adult protective service laws; and

(F) a State attorney general.

(4) the term “covered financial institution” means—

(A) a credit union;

(B) a depository institution;

(C) an investment advisor;

(D) a broker-dealer;

(E) an insurance company; and

(F) a State attorney general.

(5) the term “credit union” means a Federal credit union, State credit union, or State-chartered credit union, as those terms are defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752);

(6) the term “depository institution” has the meaning given the term in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c));

(7) the term “exploitation” means the fraudulent or otherwise illegal, unauthorized, or improper act or process of an individual, including a caregiver or fiduciary, that—

(A) uses the resources of a senior citizen for monetary personal benefit, profit, or gain; or

(B) results in depriving a senior citizen of rightful access to or use of benefits, resources, belongings or assets;

(8) the term “Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies” has the meaning given the term in section 1003 of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3302);

(9) the term “investment adviser” has the meaning given the term in section 202 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2);

(10) the term “insurance company” has the meaning given the term in section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a));

(11) the term “registered representative” means an individual who represents a broker-dealer in effecting or attempting to affect a purchase or sale of securities;

(12) the term “senior citizen” means an individual who is not less than 65 years of age;

(13) the term “State insurance regulator” has the meaning given such term in section 315 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6735); and

(14) the term “State securities or law enforcement authority” has the meaning given

the term in section 24(f)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78x(f)(4)).

(b) IMMUNITY FROM SUIT.—

(1) IMMUNITY FOR INDIVIDUALS.—An individual who has received the training described in section 3 shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for disclosing the possible exploitation of a senior citizen to a covered agency if the individual, at the time of the disclosure—

(A) served as a supervisor, compliance officer (including a Bank Secrecy Act Officer), or registered representative for a covered financial institution; and

(B) made the disclosure with reasonable care including reasonable efforts to avoid disclosure other than to a covered agency.

(2) IMMUNITY FOR COVERED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—A covered financial institution shall not be liable, including in any civil or administrative proceeding, for a disclosure made by an individual described in paragraph (1) if—

(A) the individual was employed by, or, in the case of a registered representative, affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution at the time of the disclosure; and

(B) before the time of the disclosure, the covered financial institution provided the training described in section 3 to each individual described in section 3(a).

SEC. 3. TRAINING REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A covered financial institution may provide training described in subsection (b)(1) to each officer or employee of, or registered representative affiliated or associated with, the covered financial institution who—

(1) is described in section 2(b)(1)(A);

(2) may come into contact with a senior citizen as a regular part of the duties of the officer, employee, or registered representative; or

(3) may review or approve the financial documents, records, or transactions of a senior citizen in connection with providing financial services to a senior citizen.

(b) TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The training described in this paragraph shall—

(A) instruct any individual attending the training on how to identify and report the suspected exploitation of a senior citizen;

(B) discuss the need to protect the privacy and respect the integrity of each individual customer of a covered financial institution; and

(C) be appropriate to the job responsibilities of the individual attending the training.

(2) TIMING.—The training required under subsection (a) shall be provided as soon as reasonably practicable but not later than 1 year after the date on which an officer, employee, or registered representative begins employment with or becomes affiliated or associated with the covered financial institution.

(3) BANK SECRECY ACT OFFICER.—An individual who is designated as a compliance officer under an anti-money laundering program established pursuant to section 5318(h) of title 31, United States Code, shall be deemed to have received the training described under this subsection.

SEC. 4. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preempt or limit any provision of State law, except only to the extent that section 2 provides a greater level of protection against liability to an individual described in section 2(b)(1) or to a covered financial institution described in section 2(b)(2) than is provided under State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material to the bill therein.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4538. It is the Senior Safe Act of 2016, and I would like to thank the sponsors, principally the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), also the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), for all of their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, we spend a lot of time in our committee and this Congress debating ways in which we can help Americans achieve a secure and dignified retirement. And while there are often disagreements about how to achieve that goal, one issue that is not debatable is that we must do everything in our power to stop fraudsters and scam artists from preying on the vulnerable senior citizen.

Currently, Americans over the age of 50 account for roughly 75 percent, over three-quarters of the financial assets of the U.S.; and unfortunately, one in five of those seniors, that is 20 percent, over the age of 65, have been the victim of fraud—one in five. Think of that. This costs senior citizens almost \$2.9 billion every year, not to mention the stress and the pain that comes along with it for a person who has been victimized, trying to rebuild their financial security.

Oftentimes, employees of banks or financial advisers are on the front lines against such fraud when they see that one of their clients may be a potential target. Unfortunately, current laws make it very difficult for employees of such institutions to report the occurrences of those frauds.

So what do we do? We come to the floor tonight for something called the Senior Safe Act.

What does it do? It provides a very simple fix that would allow a supervisor or a compliance officer of a bank or investment adviser to report instances of fraud to a Federal or State regulator so long as they reported the matter in good faith and, of course, with reasonable care.

□ 2000

Employees at these institutions want to protect their clients just as much as any regulator does, and so this bill would allow them to speak up when they see fraud that is being unreported. This bill passed the Financial Services Committee last month unanimously, so

I encourage all my colleagues in the House to support it today.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4538 is a bill intended to better aid our law enforcement agencies, State and Federal regulators, and agencies assisting seniors to quickly respond to and prevent financial abuse of elders.

Currently, financial institutions such as banks, credit unions, and financial advisers are required to report suspicious activity, including cases of suspected abuse of our Nation's seniors. Nevertheless, industry has raised concerns that they are prevented from doing so out of fear that they might later be sued.

Even though our regulators have taken considerable steps to allay such concerns, it seems that congressional action may be necessary to ensure that financial institutions take actions to stop elders from being swindled in their vulnerable years.

Like Ms. SINEMA, I also want to ensure that when any employee at a financial institution sees something suspicious, she immediately says something to the appropriate authorities and regulators. Indeed, I recently introduced legislation with a similar objective of ensuring the continued flow of critically important reporting of suspicious activity as it relates to terrorism, money laundering, and other serious illicit activities.

Although it is not explicitly specified in the legislation before us today, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau should also use its existing authority to set standards for this training, and is authorized to ensure that the training is being conducted.

H.R. 4538 is a good first step, but should not be the end of our efforts to rein in elder abuse. For example, State regulators are going further and mandating that financial firms make such reports to authorities instead of making the reports voluntary. The States and FINRA, the regulator of broker-dealers, also want to authorize financial advisers to put holds on financial transactions before a swindler can run off with the retirement savings of our Nation's grandparents.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the numerous changes Ms. SINEMA has incorporated to improve the bill. These edits ensure that the bill covers all financial institutions and will enhance reporting of suspected elder abuse. However, more changes are still needed before the bill can be enacted, including language suggested by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and other advocates. I hope that the Senate's sponsors will work with the administration and others to ensure their suggested changes are incorporated into the bill before it is enacted into law.

However, today, Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4538.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) who has brought so much to this committee, and I very much appreciate all of his hard work on that and especially on the legislation that is here before us today.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Our great State of Maine has the oldest average age in the country. Like thousands of fellow Mainers, I help care for my special 86- and 88-year-old parents.

Now, it is scary to realize that our vulnerable seniors, whom we love so much, are increasingly being victimized by aggressive financial scams. This fraud is costing them not only sleepless nights, but about \$3 billion each year.

So today, Mr. Speaker, here in the House, Republicans and Democrats have a chance to show our compassion and to help our seniors.

Now, our Senior Safe Act will help local bank and credit union tellers and retirement and insurance advisers and others to identify and stop these crimes before they happen. Our bill enables professionals in the financial sector and the institutions they work for to report this crookery to the proper authorities. We must do everything humanly possible, Mr. Speaker, to stop these scams before our parents and grandparents are fooled into draining and transferring their savings accounts and their nest eggs.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to work with Democrat Congresswoman SINEMA and Congressman MURPHY of Florida and for Republican Congressman MULVANEY to write this important legislation. I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman GARRETT for quickly moving this bill through our Financial Services Committee.

I also want to congratulate and thank our Maine Senator, SUSAN COLLINS, for authoring the original legislation in the Senate. I am proud to work and join with Senator COLLINS by authoring this companion legislation here in the House. As we all know in Maine and throughout the country, Senator COLLINS has been a national leader and a champion on all sorts of issues important to aging adults throughout our country.

Finally, I want to thank Judy Shaw, Maine's Securities Administrator, who has been instrumental in developing this type of program in our great State of Maine where it has been so successful in preventing financial fraud against our seniors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we Americans are facing many challenges here at home and abroad. But that doesn't mean that we can't find solutions that we can agree upon—commonsense solutions—to the serious problems that hurt our

seniors, and this is one case. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support the Senior Safe Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, Ranking Member WATERS, Congressman POLIQUIN, Congressman MURPHY of Florida, and Congressman MULVANEY for working with me on our bipartisan legislation to help law enforcement combat senior financial exploitation.

In 2014, Tinna Kay Lujan, while employed as a certified nursing assistant at Amber Lights, an assisted living facility in Tucson, my home State of Arizona, took 87-year-old Donald Hansen out of his facility and into her own home where he was later found dehydrated and suffering from an infection.

Lujan not only moved Mr. Hansen into her home against his will, she also exploited him financially. As reported in the Arizona Republic, Washington Federal Bank staff contacted law enforcement because they were suspicious when Lujan and Hansen, who had been a long-time customer, visited the bank together.

Ms. Lujan provided the bank with a power-of-attorney document signed by Hansen. She also requested bank cards and checks from Hansen's accounts and added Hansen's grandchildren as beneficiaries. But bank staff knew that Hansen had no grandchildren, and later they learned those beneficiaries were, in fact, Ms. Lujan's children.

Donald Hansen is only one of thousands of Arizona seniors who are victims of financial exploitation every year. Recent studies estimate that nearly one in five American seniors may be a target for fraud or financial abuse, and seniors lose at least \$2.9 billion annually to financial exploitation.

But even when financial institutions suspect abuse, the abuse may go unpunished because current laws lack flexibility to allow these companies to report suspected abuse to authorities. Our bill, the Senior Safe Act, helps individuals and financial institutions communicate with appropriate agencies when they suspect financial exploitation of seniors.

The bill also encourages firms to train employees to identify and stop financial fraud targeting seniors.

Seniors deserve to retire with dignity, and they shouldn't have to worry that their hard-earned savings are at risk of fraud. Our legislation protects these firms and advisers from liability when they report suspected financial exploitation of a senior citizen.

It is a commonsense solution to help ensure financial institutions can identify fraud, report it, and stop financial abuse of the elderly.

Again, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work and support to protect seniors and end financial exploitation.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I receive the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her work and her bipartisan effort on this legislation. I very, very much, as I said, thank the gentleman from Maine for all of his contributions to the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, today I urge unanimous support in the House like we had in committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4538, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE USE OF ACTIVE CAPACITY OF THE FONTENELLE RESERVOIR

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2273) to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2273

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO MAKE ENTIRE ACTIVE CAPACITY OF FONTENELLE RESERVOIR AVAILABLE FOR USE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the State of Wyoming, may amend the Definite Plan Report for the Seedskadee Project authorized under the first section of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act” (43 U.S.C. 620)) to provide for the study, design, planning, and construction activities that will enable the use of all active storage capacity (as may be defined or limited by legal, hydrologic, structural, engineering, economic, and environmental considerations) of Fontenelle Dam and Reservoir, including the placement of sufficient riprap on the upstream face of Fontenelle Dam to allow the active storage capacity of Fontenelle Reservoir to be used for those purposes for which the Seedskadee Project was authorized.

(b) *COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into any contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other agreement that is necessary to carry out subsection (a).

(2) *STATE OF WYOMING.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the State of Wyoming to work in cooperation and collaboratively with the State of Wyoming for planning, design, related preconstruction activities, and construction of any modification of the Fontenelle Dam under subsection (a).

(B) *REQUIREMENTS.*—The cooperative agreement under subparagraph (A) shall, at a min-

imum, specify the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Wyoming with respect to—

(i) completing the planning and final design of the modification of the Fontenelle Dam under subsection (a);

(ii) any environmental and cultural resource compliance activities required for the modification of the Fontenelle Dam under subsection (a) including compliance with—

(I) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(II) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(III) subdivision 2 of division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code; and

(iii) the construction of the modification of the Fontenelle Dam under subsection (a).

(c) *FUNDING BY STATE OF WYOMING.*—Pursuant to the Act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1404, chapter 161; 43 U.S.C. 395), and as a condition of providing any additional storage under subsection (a), the State of Wyoming shall provide to the Secretary of the Interior funds for any work carried out under subsection (a).

(d) *OTHER CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with the State of Wyoming, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Wyoming may agree, for division of any additional active capacity made available under subsection (a).

(2) *TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—Unless otherwise agreed to by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of Wyoming, a contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the terms and conditions of Bureau of Reclamation Contract No. 14-06-400-2474 and Bureau of Reclamation Contract No. 14-06-400-6193.

SEC. 2. SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act modifies, conflicts with, preempts, or otherwise affects—

(1) the Act of December 31, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Boulder Canyon Project Act”);

(2) the Colorado River Compact of 1922, as approved by the Presidential Proclamation of June 25, 1929 (46 Stat. 3000);

(3) the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act”);

(4) the Treaty between the United States of America and Mexico relating to the utilization of waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, and supplementary protocol signed November 14, 1944, signed at Washington February 3, 1944 (59 Stat. 1219);

(5) the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact as consented to by the Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

(6) the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.);

(7) the Colorado River Basin Project Act (Public Law 90-537; 82 Stat. 885); or

(8) any State of Wyoming or other State water law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2273 was introduced by me, and it allows the State of Wyoming and the Federal Government to study, design, plan, and perform construction that will expand the active storage capacity at the Fontenelle Reservoir and Dam in Wyoming. This is a reservoir that is on the Green River.

The State of Wyoming will pay for the entire expansion. It will take us up about 87,000 acre-feet. Currently, the dam is at about 260. It will take us up to about 345,000 acre-feet. It will do it by riprapping the face of the dam. Riprap is when you take broken up concrete or stone and prevent erosion on the face of the dam. The additional storage capacity will be used by my State of Wyoming.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, expanding surface water storage projects in the West has to continue to be on the table. This bill allows for that expansion and does not require any additional expenditure from the Federal Government.

I am in support of the bill, of course, as the sponsor.

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

□ 2015

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2273 is a real straightforward piece of legislation. It would increase the amount of water that can be stored in the Fontenelle Reservoir, which is a reservoir located in Lincoln County, Wyoming, the great State of Wyoming.

I want to commend the author, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), for her efforts on this important legislation for Wyoming. This bill has been written in a balanced manner that respects existing laws, compacts, and treaties. It does not attempt to expand Wyoming's entitlement to the Colorado River supplies. Any time we are talking about the Colorado River, Upper Basin or Lower Basin, it gets to be a bit of a sticky wicket. This does not involve any of those issues at the expense of any of the Colorado River Basin States.

H.R. 2273 is an important piece of legislation for the Congresswoman. It passed the Natural Resources Committee unanimously. Therefore, I lend my support to H.R. 2273, and I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2273, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend the Definite Plan Report for the Seedskadee Project to enable the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAVE OUR SALMON ACT

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4582) to exclude striped bass from the anadromous fish doubling requirement in section 3406(b)(1) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4582

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 "Save Our Salmon Act" or the "SOS Act".

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) California is home to many populations of native salmon and steelhead.

(2) Many of the native salmon and steelhead populations in California are listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(3) The Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) required a doubling of natural production of Central Valley populations of anadromous fish within 10 years.

(4) Striped bass are anadromous fish indigenous to the East Coast of the United States and are not native to the State of California.

(5) Striped bass were included in the CVPIA's fish doubling goal even though they are not a native species.

(6) Striped bass prey on native salmon and steelhead.

(7) Predation poses a serious threat to federally protected juvenile salmon and other native fish in California.

(8) According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, reducing abundance of striped bass and other non-native predators must be achieved to prevent extinction of Central Valley salmon and steelhead or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly.

(9) Therefore, the CVPIA's fish-doubling goal for two competing species is contradictory and counterproductive for salmon and steelhead recovery.

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF STRIPED BASS.

(a) ANADROMOUS FISH.—Section 3403(a) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (title XXXIV of Public Law 102-575) is amended by striking "striped bass," after "stocks of salmon (including steelhead)."

(b) FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.—Section 3406(b) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (title XXXIV of Public Law 102-575) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraphs (14) and (18);

(2) redesignating paragraphs (15) through (17) as paragraphs (14) through (16), respectively; and

(3) redesignating paragraphs (19) through (23) as paragraphs (17) through (21), respectively.

(c) RESTORATION FUND ESTABLISHED.—Section 3407(a) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (title XXXIV of Public Law 102-575) is amended by striking "(10)-(18), and (20)-(22)" and inserting "(10)-(16), and (18)-(20)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the author of this bill.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4582, the Save Our Salmon Act, which I introduced earlier this year, removes a contradiction in Federal law. This Federal law mandates that not only do we double the amount of threatened and endangered species, the salmon and steelhead, that we spend so much time, effort, and money trying to save, but the contradiction is it also wants us to double the striped bass that eat 98 percent of the fish we are trying to save.

This is a simple bill that is bipartisan that will save taxpayer dollars and that will save our water in California while addressing what we feel is a simple mistake.

Under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, the CVPIA, this doubling goal was set in place in 1992. Again, the steelhead and the salmon are being eaten by the striped bass, which is a nonnative predator fish. This mandated population doubling of the predator fish has proven contradictory to protecting native species under the Endangered Species Act.

This bill not only removes this provision, but at the request of the administration, my bill also removes other sections in the CVPIA which provide for the implementation of the strategies to double the striped bass.

NOAA, NMFS, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife have all indicated that predation of juvenile salmon is one of the primary stressors to these endangered species. In California, predation is rampant.

Predation of endangered fish in California continues to be one of the major factors in the complex equation of California water and the drought that our State faces. By eliminating this contradictory provision in the CVPIA, native species will again thrive without wasting the massive amounts of freshwater and taxpayer dollars currently required to do so.

Again, this is a commonsense, easy solution for Republicans and Democrats to agree on. If we want to save the threatened endangered species, let's stop spending so much money on the very fish that eat 98 percent of the fish that we are trying to save.

I want to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for cosponsoring

this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4582.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the author, as the original cosponsor of this important legislation, for trying to provide a balancing act in maintaining the waters for all beneficial uses in California.

This legislation by Congressman DENHAM that has good bipartisan support, H.R. 4582, is known also as the Save Our Salmon Act. It would amend the Central Valley Project Improvement to exempt striped bass from the law's fish-doubling goals.

One should understand that striped bass is a nonnative fish to California that was introduced in the late 1800s. Unfortunately, for the native salmon, the delta smelt, and other native fisheries, the striped bass is a very aggressive predator fish. The fact is that they eat not only juvenile salmon, but they eat delta smelt, which is part of the food chain for the salmon. As a result of this introduction, the striped bass are thriving, but, unfortunately, the native salmon of California are not.

This measure, H.R. 4582, is the first step in a range of overall policy decisions that we have got to take under consideration. Common sense tells us that we must look at all—all—of the stressors that are impacting the native fisheries of California. This attempts to do that to aid salmon recovery by providing, also, an additional, more reliable water supply for Californians.

Those in the San Joaquin Valley that Congressman DENHAM, others, and I represent have been devastated by the impact of the drought over the last 4, now going on 5, years. Farms, farm communities, and farmworkers have lost their jobs as a result of a zero—zero—water allocation. We don't even have a program to deal with what the Fish and Wildlife agencies have indicated is one of the greatest impacts of native species, which are predator fish. We don't have a predator control program as we have on the Columbia River. It is about time we do something about it.

While there are many stressors that impact the California salmon populations, thereby impacting the water supply reliability for much of California, this measure attempts to begin to do something about the predator problem.

I want to commend again Congressman DENHAM for his ongoing efforts, along with all of us, on a bipartisan effort to look at an overall balanced solution.

I support H.R. 4582, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to commend these California Members. I have been to their districts. I have seen and been at hearings in Fresno where these issues have come to my level of understanding of now a

sympathetic outsider. These issues are almost intractable. When we see bipartisan support on something this important to the economy, to the farmers and ranchers, to the wonderful ecosystems that they are trying to balance in a way that will conserve farming and ranching, that benefits every consumer in this country of some of the finest fruits, vegetables, and other commodities that you can ever imagine. I mean, this is like the breadbasket of our country. To find ways to combat nonnative species in a way that protects native species and also protects the people who produce our food and fiber is so important.

I commend the gentlemen from California on both sides of the aisle and their colleagues.

I want to offer my complete support of H.R. 4582.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4582, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEAR CREEK NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND CONSERVATION ACT

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1838) to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, to designate additional components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1838

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 “Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “management plan” means the Plan for the Recreation Area prepared under section 4(c).

(2) **RECREATION AREA.**—The term “Recreation Area” means the Clear Creek National Recreation Area.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

(5) **OFF HIGHWAY VEHICLE.**—The term “off highway vehicle” means any motorized vehicle designed for or capable of cross-country travel on or immediately over land, water, snow, or other natural terrain and not intended for use on public roads.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEAR CREEK NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To promote environmentally responsible off highway vehicle

recreation, the area generally depicted as “Proposed Clear Creek National Recreation Area” on the map titled “Proposed Clear Creek National Recreation Area” and dated December 15, 2015, is established as the “Clear Creek National Recreation Area”, to be managed by the Secretary.

(b) **OTHER PURPOSES.**—The Recreation Area shall also support other public recreational uses, such as hunting, hiking, and rock and gem collecting.

(c) **MAP ON FILE.**—Copies of the map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in—

(1) the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(2) the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management in California.

SEC. 4. MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Area to further the purposes described in section 3(a), in accordance with—

(1) this Act;

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(3) any other applicable law.

(b) **USES.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize environmentally responsible off highway vehicle recreation and also facilitate hunting, hiking, gem collecting, and the use of motorized vehicles, mountain bikes, and horses in accordance with the management plan described in subsection (c);

(2) issue special recreation permits for motorized and non-motorized events; and

(3) reopen the Clear Creek Management Area to the uses described in this subsection as soon as practicable following the enactment of this Act and in accordance with the management guidelines outlined in this Act and other applicable law.

(c) **INTERIM MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The Secretary shall use the 2006 Clear Creek Management Area Resource Management Plan Amendment and Route Designation Record of Decision as modified by this Act or the Secretary to incorporate natural resource protection information not available in 2006, as the basis of an interim management plan to govern off highway vehicle recreation within the Recreation Area pending the completion of the long-term management plan required in subsection (d).

(d) **PERMANENT MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall create a comprehensive management plan for the Clear Creek Recreation Area that—

(1) shall describe the appropriate uses and management of the Recreation Area in accordance with this Act;

(2) shall be prepared in consultation with—

(A) appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies (including San Benito, Monterey, and Fresno Counties);

(B) adjacent land owners;

(C) other stakeholders (including conservation and recreational organizations); and

(D) holders of any easements, rights-of-way, and other valid rights in the Recreation Area;

(3) shall include a hazards education program to inform people entering the Recreation Area of the asbestos related risks associated with various activities within the Recreation Area, including off-highway vehicle recreation;

(4) shall include a user fee program for motorized vehicle use within the Recreational Area and guidelines for the use of the funds collected for the management and improvement of the Recreation Area;

(5) shall designate as many previously used trails, roads, and other areas for off highway vehicle recreation as feasible in accordance

with this in order to provide a substantially similar recreational experience, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as precluding the Secretary from closing any area, trail, or route from use for the purposes of public safety or resource protection;

(6) may incorporate any appropriate decisions, as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with this Act, that are contained in any management or activity plan for the area completed before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(7) may incorporate appropriate wildlife habitat management plans or other plans prepared for the land within or adjacent to the Recreation Area before the date of the enactment of this Act, in accordance with this Act;

(8) may use information developed under any studies of land within or adjacent to the Recreation Area carried out before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(9) may include cooperative agreements with State or local government agencies to manage all or a portion of the recreational activities within the Recreation Area in accordance with an approved management plan and the requirements of this Act.

(e) **ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire land adjacent to the National Recreation Area by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—Any land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be managed in accordance with—

(A) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(3) **IMPROVED ACCESS.**—The Secretary may acquire by purchase from willing sellers, donation, exchange, or easement, land, or interest in land to improve public safety in providing access to the Recreation Area.

(f) **PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—

(1) **ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide landowners adequate access to inholdings within the Recreation Area.

(B) **INHOLDINGS.**—For access purposes, private land adjacent to the Recreation Area to which there is no other practicable access except through the Recreation Area shall be managed as an inholding.

(2) **USE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—Nothing in this Act affects the ownership, management, or other rights relating to any non-Federal land (including any interest in any non-Federal land).

(3) **BUFFER ZONES.**—Nothing in this Act creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Recreation Area.

(4) **VALID RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act affects any easements, rights-of-way, and other valid rights in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) **WATER RIGHT EXCLUSION.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) shall constitute or be construed to constitute either an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Recreation Area; or

(2) shall affect any water rights existing on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) **HUNTING AND FISHING.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) limits hunting or fishing; or

(2) affects the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the State to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law (including regulations), including the regulation of hunting or fishing on public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(i) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—Except in cases in which motorized vehicles are needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized vehicles on public land in the Recreation Area shall be permitted only on roads, trails, and areas designated by the management plan for the use by motorized vehicles.

(j) **GRAZING.**—In the Recreation Area, the grazing of livestock in areas in which grazing is allowed as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be allowed to continue, consistent with—

(1) this Act;

(2) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(3) any regulations promulgated by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(k) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patenting under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(l) **FEEES.**—Amounts received by the Secretary under the fee structure required by subsection (d)(4) shall be—

(1) deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States; and

(2) made available until expended to the Secretary for use in the Recreation Area.

(m) **RISK STANDARD.**—The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (section 300 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations), published pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605), shall not apply to the Secretary's management of asbestos exposure risks faced by the public when recreating within the Clear Creek Recreation Area described in section 3(b).

SEC. 5. JOAQUIN ROCKS WILDERNESS.

In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 21,000 acres of Federal lands located in Fresno County and San Benito County, California, and generally depicted on a map entitled "Proposed Joaquin Rocks Wilderness" and dated January 14, 2015, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System and shall be known as the "Joaquin Rocks Wilderness".

SEC. 6. RELEASE OF SAN BENITO MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), the San Benito Mountain wilderness study area has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) **RELEASE.**—The San Benito Mountain wilderness study area is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)).

SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION REGARDING FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise

and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1838, the Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act, would reopen an area administratively closed by the Bureau of Land Management to off-highway vehicle and other recreational activities, designate new wilderness, and release a wilderness study area back into multiple use.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1838 establishes the Clear Creek National Recreation Area, as stated before, and the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness Area on land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Central Coast region of California in Fresno County. I am very familiar with this. It used to be in a previous district I represented.

This area has mutual beneficial uses, from hiking and hunting to off-highway vehicle use. Adjacent to this area are areas that have been used for cattle grazing for families for generations. They have worked together to ensure that we can protect those areas for appropriate uses for cattle grazing but also, at the same time, separately provide areas where this hiking and hunting and off-highway vehicle use can take place.

This legislation will improve and enhance the success for a variety of recreational activities, which is what it is intended to, and, at the same time, try to preserve ecological sensitive and unique areas in a way that supports the overall use.

In addition to the many ecological benefits they are providing, including clean air and clean water, wilderness areas throughout the country play a large role in supporting the approximately \$646-billion-per-year outdoor recreational economy. I am pleased that we are advancing a bill that adds 21,000 acres to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Our colleagues in the House have introduced several bills to designate wilderness areas. These bills are developed from the ground up with input and support from our constituents.

This bill, in particular, has been a priority for Congressman FARR for many years. I want to congratulate him for his hard work and tenacity.

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

□ 2030

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the fine gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), one of the Republican cosponsors of this bill. These fine gentleman include all here present. They

worked together on a bipartisan basis for one of the most economically and ecologically versatile places on Earth.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, SAM FARR. Together, we have coauthored a bill that brings two valleys together. We have the Salinas Valley and the Central Valley that come together in this beautiful spot and bring a national forest to what its intended use is—for hikers, for off-roaders, and for people who just want to use the beauty of this park.

This has truly been a bipartisan effort, not only between Republicans and Democrats, but by pulling two valleys together, a number of different Members are wanting to see this area open back up and be utilized by the taxpayers. This is something that is going to provide generations to come an opportunity to spend time together—to off-road together, to hike together, and to even take photographs, which I know my good friend likes to do in areas like this.

I am proud to be a coauthor, and I am proud of the widespread bipartisan support. I am proud to have worked with such a good friend on a fine piece of legislation.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), my good friend from California's Central Coast area.

Mr. FARR. I thank very much Ranking Member COSTA and Chairwoman LUMMIS for their support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is more than what we just talked about, because it is an incredible collaboration of groups that are not necessarily friendly to each other. We have in this sponsorship the Off-Road Vehicle Association and the Native Plant Society. Normally, they would not be on the same legislation. Why did it all happen? It is because we have 60,000 acres that have been shut down for nobody's use. It was a former asbestos surface mining area.

Clear Creek has been a destination for outdoor recreation by off-road vehicle users, hikers, bird and animal enthusiasts, and many others. The area is home to unique habitats of plants and animals that attract visitors, which has helped a low-income rural area economically; but in 2008, the Bureau of Land Management closed the area because of an EPA report that said the naturally occurring asbestos may be dangerous. Without any further thought about assuming risk in the national area, it just closed it all down; but as long as people are aware of the risks and know how to safely enjoy Clear Creek, it is not dangerous at all.

For example, people climb El Capitan, which is, probably, one of the more difficult climbs in America. You make a mistake there and you die, yet the National Park Service allows you to climb it. The risks go on and on. You also see the same with heli-skiing, skydiving, and many other high-risk

activities. Two of my constituents—and they really deserve tremendous credit because they really learned how to petition government—Ed Tobin, who is with the Salinas Ramblers Motorcycle Club, and Ron DeShazer, who is a forklift operator in Salinas and a longtime Clear Creek rider, know about risks. They also know how to recreate safely in Clear Creek. We should learn from them.

Clear Creek's closure not only upset the vast off-road vehicle community, but also the California Native Plant Society, the Sierra Club hikers, and, especially, the local community, which is suffering the economic loss.

This is commonsense legislation that does three things:

First, the bill redesignates the Clear Creek Management Area as the Clear Creek National Recreation Area. This allows it to be used for off-road vehicle recreation, and it requires the Bureau of Land Management to alert all users to the risks and to instruct people to wash off vehicles that may be used on the roads. The wash racks are already in place and have been there for years.

Second, it gives the Bureau of Land Management the authority to levy a recreational user fee and apply the proceeds to the management of the area.

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

Mr. COSTA. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Third, it allows the BLM to enter into joint management agreements with the California State Parks system that manages a nearby off-road vehicle park without asbestos surfaces, known as Hollister Hills.

Fourth, this legislation designates the adjacent Joaquin Rocks landscape as wilderness and five BLM-identified streams as National Wild and Scenic Rivers.

The conservation piece of this legislation protects a diverse array of flora and fauna and several species of wildlife. In addition to falcons, hawks, and owls, the area provides a potential nesting habitat for the California condor, which was reintroduced in the nearby Gabilan Range.

I thank my colleagues JEFF DENHAM and DAVID VALADAO for being tremendous partners and for their leadership in bringing this bill to the House floor today. In working with Representatives DENHAM and VALADAO, their staffs, and many of our constituents in central California, we crafted a bill to support recreation, conservation, and economic growth.

I also thank Chairman BISHOP of the committee and Ranking Member GRIMALVA, subcommittee Chairman MCCLINTOCK and subcommittee Ranking Member TSONGAS for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the legislation, and I also urge the members of the committee to think about this when trying to solve difficult, conflicting problems in that we can bring

all parties of interest together and end up with a win-win.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I think the bipartisan support is here.

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

I express my support for this bill and my thanks to my colleagues from California for their hard work on this bill—on my side of the aisle, Mr. DENHAM and Mr. VALADAO; on the Democratic side, Mr. FARR, with whom I served on the Appropriations Committee and who did a wonderful job, by the way, and Mr. COSTA, with whom I now serve on the Natural Resources Committee. They are fine gentlemen, one and all, from California.

Before I close, I must say I have a unique love for the State. My relative, a gentleman named Charles Fletcher Lummis, walked from Ohio to California—walked—in the 1800s, arrived in Los Angeles, and became the assistant editor of what is now the Los Angeles Times. There were only 14,000 people in Los Angeles, California. His home, El Alisal, which is between Los Angeles and Pasadena, is a State historic site in California and is a wonderful, historic place to visit.

He was the first person to photograph the Penitentes ceremony, where they actually crucified some of their colleagues in a ceremony in New Mexico. He was the American who chronicled the capture of Geronimo. He was knighted by the King of Spain for being the Californian who led the designation of national historic sites for San Juan Capistrano and others of the great missions of southern California before they were destroyed. He was a magnificent, flowery character in the State of California. His friends were people like John Muir, Teddy Roosevelt, and other famous conservationists and preservationists. I am proud to be a relative of Charles Fletcher Lummis.

I am proud of what California has done to balance its efforts in having a uniquely diverse culture and a fabulous agriculture and recreation economy. This is a unique State. This is a State that has pistachios and almonds and vegetables, which we all need to sustain ourselves in a way that will allow America to continue to play a role in feeding itself.

I was involved in an effort to try to make sure, for our own national security, that we would continue to be able to feed ourselves in this Nation, and we thought we were going to be able to feed ourselves until around the year 2050. It has been years ago since we became a net importer of food. That is not necessary. We can grow enough food in America to sustain our population. To allow us to become a net importer of food, I think, is a mistake because we have a magnificent place like California that can outgrow almost any area of our Nation if we will only be respectful and listen to the people who live there and to the people who feed us, whether they are the farm

owners or the farmworkers. These are people who want to work on California and with California so as to feed America, to support their families, and to sustain a fabulous environment.

To the fine gentlemen from California who bring this bill forward and who work so hard every day to try to make sure that these different valleys and these very diverse communities come together, I offer my full support of this bill, and I commend them for their work.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZINKE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1838, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5244) to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5244

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 "Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 12, 1928, the Saint Francis Dam located in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, California, breached, resulting in a devastating flood that caused the death of approximately 425 individuals.

(2) The residents of Santa Clarita Valley, San Francisquito Canyon, Castaic Junction, Santa Clara River Valley, Piru, Fillmore, Bardsdale, Saticoy, and Santa Paula were directly impacted and suffered greatly from the worst flood in the history of the State of California.

(3) The disaster resulted in a tremendous loss of human life, property, and the livelihood of local residents, and was surpassed in the level of destruction in the 20th century only by the great San Francisco earthquake of 1906.

(4) The collapse of the dam may represent America's worst civil engineering failure in the 20th century.

(5) The site of the disaster is subject to the theft of historic artifacts, graffiti, and other vandalism.

(6) It is right to pay homage to the citizens who were killed, injured, or dislocated due to the flood, and to educate the public about this important historical event.

(7) It is appropriate that the site of the Saint Francis Dam and surrounding areas be specially designated and protected to commemorate this tragic event.

SEC. 3. SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MEMORIAL.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary is authorized to establish a memorial at the Saint Francis Dam site in the County of Los Angeles, California, for the purpose of honoring the victims of the Saint Francis Dam disaster of March 12, 1928.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Memorial shall be—

(1) known as the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial; and

(2) managed by the Forest Service.

(c) **DONATIONS.**—The Secretary is authorized to accept, hold, administer, invest, and spend any gift, devise, or bequest of real or personal property made to the Secretary for purposes of developing, designing, constructing, and managing the Memorial.

SEC. 4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MEMORIAL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress recommendations regarding—

(1) the planning, design, construction, and long-term management of the Memorial;

(2) the proposed boundaries of the Memorial;

(3) a visitor center and educational facilities at the Memorial; and

(4) ensuring public access to the Memorial.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In preparing the recommendations required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with—

(1) appropriate Federal agencies;

(2) State, tribal, and local governments, including the Santa Clarita City Council; and

(3) the public.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF SAINT FRANCIS DAM DISASTER NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established as a national monument in the State, certain National Forest System land administered by the Secretary in the County of Los Angeles comprising approximately 440 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument”, created on June 14, 2016, to be known as the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Monument is to conserve and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of the public the cultural, archaeological, historical, watershed, educational, and recreational resources and values of the Monument.

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY WITH RESPECT TO MONUMENT.

(a) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the Monument.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The management plan shall be developed in consultation with—

(A) appropriate Federal agencies;

(B) State, tribal, and local governments; and

(C) the public.

(3) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In developing and implementing the management plan, the Secretary shall, with respect to methods of protecting and providing access to the Monument, consider the recommendations of the Saint Francis Disaster National Memorial Foundation, the Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society, and the Community Hiking Club of Santa Clarita.

(b) **MANAGEMENT.**—The Secretary shall manage the Monument—

(1) in a manner that conserves and enhances the cultural and historic resources of the Monument; and

(2) in accordance with—

(A) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) and the laws generally applicable to the National Forest System;

(B) this Act; and

(C) any other applicable laws.

(c) **USES.**—

(1) **USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—The use of motorized vehicles within the Monument may be permitted only—

(A) on roads designated for use by motorized vehicles in the management plan required under subsection (a);

(B) for administrative purposes; or

(C) for emergency responses.

(2) **GRAZING.**—The Secretary shall permit grazing within the Monument, where established before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations and Executive orders); and

(B) consistent with the purpose described in section 5(b).

SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION ON FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MEMORIAL.**—The term “Memorial” means the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial authorized under section 3(a).

(2) **MONUMENT.**—The term “Monument” means the Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Monument established under section 5(a).

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. **LUMMIS**) and the gentleman from California (Mr. **COSTA**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. **LUMMIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. **LUMMIS**. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. **KNIGHT**), the author of this bill.

Mr. **KNIGHT**. I thank the Speaker for letting us talk about such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, this issue has been bantered about in my district for many years, and we are finally getting recourse whereby we are going to have a memorial for the second largest disaster in California’s history.

It is interesting that this happened about 20 miles from my house, and many people will drive by and not know that the Saint Francis Dam is there. Yet the Saint Francis Dam was

there in 1928, and it killed approximately 437 people, becoming the second largest disaster in California’s history. Entire families were wiped out in the early hours of March 12, 1928, as nearly 12 billion gallons of water flowed down the San Francisquito Canyon, located in my district, all the way to the Pacific Ocean, which is 54 miles away.

The dam was a project by the great William Mulholland, who was best known for creating the L.A. aqueduct system. However, this project of his ended in disaster, and it is one of the biggest civil engineering disasters in our Nation.

Subsequently, the failure of the Saint Francis Dam changed the methods that were used to create new dams and to set new safety standards across the Nation, including the construction of the Hoover Dam. The dam site has remained unprotected and hidden for 88 years and needs to be protected. As well, there needs to be a memorial established for the victims and their families.

My bill, H.R. 5244, seeks to memorialize these people who perished at the site of the Saint Francis Dam, and it creates a 440-acre national monument to preserve the site for educational purposes and to attract visitors.

□ 2045

The remains of the dam are of local and national historical significance and should be protected for the future of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this bill.

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

In one of the worst civil engineering failures of the 20th century, the breach of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, tragically took the lives of over 400 Americans. To honor the memory of those who lost their lives on that fateful day, H.R. 5244 establishes a national memorial at the disaster site in California’s Santa Clarita Valley. This memorial will provide a permanent place of remembrance and healing.

In addition to the memorial, H.R. 5244 also establishes the Saint Francis Dam National Monument on 440 acres of public land that is currently managed by the Forest Service. The national monument designation authorizes the U.S. Forest Service, in consultation with a range of stakeholders, to develop educational programs to improve the health of these regional wetlands.

I want to thank Congressman **KNIGHT** and the Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society for bringing the legacy of the Saint Francis Dam disaster to the attention of the Congress. As we all have heard, those who cannot remember the past are doomed to repeat it. So we need to ensure that we remember the lessons of history that are part of the Saint Francis story.

I also want to thank Mr. **KNIGHT** for his work with the Forest Service to address some of the concerns before the bill was marked up in committee.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT) for his work and leadership on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me to honor the more than 400 individuals who lost their lives nearly 90 years ago by supporting this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5244, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUOLUMNE BAND OF ME-WUK LAND INTO TRUST

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3079) to take certain Federal land located in Tuolumne County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3079

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

SECTION 1. LAND INTO TRUST.

(a) FEDERAL LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest (including improvements and appurtenances) of the United States in and to the Federal land described in subsection (b) shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians for nongaming purposes.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land taken into trust under subsection (a) is the approximately 80 acres of Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service, located in Tuolumne County, California, and described as follows:

(1) Southwest 1/4 of Southwest 1/4 of Section 2, Township 1 North, Range 16 East.

(2) Northeast 1/4 of Northwest 1/4 of Section 11, Township 1 North, Range 16 East of the Mount Diablo Meridian.

(c) GAMING.—Class II and class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)) shall not be permitted at any time on the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), the author of this bill, the chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee, a committee on which I serve.

I want to salute the fine work during this Congress and previous Congresses of the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, although I am still very angry at her for her decision to retire from the House at the end of this term. I don't think anyone blames her for wanting to deprive herself of the pleasure of our company, but I do blame her very much for depriving all of us of the pleasure of her company. She will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3079 would transfer two 40-acre parcels owned by the Forest Service to the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians. These parcels are landlocked Forest Service property that are caught between a private property owner to the north and east, and tribally owned lands to the south and west that are currently in the process of being converted from fee to trust.

These new parcels would be added to the tribe's existing tribal conservation area and would be forbidden from being used for gaming.

This bill has the full support of the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors, the elected land use agency in this jurisdiction. The private property owner whose lands abuts this parcel also supports the transfer. Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senators Feinstein and Boxer.

The Federal Lands Subcommittee has held extensive hearings into the maintenance backlog of U.S. Forest Service properties and the horrific fire danger posed by these overgrown Federal lands. Acreage in the Sierra now typically carries four times the timber density that the land can support. This region has been devastated by forest fires in the past decade because the Federal lands have been so badly neglected. The land in question is designated as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The tribal chairman testified that the Forest Service has done no thinning of these parcels throughout his lifetime.

Now, in my district that spans the Sierra Nevada, forest fires have utterly destroyed more than 1,000 square miles of forest in just the last 3 years. The Rim Fire, the largest in the history of the Sierra and one of the largest in the history of the State, came within just a few miles of this parcel.

When I visited the command center at the Rough Fire just south of

Tuolumne in August, the beleaguered firefighters begged me to carry back one message to Congress: that forest treatment matters. Where the fire ran into treated acreage, it slowed enough to extinguish, but there just wasn't enough of it. So that fire burned for more than 10 weeks and destroyed 151,000 acres of forest land.

By adding these parcels to the existing tribal conservation area, we ensure that this acreage will be properly maintained, which means additional fire protection for the region. It will add 80 acres of properly managed and maintained forest land where excess timber can be carried out before it burns out. And in association with the tribe's other conservation work, that just could make the difference in stopping or slowing the next catastrophic fire in the region. It is, at least, a start.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time, and I thank the House for hearing this bill today and ask for its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Tuolumne Band of the Me-Wuk Indians of the Tuolumne Rancheria is seeking a transfer of the two parcels that have been mentioned from the U.S. Forest Service land to the Department of the Interior to be held in trust for the tribe. These two parcels, which represent a combined total of about 80 acres, are both undeveloped and they are landlocked.

The parcels are located in an area of great cultural and historical significance to the tribe and are contiguous to lands the tribe currently owns in fee simple, known simply as the Murphy Ranch.

When the tribe inquired about the status of these parcels, the local U.S. Forest Service staff confirmed that there are no current or future uses to the U.S. Forest Service or any other Federal agency.

The tribe would like to make these existing two parcels a part of their Murphy Ranch Conservation Area, which was established to protect the environment, wildlife, and the natural beauty of the area, and also, as Congressman McCLINTOCK noted, to provide additional fire protection, which is absolutely essential.

We, as a result of 4 devastatingly dry years, combined with the bark beetle, have a tinderbox of extreme fire conditions that we are dealing with in California. Some of you have noted the fires that have taken place already in other Western States.

So fire protection is a part of the concern of this effort, and I feel very strongly that we need to do everything we can to improve the Forest Service's ability to manage our forest lands. Frankly, we are spending all the money that we do give to the Forest Service to put out fires and, therefore, it only makes matters worse because we are not doing the kind of work we ought to be doing in managing the forests.

So I want to commend the tribe for working with the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors and the Edward Ingalls Trust to mitigate any other concerns that the land transfer might have had.

Of course, Congressman MCCLINTOCK has been tenacious in working with all the parties to try to bring this legislation to the floor for swift adoption, and I want to commend his efforts.

We have no further speakers, and I think it would be appropriate that I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) for all her good work. I, too, will be one of those who will miss her presence, her active engagement, and her constructive efforts to try to find bipartisan solutions to the challenges we face here in Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3079. The tribe intends to incorporate the 80 acres into what is commonly referred to as the “Murphy Ranch,” as the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) just indicated, and to designate the land as part of the tribe’s 2013 permanent conservation area.

Once again, we have Californians coming together in a bipartisan way to do the right thing for their State. Nobody knows better than the people of their own State how best to manage their State.

I think this evening’s debates are an example of people coming together to do the right thing on a bipartisan basis for their State. This is how Congress should work. This is how Congress can work.

Mr. Speaker, I want to salute my colleague, chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee, Mr. TOM MCCLINTOCK, for all of his important work on this piece of legislation and other pieces of legislation. As I leave Congress, I am delighted to entrust the future of this Nation’s lands and water and air to the gentleman with whom I have been having these conversations tonight and debating these very bipartisan bills, practical commonsense approaches, just what the American people want to see more of in this Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3079, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES SEMIQUINCEN- TENNIAL COMMISSION ACT OF 2016

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4875) to establish the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4875

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 “United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that July 4, 2026, the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States, as marked by the Declaration of Independence in 1776, and the historic events preceding that anniversary—

(1) are of major significance in the development of the national heritage of the United States of individual liberty, representative government, and the attainment of equal and inalienable rights; and

(2) have had a profound influence throughout the world.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to establish a Commission to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States and related events through local, State, national, and international activities planned, encouraged, developed, and coordinated by a national commission representative of appropriate public and private authorities and organizations.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the United States Semiquincentennial Commission established by section 4(a).

(2) PRIVATE CITIZEN.—The term “private citizen” means an individual who is not an officer or employee of—

(A) the Federal Government; or

(B) a State or local government.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission, to be known as the “United States Semiquincentennial Commission”, to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of the history of the United States leading up to the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) 4 members of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate; and

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) 4 members of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) 16 members who are private citizens, of whom—

(A) 4 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(B) 4 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(C) 4 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(D) 4 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives; and

(E) 1 of whom shall be designated by the President as the Chairperson.

(4) The following nonvoting ex officio members:

(A) The Secretary.

(B) The Secretary of State.

(C) The Attorney General.

(D) The Secretary of Defense.

(E) The Secretary of Education.

(F) The Librarian of Congress.

(G) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

(H) The Archivist of the United States.

(I) The presiding officer of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities.

(c) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(1) TERM.—A member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(2) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission—

(A) shall not affect the powers of the Commission; and

(B) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(d) MEETINGS.—All meetings of the Commission shall be convened at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to honor the historical significance of the building as the site of deliberations and adoption of both the United States Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

(e) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

SEC. 5. DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(1) prepare an overall program for commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States and the historic events preceding that anniversary; and

(2) plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded, and are associated with, the United States Semiquincentennial.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In preparing plans and an overall program, the Commission—

(A) shall give due consideration to any related plans and programs developed by State, local, and private groups; and

(B) may designate special committees with representatives from groups described in subparagraph (A) to plan, develop, and coordinate specific activities.

(2) EMPHASIS.—The Commission shall—

(A) emphasize the planning of events in locations of historical significance to the United States, especially in those locations that witnessed the assertion of American liberty, such as—

(i) the 13 colonies; and

(ii) leading cities, including Boston, Charleston, New York City, and Philadelphia; and

(B) give special emphasis to—

(i) the role of persons and locations with significant impact on the history of the United States during the 250-year period beginning on the date of execution of the Declaration of Independence; and

(ii) the ideas associated with that history, which have been so important in the development of the United States, in world affairs, and in the quest for freedom of all mankind.

(3) INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Commission shall—

(A) evaluate existing infrastructure;

(B) include in the report required under subsection (c) recommendations for what infrastructure should be in place for the successful undertaking of an appropriate celebration in accordance with this Act; and

(C) coordinate with State and local bodies to make necessary infrastructure improvements.

(c) REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President a

comprehensive report that includes the specific recommendations of the Commission for the commemoration of the 250th anniversary and related events.

(2) **RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES.**—The report may include recommended activities such as—

(A) the production, publication, and distribution of books, pamphlets, films, and other educational materials focusing on the history, culture, and political thought of the period of the American Revolution;

(B) bibliographical and documentary projects and publications;

(C) conferences, convocations, lectures, seminars, and other programs, especially those located in the 13 colonies, including the major cities and buildings of national historical significance of the 13 colonies;

(D) the development of libraries, museums, historic sites, and exhibits, including mobile exhibits;

(E) ceremonies and celebrations commemorating specific events, such as—

(i) the signing of the Declaration of Independence;

(ii) programs and activities focusing on the national and international significance of the United States Semiquincentennial; and

(iii) the implications of the Semiquincentennial for present and future generations; and

(F) encouraging Federal agencies to integrate the celebration of the Semiquincentennial into the regular activities and execution of the purpose of the agencies through such activities as the issuance of coins, medals, certificates of recognition, stamps, and the naming of vessels.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The report shall include—

(A) the recommendations of the Commission for the allocation of financial and administrative responsibility among the public and private authorities and organizations recommended for participation by the Commission; and

(B) proposals for such legislative enactments and administrative actions as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the recommendations.

(d) **REPORT SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS.**—The President shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(1) the complete report of the Commission; and

(2) such comments and recommendations for legislation and such a description of administrative actions taken by the President as the President considers appropriate.

(e) **POINT OF CONTACT.**—The Commission, acting through the secretariat of the Commission described in section 9(b), shall serve as the point of contact of the Federal Government for all State, local, international, and private sector initiatives regarding the Semiquincentennial of the founding of the United States, with the purpose of coordinating and facilitating all fitting and proper activities honoring the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States.

SEC. 6. COORDINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this Act, the Commission shall consult and cooperate with, and seek advice and assistance from, appropriate Federal agencies, State and local public bodies, learned societies, and historical, patriotic, philanthropic, civic, professional, and related organizations.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITY OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Commission in planning, encouraging, developing, and coordinating appropriate commemorative activities.

(2) **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall undertake a study of appropriate actions that

might be taken to further preserve and develop historic sites and battlefields, at such time and in such manner as will ensure that fitting observances and exhibits may be held at appropriate sites and battlefields during the 250th anniversary celebration.

(B) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the Commission a report that contains the results of the study and the recommendations of the Secretary, in time to afford the Commission an opportunity—

(i) to review the study; and

(ii) to incorporate in the report described in section 5(c) such findings and recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate.

(3) **ARTS AND HUMANITIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The presiding officer of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities shall cooperate with the Commission, especially in the encouragement and coordination of scholarly works and artistic expressions focusing on the history, culture, and political thought of the period predating the United States Semiquincentennial.

(B) **LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, AND ARCHIVES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States shall cooperate with the Commission, especially in the development and display of exhibits and collections and in the development of bibliographies, catalogs, and other materials relevant to the period predating the United States Semiquincentennial.

(ii) **LOCATION.**—To the maximum extent practicable, displays described in subparagraph (A) shall be located in, or in facilities near to, buildings of historical significance to the American Revolution, so as to promote greater public awareness of the heritage of the United States.

(C) **SUBMISSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Each of the officers described in this paragraph shall submit to the Commission a report containing recommendations in time to afford the Commission an opportunity—

(i) to review the reports; and

(ii) to incorporate in the report described in section 5(c) such findings and recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate.

(4) **DEPARTMENT OF STATE.**—The Secretary of State shall coordinate the participation of foreign nations in the celebration of the United States Semiquincentennial, including by soliciting the erection of monuments and other cultural cooperations in founding cities of the United States so as—

(A) to celebrate the shared heritage of the United States with the many peoples and nations of the world; and

(B) to provide liaison and encouragement for the erection of international pavilions to showcase the spread of democratic institutions abroad in the period following the American Revolution.

SEC. 7. POWERS.

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Commission may hold such hearings, meet and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out this Act.

(b) **INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may secure directly from a Federal agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this Act.

(2) **PROVISION OF INFORMATION.**—On request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of the agency shall provide the information to the Commission.

(c) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) **GIFTS.**—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of money, property, or personal services.

(e) **ADDITIONAL POWERS.**—As determined necessary by the Commission, the Commission may—

(1) procure supplies, services, and property;

(2) make contracts;

(3) expend in furtherance of this Act funds donated or received in pursuance of contracts entered into under this Act; and

(4) take such actions as are necessary to enable the Commission to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this Act.

(f) **USE OF MATERIALS.**—

(1) **TIME CAPSULE.**—A representative portion of all books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other materials relating to the United States Semiquincentennial shall be deposited in a time capsule—

(A) to be buried in Independence Mall, Philadelphia, on July 4, 2026; and

(B) to be unearthed on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the United States of America on July 4, 2276.

(2) **OTHER MATERIALS.**—All other books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other materials relating to the United States Semiquincentennial, whether donated to the Commission or collected by the Commission, may be deposited for preservation in national, State, or local libraries or museums or be otherwise disposed of by the Commission, in consultation with the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Archivist of the United States, and the Administrator of General Services.

(g) **PROPERTY.**—Any property acquired by the Commission remaining on termination of the Commission may be—

(1) used by the Secretary for purposes of the National Park Service; or

(2) disposed of as excess or surplus property.

SEC. 8. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) **COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.**—The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for service on the Commission.

(b) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—A member of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(c) **STAFF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws (including regulations), appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as are necessary to enable the Commission to perform the duties of the Commission.

(2) **CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(3) **COMPENSATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Chairperson of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates.

(B) **MAXIMUM RATE OF PAY.**—The rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel shall not exceed the rate payable for

level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) **DETAIL OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An employee of the Federal Government may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement.

(2) **CIVIL SERVICE STATUS.**—The detail of the employee shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(e) **PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.**—The Chairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals that do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of that title.

(f) **ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—The Commission may appoint such advisory committees as the Commission determines necessary.

SEC. 9. EXPENDITURES OF COMMISSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All expenditures of the Commission shall be made solely from donated funds.

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARIAT.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall, through a competitive process, seek to enter into an arrangement with a nonprofit organization, the mission of which is consistent with the purpose of this Act. Under such arrangement, such nonprofit organization shall—

(1) serve as the secretariat of the Commission, including by serving as the point of contact under section 5(e);

(2) house the administrative offices of the Commission;

(3) assume responsibility for funds of the Commission; and

(4) provide to the Commission financial and administrative services, including services related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement.

(c) **PAYMENT FOR FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), payment for services provided under subsection (b)(4) shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed on by the Chairperson of the Commission and the secretariat of the Commission.

(2) **RELATIONSHIP TO REGULATIONS.**—

(A) **ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS.**—The regulations under section 5514 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to, or on behalf of, a Commission employee.

(B) **NO PROMULGATION BY COMMISSION.**—The Commission shall not be required to prescribe any regulations relating to the matters described in subparagraph (A).

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Once each year during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2027, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended during the year covered by the report.

SEC. 10. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate on December 31, 2027.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4875, as introduced by Congressman PATRICK MEEHAN of Pennsylvania.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) to talk about this bill.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin, once said that “by failing to prepare, you are preparing to fail.”

H.R. 4875, the United States Semiquincentennial Act of 2016 establishes a commission to facilitate the national plans leading up to America’s 250th birthday on July 4, 2026. This is the same process that was used in planning for the bicentennial celebrations all across the Nation in 1976.

There is much to do, so we are following Ben Franklin’s advice here and starting the planning 10 years ahead of what should be an historic celebration.

To develop these plans, the 32-member body of private citizens and public officials will meet in historic Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the very place where our new Nation was declared. Within 2 years of its formation, the commission is charged with reporting recommendations on plans to the President and to Congress. Importantly, this legislation does not appropriate any funds toward the commission activities. The commission will rely solely on generous donations from private citizens.

□ 2100

While the United States was founded in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the commission will not be limited to planning events just in our great city. H.R. 4875 encourages the commission to develop event plans at sites of historical significance, at battlefields and important locations all across the Nation that will truly celebrate the birth of the United States of America.

I want to thank my colleague BOB BRADY for his leadership and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for their work on the measure.

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4875, the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016. The bill, as we just heard, was introduced in the House by my colleague and friend, Representative PATRICK MEEHAN, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Yesterday in my district, in Philadelphia, like all of the districts around the country, we were proudly cele-

brating the 240th birthday of the United States. On July 4, 2026, we will be celebrating the 250th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of our country.

H.R. 4875 would establish a commission to plan, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of this important anniversary across the country. The commission’s events would highlight locations of historical significance, including key cities such as Boston, Charleston, New York, and of course the Nation’s birthplace of Philadelphia, my hometown.

The commission would also emphasize the roles of individuals who have made significant impacts on American history.

Under this legislation, the Department of the Interior would be required to study and report on actions to further the preservation of historic sites and develop fitting commemoration exhibits.

Other Federal agencies would coordinate the development of scholarly works on, and artistic expressions of, American history, culture, and political thought; and the Secretary of State would facilitate the participation of foreign countries in the celebration.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to begin the planning of this special event only a decade away. I urge Members to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the passage of H.R. 4875. I appreciate the good work of Mr. MEEHAN, who helped champion this through in a bipartisan way. I appreciate Mr. BOYLE and his passion on this issue as well.

All Americans are grateful for this Nation. And certainly celebrating its history is appropriate. I urge the passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4875, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

400 YEARS OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY COMMISSION ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4539) to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4539

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 “400 Years of African-American History Commission Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COMMEMORATION.**—The term “commemoration” means the commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the arrival of Africans in the English colonies, at Point Comfort, Virginia, in 1619.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the 400 Years of African-American History Commission established by section 3(a).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established a commission, to be known as the “400 Years of African-American History Commission”.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—The Commission shall be composed of 15 members, of whom—

(A) 3 members shall be appointed by the Secretary after considering recommendations of Governors, including the Governor of Virginia;

(B) 6 members shall be appointed by the Secretary after considering recommendations of civil rights organizations and historical organizations;

(C) 1 member shall be an employee of the National Park Service having experience relative to the historical and cultural resources related to the commemoration, to be appointed by the Secretary;

(D) 2 members shall be appointed by the Secretary after considering the recommendations of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; and

(E) 3 members shall be individuals who have an interest in, support for, and expertise appropriate to the commemoration, appointed by the Secretary after considering the recommendations of Members of Congress.

(2) **TIME OF APPOINTMENT.**—Each appointment of an initial member of the Commission shall be made before the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **TERM; VACANCIES.**—

(A) **TERM.**—A member of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(B) **VACANCIES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(ii) **PARTIAL TERM.**—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Commission shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of the member was appointed.

(C) **CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.**—If a member of the Commission was appointed to the Commission as an employee of the National Park Service, and ceases to be an employee of the National Park Service, that member may continue to serve on the Commission for not longer than the 30-day period beginning on the date on which that member ceases to be an employee of the National Park Service.

(c) **DUTIES.**—The Commission shall—

(1) plan, develop, and carry out programs and activities throughout the United States—

(A) appropriate for the commemoration;

(B) to recognize and highlight the resilience and contributions of African-Americans since 1619;

(C) to acknowledge the impact that slavery and laws that enforced racial discrimination had on the United States; and

(D) to educate the public about—

(i) the arrival of Africans in the United States; and

(ii) the contributions of African-Americans to the United States;

(2) encourage civic, patriotic, historical, educational, artistic, religious, economic, and other organizations throughout the United States to organize and participate in anniversary activities to expand understanding and appreciation of—

(A) the significance of the arrival of Africans in the United States; and

(B) the contributions of African-Americans to the United States;

(3) provide technical assistance to States, localities, and nonprofit organizations to further the commemoration;

(4) coordinate and facilitate for the public scholarly research on, publication about, and interpretation of—

(A) the arrival of Africans in the United States; and

(B) the contributions of African-Americans to the United States;

(5) ensure that the commemoration provides a lasting legacy and long-term public benefit by assisting in the development of appropriate programs; and

(6) help ensure that the observances of the commemoration are inclusive and appropriately recognize the experiences and heritage of all individuals present at the arrival of Africans in the United States.

SEC. 4. COMMISSION MEETINGS.

(a) **INITIAL MEETING.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold the initial meeting of the Commission.

(b) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet—

(1) at least 3 times each year; or

(2) at the call of the Chairperson or the majority of the members of the Commission.

(c) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold meetings.

(d) **CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.**—

(1) **ELECTION.**—The Commission shall elect the Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson of the Commission on an annual basis.

(2) **ABSENCE OF THE CHAIRPERSON.**—The Vice Chairperson shall serve as the Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson.

(e) **VOTING.**—The Commission shall act only on an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Commission.

SEC. 5. COMMISSION POWERS.

(a) **GIFTS.**—The Commission may solicit, accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of money or other property for aiding or facilitating the work of the Commission.

(b) **APPOINTMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—The Commission may appoint such advisory committees as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out this Act.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF ACTION.**—The Commission may authorize any member or employee of the Commission to take any action that the Commission is authorized to take under this Act.

(d) **PROCUREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may procure supplies, services, and property, and make or enter into contracts, leases, or other legal agreements, to carry out this Act (except that a contract, lease, or other legal agreement made or entered into by the Commission shall not extend beyond the date of termination of the Commission).

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The Commission may not purchase real property.

(e) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(f) **GRANTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Commission may—

(1) provide grants in amounts not to exceed \$20,000 per grant to communities and nonprofit organizations for use in developing programs to assist in the commemoration;

(2) provide grants to research and scholarly organizations to research, publish, or distribute information relating to the arrival of Africans in the United States; and

(3) provide technical assistance to States, localities, and nonprofit organizations to further the commemoration.

SEC. 6. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) **COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(2) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—A member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall serve without compensation other than the compensation received for the services of the member as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(b) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—A member of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(c) **DIRECTOR AND STAFF.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws (including regulations), nominate an executive director to enable the Commission to perform the duties of the Commission.

(2) **CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.**—The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(d) **COMPENSATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates.

(2) **MAXIMUM RATE OF PAY.**—The rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel shall not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) **DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—

(A) **DETAIL.**—At the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this Act.

(B) **CIVIL SERVICE STATUS.**—The detail of an employee under subparagraph (A) shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(2) **STATE EMPLOYEES.**—The Commission may—

(A) accept the services of personnel detailed from the State; and

(B) reimburse the State for services of detailed personnel.

(f) **PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.**—The Chairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services in accordance with section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals that do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(g) **VOLUNTEER AND UNCOMPENSATED SERVICES.**—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title

31, United States Code, the Commission may accept and use such voluntary and uncompensated services as the Commission determines to be necessary.

(h) SUPPORT SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT.—Any reimbursement under this paragraph shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account used for paying the amounts reimbursed.

(i) NO EFFECT ON AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section supersedes the authority of the National Park Service with respect to the commemoration.

SEC. 7. PLANS; REPORTS.

(a) STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Commission shall prepare a strategic plan for the activities of the Commission carried out under this Act.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than July 1, 2020, the Commission shall complete and submit to Congress a final report that contains—

(1) a summary of the activities of the Commission;

(2) a final accounting of funds received and expended by the Commission; and

(3) the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

SEC. 8. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

(a) DATE OF TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate on July 1, 2020.

(b) TRANSFER OF DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS.—Before the date of termination specified in subsection (a), the Commission shall transfer all documents and materials of the Commission to the National Archives or another appropriate Federal entity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4539, introduced by Congressman BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia.

In 1619, the first people from Africa arrived at the English colonies in Point Comfort, Virginia. To highlight the significant history and cultural impact of the 400th anniversary of the first Africans to arrive at Point Comfort, this bill creates a commission to plan and carry out commemorative activities.

The Commission's membership will be comprised of members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior after considering recommendations of civil rights and historical organizations: the secretary of the Smithsonian, Members of Congress, and Governors from across the country.

Under the bill, the commission will plan, develop, and carry out programs

and activities to recognize and highlight the resilience and contributions of African Americans since 1619 and to acknowledge the impact that slavery and laws that enforced racial discrimination had on the United States.

The bill will also coordinate and facilitate for the public scholarly research on the arrival of Africans in the United States and the contributions of African Americans throughout our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 4539.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to speak on this resolution, but we are very privileged to have its author right here with us. So I will yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4539. The 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act was introduced earlier in the Senate by Senators TIM KAINE and MARK WARNER, and I was proud to introduce the House version with the support of Representatives Rigell, Butterfield, Forbes, Beyer, Wittman, Lewis, and many others.

I would like to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for their assistance in bringing the bill to the floor today.

This bill would establish a commission to begin planning programs and activities across the Nation to recognize the many contributions of African Americans since the first arrival of Africans in the English colonies at Point Comfort, Virginia, in 1619.

African Americans have contributed greatly to our Nation, and their achievements deserve to be celebrated. The history of Virginia and our Nation cannot be fully understood without recognizing the role played by the slave trade.

Slavery was an abhorrent institution; but for hundreds of years, it was the foundation of the colonial and early American agricultural system and was essential to its economic sustainability. The 20 Africans who arrived at Point Comfort, Virginia, in Hampton, Virginia, in 1619 were the first on record to be forcibly settled as involuntary laborers in the English colonies.

The 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act will be instrumental in recognizing and highlighting the resilience and contributions of African Americans since 1619. From slavery, to fighting in the Civil War, to working against the oppression of Jim Crow segregation, to the civil rights movement, the rich history of African Americans and their contributions to our Nation began hundreds of years ago but obviously does not end there.

The commission established by this bill will be charged with the important task of planning, developing, and implementing a series of programs and activities throughout 2019 to fully tell the story of African Americans, their contributions, and their resilience over the last 400 years and even earlier, as Africans were brought to North America by the Spanish more than a century earlier.

The efforts of this 15-member commission, which will include historical experts and not politicians, will ensure that the legacy of those Africans in colonial America, along with other African American leaders whose contributions have helped move our Nation forward, are recognized appropriately.

It would be a great disservice not only to African Americans but all Americans if we failed to appropriately recognize this important upcoming milestone in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for their leadership in this effort. And I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I thank the manager for his leadership, the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. And let me also thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the original sponsor of this bill, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

I cannot think of a more important statement and act on the vast expanse of African American history. The 400 Years of African-American History Commission Act, as has been offered by Mr. SCOTT, is giving one of the most authoritative and widely needed reviews of African American history. It is extensive; it is detailed; and it is distinct.

Specifically, I come from the region called Texas and the Gulf States. In particular, as relates to the Emancipation Proclamation, we commemorate something called Juneteenth. That means that in 1863, we did not get the word that President Lincoln had freed the slaves. It came in 1865 when General Granger landed on the shores of Galveston. So we have this phenomenon called Juneteenth. It may not be an idea or a commemoration that is known all over.

And then, of course, the early stages of slavery. The vast differences in the regions on how slaves were held, the many places where African Americans participated in war and peace that may not be known, the science and scientific research that we have evidenced beyond the likes of Dr. George Washington Carver or the debate between

W.E.B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington on the pathways of African Americans. Certainly, we are well aware of the civil rights movement. Many believe they know their current history, but there are so many different nuances. And I imagine the commission of this particular legislation, this commission would go even far more deeply into African American history.

So let me say that this is a very important legislative initiative. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for bringing it forward. And I will say that if this is signed by the President, America will be better for knowing the history of all people, and this commission will certainly be part of telling that very detailed, diverse, and different story of African Americans in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask support of the bill.

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank my colleagues for bearing with me while I am a little hoarse in doing this duty here tonight. I had a little bit too much screaming at our 4th of July festivities and parades in Philadelphia and Montgomery County yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I really admire—and I am not sure if it was done intentionally this way—the wisdom of the chairman and those who scheduled these two resolutions coming in tandem because I think they are both important, and I am enthusiastic about both of them.

It is impossible to tell the story of the United States of America without the enormous contributions and resilience shown by those who are the descendants of slaves who were brought here to our shores against their will.

I am, like many of us, the descendant of immigrants who came here willingly. Though they came here with nothing, at least they came here willingly. And of course that does not represent the entire American experience.

So I think that this is an important resolution. I commend my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) as well as Senators TIM Kaine and MARK WARNER for their championing of it. I am proud to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, again, let me echo the wide bipartisan support in favor of this bill.

I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank Mr. BOYLE for his support in championing this through with our committee. And I particularly want to thank BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia, his representation of that area and is a pivotal voice in bringing this bill forward. I am glad to be supportive of this bill, and I would urge my colleagues to also support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4539, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2115

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1252) to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1252

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 “Global Food Security Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (referred to in this section as the “FAO”), 805,000,000 people worldwide suffer from chronic hunger. Hunger and malnutrition rob people of health and productive lives and stunt the mental and physical development of future generations.

(2) According to the January 2014 “Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community”—

(A) the “[l]ack of adequate food will be a destabilizing factor in countries important to US national security that do not have the financial or technical abilities to solve their internal food security problems”; and

(B) “[f]ood and nutrition insecurity in weakly governed countries might also provide opportunities for insurgent groups to capitalize on poor conditions, exploit international food aid, and discredit governments for their inability to address basic needs”.

(3) A comprehensive approach to sustainable food and nutrition security should not only respond to emergency food shortages, but should also address malnutrition, resilience to food and nutrition insecurity, building the capacity of poor, rural populations to improve their agricultural productivity and incomes, removing institutional impediments to agricultural development, value chain access and efficiency, including processing and storage, enhancing agribusiness development, access to markets and activities that address the specific needs and barriers facing women and small-scale producers, education, and collaborative research.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY OBJECTIVES; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY OBJECTIVES.—It is in the national interest of the United

States to promote global food security, resilience, and nutrition, consistent with national food security investment plans, which is reinforced through programs, activities, and initiatives that—

(1) place food insecure countries on a path toward self-sufficiency and economic freedom through the coordination of United States foreign assistance programs;

(2) accelerate inclusive, agricultural-led economic growth that reduces global poverty, hunger, and malnutrition, particularly among women and children;

(3) increase the productivity, incomes, and livelihoods of small-scale producers, especially women, by working across agricultural value chains, enhancing local capacity to manage agricultural resources effectively and expanding producer access to local and international markets;

(4) build resilience to food shocks among vulnerable populations and households while reducing reliance upon emergency food assistance;

(5) create an enabling environment for agricultural growth and investment, including through the promotion of secure and transparent property rights;

(6) improve the nutritional status of women and children, with a focus on reducing child stunting, including through the promotion of highly nutritious foods, diet diversification, and nutritional behaviors that improve maternal and child health;

(7) demonstrably meet, align with and leverage broader United States strategies and investments in trade, economic growth, national security, science and technology, agriculture research and extension, maternal and child health, nutrition, and water, sanitation, and hygiene;

(8) continue to strengthen partnerships between United States-based universities, including land-grant colleges, and universities and institutions in target countries and communities that build agricultural capacity; and

(9) ensure the effective use of United States taxpayer dollars to further these objectives.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President, in providing assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy, should—

(1) coordinate, through a whole-of-government approach, the efforts of relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the Global Food Security Strategy;

(2) seek to fully utilize the unique capabilities of each relevant Federal department and agency while collaborating with and leveraging the contributions of other key stakeholders; and

(3) utilize open and streamlined solicitations to allow for the participation of a wide range of implementing partners through the most appropriate procurement mechanisms, which may include grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other instruments as necessary and appropriate.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **FEED THE FUTURE INNOVATION LABS.**—The term “Feed the Future Innovation Labs” means research partnerships led by United States universities that advance solutions to reduce global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition.

(3) **FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY.**—The term “food and nutrition security” means access to, and availability, utilization, and stability of, sufficient food to meet caloric and nutritional needs for an active and healthy life.

(4) **GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY.**—The term “Global Food Security Strategy” means the strategy developed and implemented pursuant to section 5(a).

(5) **KEY STAKEHOLDERS.**—The term “key stakeholders” means actors engaged in efforts to advance global food security programs and objectives, including—

(A) relevant Federal departments and agencies;

(B) national and local governments in target countries;

(C) other bilateral donors;

(D) international and regional organizations;

(E) international, regional, and local financial institutions;

(F) international, regional, and local private voluntary, nongovernmental, faith-based, and civil society organizations;

(G) the private sector, including agribusinesses and relevant commodities groups;

(H) agricultural producers, including farmer organizations, cooperatives, small-scale producers, and women; and

(I) agricultural research and academic institutions, including land-grant universities and extension services.

(6) **MALNUTRITION.**—The term “malnutrition” means poor nutritional status caused by nutritional deficiency or excess.

(7) **RELEVANT FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—The term “relevant Federal departments and agencies” means the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Peace Corps, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the United States African Development Foundation, the United States Geological Survey, and any other department or agency specified by the President for purposes of this section.

(8) **RESILIENCE.**—The term “resilience” means the ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses to food security in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.

(9) **SMALL-SCALE PRODUCER.**—The term “small-scale producer” means farmers, pastoralists, foresters, and fishers that have a low asset base and limited resources, including land, capital, skills and labor, and, in the case of farmers, typically farm on fewer than 5 hectares of land.

(10) **STUNTING.**—The term “stunting” refers to a condition that—

(A) is measured by a height-to-age ratio that is more than 2 standard deviations below the median for the population;

(B) manifests in children who are younger than 2 years of age;

(C) is a process that can continue in children after they reach 2 years of age, resulting in an individual being “stunted”;

(D) is a sign of chronic malnutrition; and

(E) can lead to long-term poor health, delayed motor development, impaired cognitive function, and decreased immunity.

(11) **SUSTAINABLE.**—The term “sustainable” means the ability of a target country, com-

munity, implementing partner, or intended beneficiary to maintain, over time, the programs authorized and outcomes achieved pursuant to this Act.

(12) **TARGET COUNTRY.**—The term “target country” means a developing country that is selected to participate in agriculture and nutrition security programs under the Global Food Security Strategy pursuant to the selection criteria described in section 5(a)(2), including criteria such as the potential for agriculture-led economic growth, government commitment to agricultural investment and policy reform, opportunities for partnerships and regional synergies, the level of need, and resource availability.

SEC. 5. COMPREHENSIVE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY.

(a) **STRATEGY.**—The President shall coordinate the development and implementation of a United States whole-of-government strategy to accomplish the policy objectives set forth in section 3(a), which shall—

(1) set specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, timetables, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans that reflect international best practices relating to transparency, accountability, food and nutrition security, and agriculture-led economic growth, consistent with the policy objectives described in section 3(a);

(2) establish clear and transparent selection criteria for target countries, communities, regions, and intended beneficiaries of assistance;

(3) describe the methodology and criteria for the selection of target countries;

(4) support and be aligned with country-owned agriculture, nutrition, and food security policy and investment plans developed with input from key stakeholders, as appropriate;

(5) support inclusive agricultural value chain development, with small-scale producers, especially women, gaining greater access to the inputs, skills, resource management capacity, networking, bargaining power, financing, and market linkages needed to sustain their long-term economic prosperity;

(6) support improvement of the nutritional status of women and children, particularly during the critical first 1,000-day window until a child reaches 2 years of age and with a focus on reducing child stunting, through nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programs, including related water, sanitation, and hygiene programs;

(7) facilitate communication and collaboration, as appropriate, among local stakeholders in support of a multi-sectoral approach to food and nutrition security, to include analysis of the multiple underlying causes of malnutrition, including lack of access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene;

(8) support the long-term success of programs by building the capacity of local organizations and institutions in target countries and communities;

(9) integrate resilience and nutrition strategies into food security programs, such that chronically vulnerable populations are better able to build safety nets, secure livelihoods, access markets, and access opportunities for longer-term economic growth;

(10) develop community and producer resilience to natural disasters, emergencies, and natural occurrences that adversely impact agricultural yield;

(11) harness science, technology, and innovation, including the research and extension activities supported by relevant Federal Departments and agencies and Feed the Future Innovation Labs, or any successor entities;

(12) integrate agricultural development activities among food insecure populations liv-

ing in proximity to designated national parks or wildlife areas into wildlife conservation efforts, as necessary and appropriate;

(13) leverage resources and expertise through partnerships with the private sector, farm organizations, cooperatives, civil society, faith-based organizations, and agricultural research and academic institutions;

(14) strengthen and expand collaboration between United States universities, including public, private, and land-grant universities, with higher education institutions in target countries to increase their effectiveness and relevance to promote agricultural development and innovation through the creation of human capital, innovation, and cutting edge science in the agricultural sector;

(15) seek to ensure that target countries and communities respect and promote land tenure rights of local communities, particularly those of women and small-scale producers;

(16) include criteria and methodologies for graduating target countries and communities from assistance provided to implement the Global Food Security Strategy as such countries and communities meet the progress benchmarks identified pursuant to section 8(b)(4); and

(17) demonstrably support the United States national security and economic interest in the countries where assistance is being provided.

(b) **COORDINATION.**—The President shall coordinate, through a whole-of-government approach, the efforts of relevant Federal departments and agencies in the implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy by—

(1) establishing monitoring and evaluation systems, coherence, and coordination across relevant Federal departments and agencies;

(2) establishing linkages with other initiatives and strategies of relevant Federal departments and agencies; and

(3) establishing platforms for regular consultation and collaboration with key stakeholders and the appropriate congressional committees.

(c) **STRATEGY SUBMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than October 1, 2016, the President, in consultation with the head of each relevant Federal department and agency, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the Global Food Security Strategy required under this section, including a detailed description of how the United States intends to advance the objectives set forth in section 3(a) and the agency-specific plans described in paragraph (2).

(2) **AGENCY-SPECIFIC PLANS.**—The Global Food Security Strategy shall include specific implementation plans from each relevant Federal department and agency that describes—

(A) the anticipated contributions of the department or agency, including technical, financial, and in-kind contributions, to implement the Global Food Security Strategy; and

(B) the efforts of the department or agency to ensure that the activities and programs carried out pursuant to the strategy are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability.

SEC. 6. ASSISTANCE TO IMPLEMENT THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY.

(a) **FOOD SHORTAGES.**—The President is authorized to carry out activities pursuant to section 103, section 103A, title XII of chapter 2 of part I, and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151a, 2151a–1, 2220a et seq., and 2346 et seq.) to prevent or address food shortages notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development \$1,000,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018 to carry out those portions of the Global Food Security Strategy that relate to the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, respectively.

(c) **MONITORING AND EVALUATION.**—The President shall seek to ensure that assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy is provided under established parameters for a rigorous accountability system to monitor and evaluate progress and impact of the strategy, including by reporting to the appropriate congressional committees and the public on an annual basis.

SEC. 7. EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the crisis in Syria, which is characterized by acts of terrorism and atrocities directed against civilians, including mass murder, forced displacement, aerial bombardment, ethnic and religious persecution, torture, kidnapping, rape and sexual enslavement, has triggered one of the most profound humanitarian crises of this century and poses a direct threat to regional security and the national security interests of the United States;

(2) it is in the national security interests of the United States to respond to the needs of displaced Syrian persons and the communities hosting such persons, including with food assistance; and

(3) after four years of conflict in Syria and the onset of other major humanitarian emergencies where, like Syria, the provision of certain United States humanitarian assistance has been particularly challenging, including the 2013 super-typhoon in the Philippines, the 2014 outbreak of Ebola in west Africa, the 2015 earthquake in Nepal, ongoing humanitarian disasters in Yemen and South Sudan, and the threat of a major El Nino event in 2016, United States international disaster assistance has become severely stressed.

(b) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It shall be the policy of the United States, in coordination with other donors, regional governments, international organizations, and international financial institutions, to fully leverage, enhance, and expand the impact and reach of available United States humanitarian resources, including for food assistance, to mitigate the effects of manmade and natural disasters by utilizing innovative new approaches to delivering aid that support affected persons and the communities hosting them, build resilience and early recovery, and reduce opportunities for waste, fraud, and abuse.

(c) **AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.**—

(1) Section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) **EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the limitations in section 492, and notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, the President is authorized to make available emergency food assistance, including in the form of funds, transfers, vouchers, and agricultural commodities (including products derived from agricultural commodities) acquired through local or regional procurement, to meet emergency food needs arising from manmade and natural disasters.

“(2) **DESIGNATION.**—Funds made available under this subsection shall be known as the ‘International Disaster Assistance – Emergency Food Security Program’.”.

(2) Section 492 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “\$25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1986 and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1987.” and inserting “\$2,794,184,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018, of which up to \$1,257,382,000 should be made available to carry out section 491(c).”; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

“(c) **AMOUNTS IN ADDITION TO OTHER AMOUNTS.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations under section 491(c) are in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes.

“(d) **FLEXIBILITY.**—

“(1) **UNITED STATES POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States that the funds made available to carry out section 491 are intended to provide the President with the greatest possible flexibility to address disaster-related needs as they arise and to prepare for and reduce the impact of natural and man-made disasters.

“(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that any amendments to applicable legal provisions contained in this Act are not intended to limit such authorities.

“(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 1 of each fiscal year, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that describes the activities undertaken by the President over the course of the prior fiscal year pursuant to section 491(c), including the amounts of assistance provided, intended beneficiaries, monitoring and evaluation strategies, anticipated outcomes, and, as practicable, actual outcomes.”.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

(a) **GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year and 2 years after the date of the submission of the strategy required under section 5(c), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees reports that describe the status of the implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy for 2017 and 2018, which shall—

(1) contain a summary of the Global Food Security Strategy as an appendix;

(2) identify any substantial changes made in the Global Food Security Strategy during the preceding calendar year;

(3) describe the progress made in implementing the Global Food Security Strategy;

(4) identify the indicators used to establish benchmarks and measure results over time, as well as the mechanisms for reporting such results in an open and transparent manner;

(5) describe related strategies and benchmarks for graduating target countries and communities from assistance provided under the Global Food Security Strategy over time, including by building resilience, reducing risk, and enhancing the sustainability of outcomes from United States investments in agriculture and nutrition security;

(6) indicate how findings from monitoring and evaluation were incorporated into program design and budget decisions;

(7) contain a transparent, open, and detailed accounting of spending by relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the Global Food Security Strategy, including, for each Federal department and agency, the statutory source of spending, amounts spent, implementing partners and

targeted beneficiaries, and activities supported to the extent practicable and appropriate;

(8) describe how the Global Food Security Strategy leverages other United States food security and development assistance programs on the continuum from emergency food aid through sustainable, agriculture-led economic growth and eventual self-sufficiency;

(9) describe the contributions of the Global Food Security Strategy to, and assess the impact of, broader international food and nutrition security assistance programs, including progress in the promotion of land tenure rights, creating economic opportunities for women and small-scale producers, and stimulating agriculture-led economic growth in target countries and communities;

(10) assess efforts to coordinate United States international food security and nutrition programs, activities, and initiatives with key stakeholders;

(11) assess United States Government-facilitated private investment in related sectors and the impact of private sector investment in target countries and communities;

(12) identify any United States legal or regulatory impediments that could obstruct the effective implementation of the programming referred to in paragraphs (8) and (9);

(13) contain a clear gender analysis of programming, to inform project-level activities, that includes established disaggregated gender indicators to better analyze outcomes for food productivity, income growth, control of assets, equity in access to inputs, jobs and markets, and nutrition; and

(14) incorporate a plan for regularly reviewing and updating strategies, partnerships, and programs and sharing lessons learned with a wide range of stakeholders in an open, transparent manner.

(b) **GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY CROSSCUT REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the President submits the budget to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report including—

(1) an interagency budget crosscut report that—

(A) displays the budget proposed, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the principal Federal agencies that carries out global food security activities in the upcoming fiscal year, separately reporting the amount of planned funding to be provided under existing laws pertaining to the global food security strategy to the extent available; and

(B) to the extent available, identifies all assistance and research expenditures at the account level in each of the five prior fiscal years by the Federal Government and United States multilateral commitments using Federal funds for global food security strategy activities;

(2) to the extent available, a detailed accounting of all assistance funding received and obligated by the principal Federal agencies identified in the report and United States multilateral commitments using Federal funds, for global food security activities during the current fiscal year; and

(3) a breakout of the proposed budget for the current and budget years by agency, categorizing expenditures by type of funding, including research, resiliency, and other food security activities to the extent that such information is available.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The information referred to in subsections (a) and (b) shall be made available on the public website of the United States Agency for International Development in an open,

machine readable format, in a timely manner.

SEC. 9. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **EFFECT ON OTHER PROGRAMS.**—Nothing in the Global Food Security Strategy or this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to supersede or otherwise affect the authority of the relevant Federal departments and agencies to carry out programs specified in subsection (b), in the manner provided, and subject to the terms and conditions, of those programs, including, but not limited to, the terms, conditions, and requirements relating to the procurement and transportation of food assistance furnished pursuant to such programs.

(b) **PROGRAMS DESCRIBED.**—The programs referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.).

(2) The Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o).

(3) Section 416(b) of the Agriculture Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431).

(4) McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program (7 U.S.C. 1736o-1).

(5) Local and Regional Procurement Program (7 U.S.C. 1726c).

(6) Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f-1).

(7) Any other food and nutrition security and emergency and non-emergency food assistance program of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Global Food Security Act.

The Global Food Security Act, led by Representatives SMITH and MCCOLLUM, establishes very clear priorities for and enhances the transparency of existing, yet unauthorized, food security and disaster assistance programs.

What this does is it authorizes, for the first time in 30 years, International Disaster Assistance, the essential humanitarian account that provides everything from tents and sheeting to water and medicine for people afflicted by conflict and hit by natural disasters around the globe.

It authorizes, for the first time, the Emergency Food Security Program, which is the flexible, efficient, and effective food aid program that helps refugees when and where they need it most so they won't be forced to seek refuge in Europe or beyond.

Finally, with an eye toward the future, it advances policies which will improve food security, stimulate economic growth, and better enable people

to grow their own way out of poverty so they will no longer have to depend upon U.S. foreign assistance. It does this without increasing spending, Mr. Speaker.

The legislation before us is the product of more than 3 years of careful deliberation and inclusive negotiations. The Foreign Affairs Committee has held multiple hearings on food security. We marked and reported not one, but two earlier versions, H.R. 5656 and H.R. 1567. The House passed each of these bills with broad bipartisan support. I want to thank our ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL of New York, for his assistance in all of this work.

This bill, S. 1252, maintains all of the provisions the House previously approved, while filling a critical gap. By adding International Disaster Assistance and the Emergency Food Security Program, S. 1252 brings the bill full cycle and enables Congress to conduct effective oversight of the full range of international food security programs from disaster to resilience, to development, to trade. At the same time, it adds even more transparency requirements so that we can eliminate duplication and we can eliminate the waste.

So I want to thank Mr. SMITH also for his leadership on this important legislation, and I urge Members to help get it to the President's desk without further delay.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. I am very proud that we are about to take our final step on the Global Food Security Act and send it to the President's desk.

I want to thank Representatives SMITH and MCCOLLUM for their hard work on this issue here in the House, as well as Senators CASEY and CORKER for steering this effort in the other body. I also want to thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, as always, for his leadership. This is another great example of bipartisan, commonsense cooperation on foreign policy issues.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 800 million people around the world live without the certainty that their families will have enough to eat. When children don't make it to the age of 5, half the time it is because of malnutrition. That is just heartbreaking. There is more than enough food on this planet to feed everyone. The idea that so many are starving is simply unconscionable.

It is also a major roadblock for countries and communities. Underfed populations are less productive and more vulnerable to disease. Without reliable access to food, it is much harder for a country to achieve stability and prosperity. So we have an interest—and a moral obligation—in trying to tackle this problem as part of our foreign policy.

This bill places a special priority on foreign assistance programs that aim

to reduce global poverty and hunger. It also authorizes a robust investment in the Obama administration's signature Feed the Future initiative as well as other State Department and USAID efforts dealing with global hunger.

This bill has moved forward with tremendous bipartisan support, and I am glad to cast one final vote for it today. I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I thank Chairman ROYCE once again.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The rule of construction under section 9 affirms that nothing in this act, or amendments made by this act, will supersede or otherwise affect the authority of a relevant Federal department or agency to carry out a number of vital international food aid programs, including Food for Peace, Food for Progress, USDA's Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program, the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Program, the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, or any other emergency or non-emergency food aid program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Is it the gentleman from California's understanding that this rule of construction applies equally to all parts of the bill, including section 7, which authorizes an Emergency Food Security Program, or EFSP?

I yield to the gentleman from California for his response.

Mr. ROYCE. That is correct. The rule of construction under section 9 of the Global Food Security Act—which was carefully negotiated with the chairman of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—applies equally to all parts of the bill. This includes section 7, which authorizes the existing International Disaster Assistance-funded Emergency Food Security Program.

Mr. CONAWAY. Reclaiming my time, is it also the gentleman's understanding that the "notwithstanding authority" granted to the Emergency Food Security Program will not in any way affect the existing requirements under the Food for Peace Act, including requirements relating to the purchase and shipment of U.S. agriculture commodities under this act?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYCE. Correct. The committee has conferred with the Government Accountability Office and received its confirmation that "notwithstanding authority" cannot migrate to other provisions of law.

For example, funds provided to carry out the Food for Peace Act are subject

to the requirements of the Food for Peace Act and funds provided to carry out the International Disaster Assistance/Emergency Food Security Program are subject to the requirements of the Foreign Assistance Act. Neither the funds nor the authorities for these programs are interchangeable.

Mr. CONAWAY. Reclaiming my time, does the committee chairman agree that the Food for Peace program, which is wholly separate from the bill we are debating on the floor today, is vital to U.S. efforts to respond to emergencies and alleviate global hunger? Does the gentleman also agree that the provision of U.S. agriculture commodities through the Food for Peace program has saved millions of lives, and that the U.S. agriculture commodities must remain a significant part of U.S. international food aid programs?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYCE. Yes. Through the Food for Peace program, the United States has reached more than a billion people around the globe in times of need, reducing poverty and improving food security in the process. American farmers are rightfully proud of this legacy. Unfortunately, ever-growing world crises have stressed our international food aid, leading us to look to new approaches that will help us stretch our food aid dollars further and, ultimately, save more lives.

The Global Food Security Act authorizes one of these approaches—the International Disaster Assistance/Emergency Food Security Program—to provide electronic transfers, vouchers, and locally procured food to help desperate people meet their needs in the wake of disasters or war.

This program is meant to complement, not replace, time-tested approaches to delivering food aid, including the Food for Peace program. Like the gentleman from Texas, I have had an opportunity to see how the Emergency Food Security Program works in places like Jordan, where humanitarian organizations are working to meet the needs of Syrian refugees.

While the world may be changing rapidly, one thing will never change: the American farmer will always play a significant role in promoting food security at home and abroad. U.S. agricultural commodities will always be in demand and will always remain a part of the Food for Peace program. While the two of us may differ on the specific degree to which they should be, I have no doubt that this principle will be reflected in the next farm bill.

In the meantime, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for his continued leadership on this issue, including his efforts to ensure that the vast expertise and experience of the U.S. agriculture community will be fully leveraged through the Global Food Security Act. I look forward to continuing our close collaboration on these important matters, and I appreciate his support for this important legislation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman from California for his continued work on this important matter, particularly his recognition of the crucial role that the Agriculture Committee must play in any global food security strategy.

As he rightly points out, programs like EFSP should be used in tandem with the time-tested Food for Peace program. It should not serve as a step towards eliminating the donation of U.S. commodities abroad.

I look forward to closely monitoring the progress of this strategy and developing a better understanding of how our foreign assistance dollars are being used.

I thank the gentleman for his extended colloquy and patience with the Committee on Agriculture's concerns with the bill. I thank him for that consideration and I look forward to supporting this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the proverb, "If you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day. If you teach a man to fish, you feed him for the rest of his life."

That is the aim of our food assistance efforts. We want to help populations to feed themselves. We want to get at the root causes of poverty and malnutrition. We want to help build strong, sustainable communities that contribute to stability and prosperity in their countries, across regions, and around the world.

We need to invest in the initiatives that have made a difference. That is what we are doing here by authorizing strong support for Feed the Future and working to ramp up other foreign assistance efforts focusing on food aid.

This is a good bill. This is Congress at its best. This is bipartisanship at its best. I am glad we are sending it to the President's desk. This was done, really, as a collaborative effort by both sides of the aisle. I thank my colleagues again for their good work on this, and I urge a "yes" vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the link between conflict and hunger is undeniable. Mr. ENGEL and I recently traveled to Sub-Saharan Africa to a drought-stricken region, Ethiopia, where more than 10.2 million people are on the verge of what I would designate as "starvation," yet no one really used that word or used the word "famine" because of the concern that it might provoke a coup.

□ 2130

But the reality is that this is the situation on the ground. And at the same time, massive humanitarian disasters in Syria and Yemen, in South Sudan, have sparked these massive refugee flows. They threaten regional security. All told, there are currently 800 million people suffering from chronic hunger,

and over 60 million people displaced by conflict, who desperately need our help.

It is in our national security and economic interest to help address these needs, to meet humanitarian needs while supporting the growth of healthier, more stable societies through cost-effective programs that promote agriculture-led economic growth, that open markets for U.S. investment and trade, that promote food and nutrition security, and, ultimately, that break the cycle of dependence on aid. The Global Food Security Act can help.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1252.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FOREIGN AID TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3766) to direct the President to establish guidelines for United States foreign development and economic assistance programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.*—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) *the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;*

(B) *the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;*

(C) *the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and*

(D) *the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.*

(2) *EVALUATION.*—The term "evaluation" means, with respect to a covered United States foreign assistance program, the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of the program, including projects conducted under such program, as a basis for—

(A) *making judgments and evaluations regarding the program;*

(B) *improving program effectiveness; and*

(C) *informing decisions about current and future programming.*

(3) *COVERED UNITED STATES FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.*—The term "covered United States foreign

assistance” means assistance authorized under—

(A) part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), except for—

(i) title IV of chapter 2 of such part (relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation); and

(ii) chapter 3 of such part (relating to International Organizations and Programs);

(B) chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to Economic Support Fund);

(C) the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); and

(D) the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.).

SEC. 3. GUIDELINES FOR COVERED UNITED STATES FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are to—

(1) evaluate the performance of covered United States foreign assistance and its contribution to the policies, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities undertaken by the Federal Government;

(2) support and promote innovative programs to improve effectiveness; and

(3) coordinate the monitoring and evaluation processes of Federal departments and agencies that administer covered United States foreign assistance.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall set forth guidelines, according to best practices of monitoring and evaluation studies and analyses, for the establishment of measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans that can be applied with reasonable consistency to covered United States foreign assistance.

(c) **OBJECTIVES OF GUIDELINES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The guidelines established pursuant to subsection (b) shall provide direction to Federal departments and agencies that administer covered United States foreign assistance on—

(A) monitoring the use of resources;

(B) evaluating the outcomes and impacts of covered United States foreign assistance projects and programs; and

(C) applying the findings and conclusions of such evaluations to proposed project and program design.

(2) **OBJECTIVES.**—The guidelines established pursuant to subsection (b) shall provide direction to Federal departments and agencies that administer covered United States foreign assistance on how to—

(A) establish annual monitoring and evaluation objectives and timetables to plan and manage the process of monitoring, evaluating, analyzing progress, and applying learning toward achieving results;

(B) develop specific project monitoring and evaluation plans, including measurable goals and performance metrics, and to identify the resources necessary to conduct such evaluations, which should be covered by program costs;

(C) apply rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies to such programs, including through the use of impact evaluations, ex-post evaluations, or other methods, as appropriate, that clearly define program logic, inputs, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and end outcomes;

(D) disseminate guidelines for the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs to all personnel, especially in the field, who are responsible for the design, implementation, and management of covered United States foreign assistance programs;

(E) establish methodologies for the collection of data, including baseline data to serve as a reference point against which progress can be measured;

(F) evaluate, at least once in their lifetime, all programs whose dollar value equals or exceeds the median program size for the relevant office

or bureau or an equivalent calculation to ensure the majority of program resources are evaluated;

(G) conduct impact evaluations on all pilot programs before replicating, or conduct performance evaluations and provide a justification for not conducting an impact evaluation when such an evaluation is deemed inappropriate or impracticable;

(H) develop a clearinghouse capacity for the collection, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge and lessons learned to guide future programs for United States foreign assistance personnel, implementing partners, the donor community, and aid recipient governments;

(I) internally distribute evaluation reports;

(J) publicly report each evaluation, including an executive summary, a description of the evaluation methodology, key findings, appropriate context, including quantitative and qualitative data when available, and recommendations made in the evaluation within 90 days after the completion of the evaluation;

(K) undertake collaborative partnerships and coordinate efforts with the academic community, implementing partners, and national and international institutions, as appropriate, that have expertise in program monitoring, evaluation, and analysis when such partnerships provide needed expertise or significantly improve the evaluation and analysis;

(L) ensure verifiable, reliable, and timely data, including from local beneficiaries and stakeholders, are available to monitoring and evaluation personnel to permit the objective evaluation of the effectiveness of covered United States foreign assistance programs, including an assessment of assumptions and limitations in such evaluations; and

(M) ensure that standards of professional evaluation organizations for monitoring and evaluation efforts are employed, including ensuring the integrity and independence of evaluations, permitting and encouraging the exercise of professional judgment, and providing for quality control and assurance in the monitoring and evaluation process.

(d) **PRESIDENT'S REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that contains a detailed description of the guidelines established pursuant to subsection (b). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but it may contain a classified annex.

(e) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than 18 months after the report required by subsection (d) is submitted to Congress, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(1) analyzes the guidelines established pursuant to subsection (b); and

(2) assesses the implementation of the guidelines by the agencies, bureaus, and offices that implement covered United States foreign assistance as outlined in the President's budget request.

SEC. 4. INFORMATION ON COVERED UNITED STATES FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **UPDATE OF EXISTING WEBSITE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall update the Department of State's website, “ForeignAssistance.gov”, to make publicly available comprehensive, timely, and comparable information on covered United States foreign assistance programs, including all information required under subsection (b) that is available to the Secretary of State.

(2) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the head of each Federal department or agency that administers covered United States foreign assistance shall provide the Secretary of State with comprehensive information about the covered United States

foreign assistance programs carried out by such department or agency.

(3) **UPDATES TO WEBSITE.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the Secretary of State shall publish, on the “ForeignAssistance.gov” website or through a successor online publication, the information provided under subsection (b).

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The information described in subsection (a)—

(A) shall be published for each country on a detailed basis, such as award-by-award; or

(B) if assistance is provided on a regional level, shall be published for each such region on a detailed basis, such as award-by-award.

(2) **TYPES OF INFORMATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To ensure the transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of covered United States foreign assistance programs, the information described in subsection (a) shall include—

(i) links to all regional, country, and sector assistance strategies, annual budget documents, congressional budget justifications, and evaluations in accordance with section 3(c)(2)(J);

(ii) basic descriptive summaries for covered United States foreign assistance programs and awards under such programs; and

(iii) obligations and expenditures.

(B) **PUBLICATION.**—Each type of information described in subparagraph (A) shall be published or updated on the appropriate website not later than 90 days after the date on which the information is issued.

(C) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to require a Federal department or agency that administers covered United States foreign assistance to provide any information that does not relate to, or is not otherwise required by, the covered United States foreign assistance programs carried out by such department or agency.

(3) **REPORT IN LIEU OF INCLUSION.**—

(A) **HEALTH OR SECURITY OF IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS.**—If the head of a Federal department or agency, in consultation with the Secretary of State, makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of information online would jeopardize the health or security of an implementing partner or program beneficiary or would require the release of proprietary information of an implementing partner or program beneficiary, the head of the Federal department or agency shall provide such determination in writing to the appropriate congressional committees, including the basis for such determination.

(B) **NATIONAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—If the Secretary of State makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of information online would be detrimental to the national interests of the United States, the Secretary of State shall provide such determination, including the basis for such determination, in writing to the appropriate congressional committees.

(C) **FORM.**—Information provided under this paragraph may be provided in classified form, as appropriate.

(4) **FAILURE TO COMPLY.**—If a Federal department or agency fails to comply with the requirements under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a), or subsection (c), with respect to providing information described in subsection (a), and the information is not subject to a determination under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) not to make the information publicly available, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the head of such department or agency, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall submit a consolidated report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes, with respect to each required item of information not made publicly available—

(A) a detailed explanation of the reason for not making such information publicly available; and

(B) a description of the department's or agency's plan and timeline for—

(i) making such information publicly available; and

(ii) ensuring that such information is made publicly available in subsequent years.

(C) SCOPE OF INFORMATION.—The online publication required under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum—

(1) in each of the fiscal years 2016 through 2019, provide the information required under subsection (b) for fiscal years 2015 through the current fiscal year; and

(2) for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter, provide the information required under subsection (b) for the immediately preceding 5 fiscal years in a fully searchable form.

(D) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development should coordinate the consolidation of processes and data collection and presentation for the Department of State's website, "ForeignAssistance.gov", and the United States Agency for International Development's website, "Explorer.USAID.gov", to the extent that is possible to maximize efficiencies, no later than the end of fiscal year 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3766, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act, and I would like to thank Judge TED POE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, for his years of dedication to this important issue.

Effective U.S. foreign assistance can help advance the diplomatic, economic, and national security interests of the United States, and it can help support the growth of healthier, more stable societies. It can provide alternatives to extremism. It can combat global health threats, foster self-sufficiency, and open new markets to U.S. trade and investment. But it can also be wasted, as it has many times, and that is why making U.S. foreign assistance as efficient and effective as possible has been a central focus of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

This is no easy task. There are more than 20 Federal departments and agencies delivering food aid. Too many of them do not share our interest in transparency, accountability, and results.

Too often, the importance of an agency is measured by the amount of resources it controls and not by its positive impact. Unfortunately, the success of initiatives are too often measured by

"things delivered," like bed nets, instead of "program outcomes," like malaria infections averted and lives saved. As long as our foreign aid agencies and organizations are allowed to operate beyond scrutiny, nothing will change.

Congress needs the tools to break down these barriers to effective aid. We need to help U.S. foreign aid agencies and organizations improve coordination, identify duplication, eliminate waste, and learn from experience, and this bill will help.

The Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act will establish tough standards for monitoring and evaluation. It will ensure that many Federal departments and agencies that implement these programs, all of them, coordinate, rather than duplicate, their efforts and then apply the lessons learned. And it will require these agencies to publish foreign assistance data on a consolidated Web site so we can better track investments against results.

This bill is the result of years of consultation and collaboration between Congress, experts, and advocates, and I want to again thank Judge POE as well as Representative CONNOLLY for their steadfast work and leadership in bringing this important measure before us today. I also thank our ranking member, ELIOT ENGEL of New York.

I would urge Members to support this bill and get it to the President's desk without further delay.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure.

I want to again thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I want to thank my colleagues who have worked so hard on this bill, Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

We marked up this bill in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House approved it last winter. The Senate sent it back to us with a few changes, and now I am pleased that we are taking a final vote on this measure before we send it to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I view foreign assistance as one of our most important foreign policy tools. Whether we are helping a community build a school and train teachers, helping a country improve its power grid, or making it easier for farmers to irrigate their fields and families to get clean water, foreign assistance shows the rest of the world that the United States is eager to be a friend and eager to be a partner. And partnership is good for us as well.

Of course, foreign assistance isn't about handouts. It is about helping build capacity and capabilities. We want to see countries become vibrant and productive. We want to see societies become strong and prosperous. Stronger partners around the world mean better lives for the people in

those countries and greater stability and security for their neighbors and regions and, of course, a greater partnership with the United States of America. That is important to us as well as to the nations we are helping.

At its best, foreign assistance is like planting a seed, nurturing it, and seeing it grow into something strong and self-sufficient. If we are doing it right, it will give us a tremendous bang for our buck.

Foreign policy, foreign assistance is less than 1 percent of the total American budget. Although people think it is 15 percent or even more, it is less than 1 percent. But we don't have a lot to work with because our foreign assistance represents that 1 percent, just a small sliver of the Federal budget, so we need to know that these investments are being put to the best use. We need to take a hard look at the results in order to cut away dead wood and focus on the efforts that are giving us the best outcomes.

The administration has already taken tremendous steps to provide accountability and transparency in our foreign assistance programs. This bill would write many of those steps into law and build on them, requiring measurable goals for foreign aid and requiring strong plans for monitoring and evaluation.

We need to see just what a difference our foreign assistance is making and get a better understanding of the way foreign assistance programs tie into our own national security interests, and they do. We have national security concerns, and foreign aid is one way of addressing those concerns.

So I am glad to support this measure. I am grateful for the hard work of Mr. POE, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Chairman ROYCE.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I again want to thank my colleagues for their work on this measure, and I am pleased that we are getting near the finish line.

Let me just say that, as ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I often hear the question: Why are we sending tax dollars overseas when we have our share of problems here at home?

It is a fair question, but there are good answers.

The United States isn't an island. Our stability and security are tied to those countries around the world. We see where threats emerge. Often they emerge in places where there is a lack of opportunity, poor access to education, weak justice systems, poor governance.

When we send assistance overseas, we are not just putting cash in people's pockets willy-nilly. We are targeting these areas that we know are tied to making countries more stable. We are looking at the root causes of instability and helping countries overcome those challenges so, hopefully, they can thrive on their own.

But we need to make sure we are using these limited dollars efficiently

and effectively. The administration has taken the groundbreaking measures to track and publicize the effectiveness of our foreign assistance programs. This bill will make those efforts stronger. It will help us and all the American people know exactly what our foreign assistance investments are paying for and that they are paying dividends in the long run.

I want to again stress the partnership because it is a fair question to say: Well, we have pressing needs here at home. Why are we sending money abroad?

We look at the instability of the world. We see terrorism. We see what is happening. The United States has a stake in having partners all around the world. The United States has a stake in making conditions better for people all around the world so that radicalism isn't appealing. People can understand that what we have to offer is just so much better.

This partnership is important. This bill sustains that partnership, so I am glad to support the bill. I urge a "yes" vote.

I thank Chairman ROYCE.

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

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

Smart investments and development can help support growth of healthier, more stable societies, open markets that can generate consumers of U.S. goods. It can create opportunities for people there and for U.S. businesses to grow. But unwise investments can have the exact opposite effect.

This bill will give us the tools we need to make our foreign aid programs more smart and wise, and I strongly support this bill. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate Amendment to the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (H.R. 3766).

I want to thank my friend, Judge TED POE of Texas, for working with me to introduce and advance this bill.

I also want to thank Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for previously marking up this measure in Committee and bringing it to the Floor today.

And finally, I want to thank our colleagues in the Senate, including Senators CARDIN, RUBIO, and LEAHY for working with us to strengthen the bill and shepherd it through the Senate.

The Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act is a project that I have worked on with Judge POE for several years now, and in December 2015 this bill passed in the House by voice vote.

The bill directs the President to establish monitoring and evaluation or M&E guidelines for the federal agencies charged with implementing foreign assistance programs abroad.

The guidelines will require M&E plans as part of the project development process, and agencies will be encouraged to incorporate the findings of project evaluations and impact studies into subsequent foreign assistance programs.

This feedback loop will include measurable goals, performance metrics, and a clearing house for lessons learned on U.S.-led aid projects.

Additionally, the legislation requires that the documents and reports created under this M&E regime be made available to the public on foreignassistance.gov.

This administration has developed an encouraging record on foreign aid transparency. The Foreign Assistance Dashboard created in 2010 demonstrated a promising inclination towards disclosure that we should hope to enshrine in law.

This measure will strengthen and codify those transparency best practices to ensure that they exist as agency policy under future Administrations that might not be as accommodating of the aid community's demand for this information.

Aid programs that are held accountable for their performance and results can be made more effective, and their impact on communities and countries abroad can be more easily demonstrated.

Perhaps with more information, we can dispel the commonly held belief that 26 percent of the federal budget is spent on foreign aid when the actual amount is less than 1 percent.

I am hopeful that this bill will help foreign assistance operations become more focused and efficacious.

It is time to apply a data driven approach to constructing an assistance operation that has the support of Congress and a well-informed public.

We cannot ignore the increasingly important role diplomacy and development play in meeting our most pressing security challenges and demonstrating American leadership in global affairs.

It is an act of political malpractice that this vital part of the federal budget is so misunderstood and that the direct link between our national security and stability and prosperity abroad is so underappreciated.

I urge my colleagues to join the Modernizing Foreign Assistance Network, the Professional Services Council, the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, and several other well-regarded members of the foreign assistance community in supporting this bipartisan legislation and foster greater understanding of our vital investments abroad.

I would like to close by thanking, once again, Judge POE for his leadership on the issue of foreign aid effectiveness.

I think his advocacy is motivated by a shared belief that our foreign assistance dollars have the potential to create a path to prosperity in the most poverty stricken areas of the world, and nurture the promise of democracy in the face of even the most repressive authoritarian regimes.

I look forward to working with Judge POE to ensure that those common goals are advanced by the implementation of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3766.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRAGGING ON SIMONE MANUEL

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress love to brag. Texans like me brag the most.

Today, I am going to brag about a young lady from my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas. She is a Bulldog from Austin High School. Her name is Simone Manuel. If you don't know that name today, you will after this summer's Olympics in Rio de Janeiro.

Simone swims fast, really fast, water-on-fire fast. In fact, she recently swam so fast she is swimming in three events at the Olympics: the 50-meter freestyle, the 100-meter freestyle, and the 4-by-100-meter freestyle relay.

Texas women love precious metal. They are okay with bronze, they like silver, and they love gold.

Good luck, Simone. Bring home some precious metal to Sugar Land, Texas. Sugar Land loves you.

ROULETTE TOWNSHIP BICENTENNIAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Roulette Township, Potter County.

The township was founded on January 29, 1816, in honor of John Sigmund Roulet. Roulet was an associate of John Keating, one of the original settlers of Potter County. Today, the community's name is spelled a bit differently due to an early error by the Post Office Department.

Today, the township is home to more than 1,300 people. Later this week, members of the community will kick off a 2-day celebration, starting on Friday, in honor of the township's bicentennial and its history.

The celebration will start with a 5K walk for the fight against domestic violence, and it will continue with an ice cream social and bingo. On Saturday, a prayer service is planned, followed by a barbecue, with a parade planned for Saturday afternoon. A hymn sing is planned for Sunday, along with a "Walk Down Memory Lane," with signs placed highlighting the long history of Roulette Township.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to see the residents of Roulette Township honoring their history with this week's celebration, making sure that the region's past is not forgotten.

□ 2145

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, we know that ISIS and other terror groups are trying to manipulate, exploit, and radicalize vulnerable Americans to commit acts of terror.

An al Qaeda spokesman called for violence saying: “America is absolutely awash with easily obtainable firearms. You can go down to a gun show at the local convention center and come away with a fully automatic assault rifle, without a background check, and most likely without having to show an identification card. So what are you waiting for?”

Our law enforcement, Mr. Speaker, needs the tools to stop an attack. Unfortunately, the proposal to be offered by the Republican majority this week will actively hinder investigations. It will make it easier for terrorists to evade capture, and it will make America more vulnerable to attack.

I have spoken with the FBI Director. He knows the current law prevents law enforcement from blocking a gun purchase by suspected terrorists. This loophole will certainly lead to tragedy. It is only a matter of time.

We must act now. The terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 used planes. In response, we barred suspected terrorists from flying. Now terrorists are attempting to exploit our weak gun laws. Let's make the laws stronger. Let's stop the next attack before it happens and before it is too late.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for half of the remaining time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago on this floor, the Democrats said: We want a vote. We want a vote on a bill that would prohibit terrorists who are on the no-fly list from being able to buy a gun and explosives, and we want a vote on comprehensive background checks. So we sat down and created a bit of confusion and maybe even some anger.

I am pleased that the Speaker has decided that maybe there will be some piece of legislation, a piece of legislation, H.R. 5611. Unfortunately, it doesn't even come close to solving the problem and probably makes it worse. It is written in such a way that it is virtually unenforceable, will guarantee that terrorists will be given a heads-up that they are being looked at and investigated by the FBI, and it puts the courts in an impossible situation where they have to find probable cause that there is a terrorist out there who has

done something bad or is likely to do something bad, in which case just go arrest them. You don't need to do more than that. You already have probable cause. Arrest them.

The bill is a nonstarter, so we are not going to go away. We are going to stay at this until we have decent legislation.

There are two pieces: a bill by Mr. KING of New York, a Republican, and the same, coauthored by Mr. THOMPSON of California, that would expand the background checks, which is absolutely essential; and also one that provides for no fly, no buy.

We would like to have a vote on the bills. Put them on the floor, Mr. Speaker. You can do this. Put your bill on the floor, put our two bills on the floor, and let us, the 435 Representatives, speak to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GARAMENDI for his consistent, persistent leadership in these Special Orders to put forth issues of concern to the American people.

Right now, we are talking about saving lives. We are talking about responsible background checks on gun purchases as well no fly, no buy. If you are on the terrorist list, if you can't fly, then you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. What is so difficult about that for our Republican majority to understand?

Actually, on the background check legislation, we are talking about expanding the background check bill that already exists to include Internet sales, something relatively new—not new compared to when we passed the bill in the middle nineties—and we are talking about gun shows. This would save lives to have background checks on everyone who is there to purchase a gun.

Eighty-five percent of the American people support responsible legislation for background checks, which is what we are proposing, and 90 percent support no fly, no buy. The only place where there is an obstacle to this reasonable commonsense legislation is on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am so proud of our Members led by JOHN LEWIS 2 weeks ago, tomorrow, who led the sit-in on the floor of the House. It was remarkable, and it generated interest throughout the world—over 2 billion impressions from what went out from the floor of this House—something remarkable, something appropriate for the people's House. Then, following that, for this to go on for 25 hours and then to continue over the weeks when we were in recess into our districts, to have the beat go on. Now we are back, and the beat will continue to go on.

I think if there is one message of hope that JOHN LEWIS gave all of us, it is that we are not going away until the job is done.

So, respectfully, I ask our Speaker of the House to give us a vote, to enable

us to show the support that commonsense, sensible gun safety legislation has in this House. I believe that, if given the opportunity, this House would support that legislation. Maybe that is why it will not be brought up.

But I will also associate myself with the concerns expressed by Mr. GARAMENDI about a bill, the Cornyn bill. I think it has a new name in the House. It is the gun lobby bill—the gun lobby bill—the NRA bill. It is not a gun safety bill. It is an excuse for not doing something really effective and sensible.

So you will be seeing the stories of the people and the families affected, the most eloquent stories of all, their stories of their loss, and they are channeling their grief to make sure it doesn't happen to other families. What a beautiful sense of community.

We thank JOHN LEWIS for being the unifier in all of that, and we thank all of our Members for their participation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the minority leader. I am delighted to have the gentlewoman's leadership on this issue. It is profoundly important.

I understand tomorrow, at 10 o'clock, 91 people will be outside, together with many members of our caucus, to demonstrate that each day 91 people are killed by guns here in the United States.

So we have work to do. It is very simple. All we are asking for is a vote on a no fly, no buy bill that actually works—not the Cornyn bill, not the Republican bill, but one that actually works, put together by Mr. KING of New York and Mr. THOMPSON of California—and also a bill that deals with expanding the background check. Put them on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

And one more, I promise, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to go away until the American public has the safe gun measures written into law.

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

DEL LATTA, A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in honor of Delbert Latta, who served in this body for 30 years and who sadly passed away in Bowling Green, Ohio, on May 12.

Del lived a full and productive 96 years, and he used that time very wisely. While I never had the privilege of

servicing with him here in this House, I think we all have felt the impact of the time that he spent here in Congress.

Del Latta was a lot of things. He was an attorney, teacher, a leader, a competitive boxer in his youth, and a loving husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. Perhaps most of all, though, he was dedicated to serving the people of the Fifth District of Ohio, and he kept in touch with them on a very regular basis. He drove home every week. He was with his family. He was very much a family man.

Congressman Latta, also known as Del, attended Findlay College before graduating from Ohio Northern University in 1943. While in school, he served in the Ohio National Guard, the United States Army, and in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves. Del was admitted to the Ohio bar in 1944, and began practicing law as well as teaching at his alma mater, Ohio Northern University.

After several years in private practice, Congressman Latta was called to service again when he was elected to the Ohio senate in 1952. He would serve in the senate until 1958, when he was elected to the United States Congress.

He did many things here. Probably the most significant thing was when he was ranking member of the Budget Committee, he accomplished, really, his crowning achievement at that time, which was the enactment of President Ronald Reagan's economic recovery plan.

As those around in the late 1970s and early 1980s will recall, the Nation was mired in an economic morass when Ronald Reagan was elected. Stagflation, a combination of high employment and high inflation, had crippled our economy. President Reagan knew that the only way to escape this situation was to stimulate, through the private sector, economic growth.

To achieve this, he proposed a combination of tax cuts and spending reductions, which would come to be known as supply-side economics. At first, many in Congress were skeptical of the plan, but Congressman Del Latta saw the promise that the idea held. So he began working with his colleagues from both sides of the aisle to draft legislation to build support for the plan.

In addition to Del Latta, the other central player in the effort was Congressman Phil Gramm, then a Democratic Representative from Texas. Together, they would introduce two pieces of legislation to enact Ronald Reagan's economic plan: the 1981 Gramm-Latta budget and the Gramm-Latta Omnibus Reconciliation Act. A great deal of credit for that bipartisan support is due to the efforts of Congressman Del Latta.

Del had great respect for his colleagues in the House and got along with people of every political persuasion. As a result, he was liked and respected by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, making Latta the ideal person to build a consensus for Presi-

dent Reagan's economic package, which turned this economy around and this country around for the better. Latta and Gramm worked hard to build that consensus, and President Reagan's economic plan may not have been enacted if not for their efforts.

They sometimes say "the apple doesn't fall far from the tree," and I think that is the case with the next speaker here this evening, and that is his son, Congressman BOB LATTA, who also goes home every week, works his district extremely hard, stays very much in touch, and I think also very important, he is respected by the people in this institution, again, on both sides of the aisle. He truly is one that people take him at his word.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman LATTA.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for having this Special Order tonight.

We heard Dad's time down here as 30 years, and I must have to also mention that was 30 years in the minority. He never served 1 day in the majority the whole time he was here.

When he was elected in 1958, he served on the Ag Committee, and then went to the Rules Committee. In 1974, Gerald Ford put him on the Judiciary Committee during Watergate, a committee he did not want to serve on, but then he went on to serve as the ranking member on the Budget Committee until his retirement along with being on the Rules Committee.

If I could just in the remaining time talk a little about Dad because a lot of people know about his work here, but also I think it is important to know that he was one of those they call the greatest generation.

His younger brother, Lester Latta, was asked by his son what it was like when they were growing up, and my uncle had said that they didn't have much, but there were a lot of other people they knew that didn't have as much as they did.

He grew up in a small town in McComb, Ohio, which had 1,600 people, which it is today. My grandfather was a barber, sold insurance, and was an auctioneer. He did anything he could to keep six kids going during the Depression. My grandmother wallpapered and did everything else and raised a family. Dad was the first to graduate from high school in his family, the first to even go to college. The thought of going to college back then was something that most people never thought about.

Growing up, he knew the value of hard work. He would mow yards for 15 cents, caddied 18 holes for 25 cents, shoveled snow off the township roads with his brothers and his father, unloaded coal cars with a shovel, hauled corncobs, worked on construction

crews building one of the high schools in Findlay, blocked beets, cut down trees with a crosscut saw for Rural Electric, sold shoes on commission for 5 percent, and he was also a prizefighter when he was younger.

But Dad always knew what the value of an education was. He also knew what hard work was. One of Dad's crowning achievements, and he was always very proud of it, at Bowling Green State University there was a scholarship that is still there, and 174 students have received this scholarship. One of the things my dad always told my sister and me was to always remember that you never want to think that you shouldn't have much education, because one thing in life they can't take away from you is your education, so get as much as you want.

One of the things I always mention about here, and I would like to close on this, Dad always told me that this is not a profession my dad told me to get into, but I learned from him. Two of the sayings were that you want to remember when you go into public service, you go in with nothing and you should come out with nothing. He also said: Always remember in life it is not the big things you do for people, it is little things, because people expect the big things, not the little things.

So I think that that is the memory that Dad had not only here, but also in the district. After Dad's passing I had people coming up to me telling what my dad did for them over 50 years ago for some problem that they were having. But Dad always said to always remember that there is a big difference between a politician and a public servant. A politician sees how much they can take from the people they represent, while a public servant sees how much they can give back.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) very much for having this Special Order.

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues to pay tribute to former Ohio Congressman Delbert Latta.

While I did not have the opportunity to serve with "Del"—as he was known—I am pleased to serve in the Ohio Delegation with his son, Congressman BOB LATTA, who represents his father's former District—Ohio's Fifth District.

And I know that Del would be proud of his son's record here in the House of Representatives.

While many Members here tonight have or will mention Del's achievements, given his tenure in the House, his accomplishments are certainly worth repeating.

Del served our nation proudly as a member of the Ohio National Guard and the U.S. Army from 1938 to 1941 and in the Marine Corps Reserve from 1942 to 1943.

However, his service to the great state of Ohio and our nation did not end with his military career.

After serving in the Army and Marine Corps Reserve, Del received his undergraduate and law degrees from Ohio Northern University, and was elected to the Ohio Senate in 1952.

Six years later, in 1958, he was elected to the House of Representatives and served in the people's House for 15 terms before retiring in 1988.

During his tenure in the House, he served as the dean of the Ohio Congressional delegation as well as the top Republican on the House Budget Committee.

During the Watergate hearings, he was appointed to the House Judiciary Committee.

Outside of the Halls in Congress, Del was a devoted father and husband, and he is survived by his wife, Rose Mary, his two children, five grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

From his record, surely he will be missed by many at home, in Ohio, and in Washington.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to honor a great Ohioan, former Congressman Del Latta. Mr. Latta served northwest Ohio from 1959 to 1989. During his thirty-year career he found himself at the center of history as he sat on the Judiciary Committee in 1974 during the Watergate scandal.

He also helped President Ronald Reagan cut the federal budget and fought for a robust defense budget. Mr. Latta bravely served in the Army and Marine Corps Reserves before serving in Congress. He will be remembered for his unwavering service to his country and the great state of Ohio. Mr. Latta is a true statesman and his legacy will be remembered for years to come. I continue to send my condolences to Congressman Bob Latta and his family.

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

April 29, 2016:

H.R. 1670. An Act to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

H.R. 2722. An Act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer.

May 9, 2016:

H.R. 1493. An Act to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2908. An Act to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

May 20, 2016:

H.R. 4238. An Act to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act and the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 to modernize terms relating to minorities.

H.R. 4336. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the inurnment in Arlington National Cemetery of the cremated remains of certain persons whose service has been determined to be active service.

H.R. 4923. An Act to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4957. An Act to designate the Federal building located at 99 New York Avenue, N.E., in the District of Columbia as the "Ariel Rios Federal Building".

June 3, 2016:

H.R. 2814. An Act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based out-

patient clinic in Sevierville, Tennessee, the Dannie A. Carr Veterans Outpatient Clinic.

June 13, 2016:

H.R. 136. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1103 USPS Building 1103 in Camp Pendleton, California, as the "Camp Pendleton Medal of Honor Post Office".

H.R. 433. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 523 East Railroad Street in Knox, Pennsylvania, as the "Specialist Ross A. McGinnis Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 1132. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1048 West Robinhood Drive in Stockton, California, as the "W. Ronald Coale Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 2458. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5351 Lalpalco Boulevard in Marrero, Louisiana, as the "Lionel R. Collins, Sr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2928. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the "Harold George Bennett Post Office".

H.R. 3082. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5919 Chef Menteur Highway in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Daryle Holloway Post Office Building".

H.R. 3274. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4567 Rockbridge Road in Pine Lake, Georgia, as the "Francis Manuel Ortega Post Office".

H.R. 3601. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7715 Post Road, North Kingstown, Rhode Island, as the "Melvoid J. Benson Post Office Building".

H.R. 3735. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Town Run Lane in Winston Salem, North Carolina, as the "Maya Angelou Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3866. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1265 Hurffville Road in Deptford Township, New Jersey, as the "First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building".

H.R. 4046. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 East Oak Street, Glenwood City, Wisconsin, as the Second Lt. Ellen Ainsworth Memorial Post Office.

H.R. 4605. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 615 6th Avenue SE in Cedar Rapids, Iowa as the "Sgt. 1st Class Terry L. Pasker Post Office Building".

June 22, 2016:

H.R. 812. An Act to provide for Indian trust asset management reform, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1762. An Act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in The Dalles, Oregon, as the "Loren R. Kaufman VA Clinic".

H.R. 2137. An Act to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

H.R. 2212. An Act to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2576. An Act to modernize the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes.

June 30, 2016:

H.R. 3209. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the disclosure of certain tax return information for the purpose of missing or exploited children investigations.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

April 11, 2016:

S. 1180. An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to modernize the integrated public alert and warning system of the United States, and for other purposes.

April 19, 2016:

S. 192. An Act to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 483. An Act to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2512. An Act to expand the tropical disease product priority review voucher program to encourage treatments for Zika virus.

April 29, 2016:

S. 719. An Act to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

S. 1638. An Act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress information on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes.

May 11, 2016:

S. 1890. An Act to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

May 16, 2016:

S. 32. An Act to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

S. 125. An Act to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 2755. An Act to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of firefighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty.

May 20, 2016:

S. 1492. An Act to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

S. 1523. An Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2143. An Act to provide for the authority for the successors and assigns of the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Texas, and for other purposes.

June 3, 2016:

S. 184. An Act to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to require background checks before foster care placements are ordered in tribal court proceedings, and for other purposes.

June 22, 2016:

S. 2276. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes.

June 30, 2016:

S. 337. An Act to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

S. 2133. An Act to improve Federal agency financial and administrative controls and procedures to assess and mitigate fraud risks, and to improve Federal agencies' development and use of data analytics for the purpose of identifying, preventing, and responding to fraud, including improper payments.

S. 2328. An Act to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2487. An Act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. NUGENT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through July 8.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 29, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3114. To provide funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Corps with curation and historic preservation activities, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 6, 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:

5875. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments to Swap Data Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements for Cleared Swaps (RIN: 3038-AE12) received June 24, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5876. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Des-

ignated Country-Ukraine (DFARS Case 2016-D026) [Docket No.: DARS-2016-0022] (RIN: 0750-AI98) received June 24, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5877. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Deletion of Supplemental Coverage for Definition of "Simplified Acquisition Threshold" (DFARS Case 2016-D007) [Docket No.: DARS-2016-0008] (RIN: 0750-AI89) received June 24, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5878. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Implementation of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 (RIN: 2590-AA76) received June 29, 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.

5879. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure; Civil Money Penalty Inflation Adjustment (RIN: 2590-AA88) received June 29, 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.

5880. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Revisions to Safety Standard for Carriages and Strollers [Docket No.: CPSC-2013-0019] received June 24, 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.

5881. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Limited Disapproval of Air Plan Revisions; Arizona; New Source Review; PM2.5 [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0187; FRL-9948-01-Region 9] received June 22, 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.

5882. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Determination of Attainment by the Attainment Date; 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Cleveland, Ohio and St. Louis, Missouri-Illinois Areas [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0276; FRL-9948-19-Region 5] received June 22, 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.

5883. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; San Joaquin Valley; Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0636; FRL-9948-24-Region 9] received June 22, 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.

5884. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Kaman Aerospace Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0183; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-016-AD; Amendment 39-18498; AD 2016-08-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28,

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.

5885. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-6547; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-18490; AD 2016-08-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5886. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7532; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-18477; AD 2016-08-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5887. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4344; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-18486; AD 2016-08-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5888. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4474; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-34-AD; Amendment 39-18485; AD 2016-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5889. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-6539; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-036-AD; Amendment 39-18504; AD 2016-09-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5890. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2458; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-18468; AD 2016-07-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5891. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3970; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-006-AD; Amendment 39-18497; AD 2016-08-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5892. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket

No.: FAA-2015-4814; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-18502; AD 2016-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5893. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-1363; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-040-AD; Amendment 39-18496; AD 2016-08-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5894. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0338; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-010-AD; Amendment 39-18495; AD 2016-08-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5895. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1130; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-18492; AD 2015-09-04 RI] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5896. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0657; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-18501; AD 2016-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5897. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3988; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-005-AD; Amendment 39-18491; AD 2016-08-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 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.

5898. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Neurological Disorders [Docket No.: SSA-2006-0140] (RIN: 0960-AF35) received June 29, 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.

5899. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Effective Date for Temporary Pilot Program Setting the Time and Place for a Hearing Before an Administrative Law Judge [Docket No.: SSA-2016-0019] (RIN: 0960-AI02) received June 29, 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. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; with an amendment (Rept. 114-655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception to the employer health insurance mandate for Indian tribal governments and tribally owned businesses; with an amendment (Rept. 114-656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the income threshold used in determining the deduction for medical care; with an amendment (Rept. 114-657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3734. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide support to mining schools, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4538. A bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption from the definition of an investment company; with an amendment (Rept. 114-660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4855. A bill to amend provisions in the securities laws relating to regulation crowdfunding to raise the dollar amount limit and to clarify certain requirements and exclusions for funding portals established by such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 114-661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 5385. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 4511. A bill to amend the Veterans' Oral History Project Act to allow the collection of video and audio recordings of biographical histories by immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces who died as a result of their service during a period of war (Rept. 114-663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 4733. A bill to

permit the United States Capitol Police to accept certain property from other Federal agencies and to dispose of certain property in its possession (Rept. 114-664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 4734. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate (Rept. 114-665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 803. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4361) to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security of Federal information systems, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 114-666). 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. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 5619. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5620. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5621. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lawrence Eugene "Larry" Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during WWII; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to give borrowers an option to extend the grace period prior to the beginning of the repayment period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 5623. A bill to authorize the award of the Distinguished Service Cross to Chaplain (First Lieutenant) Joseph Verbis LaFleur for acts of valor during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 5624. A bill to require the Secretary of State to take such actions as may be necessary for the United States to rejoin the

Bureau of International Expositions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 5625. A bill to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 5626. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement for 3 months of retroactive coverage under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 5627. A bill to adopt the monarch butterfly as the national butterfly of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.J. Res. 96. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the President from making recess appointments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PETERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. WELCH):

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a presentation from the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the audited financial statement of the Executive branch; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. HARPER):

H. Res. 802. A resolution recognizing the historical significance and the 50th anniversary of the "James H. Meredith March Against Fear", a 220-mile walk down Highway 51 from Memphis, Tennessee, to Jackson, Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 804. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow independent, non-government television cameras to broadcast House floor proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Ms. LEE, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 805. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Latino AIDS Awareness Day" on October 15, 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H. Res. 806. A resolution expressing condolences for the killing of the British Member of Parliament (MP) Jo Cox; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BROWN

of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. COLE):

H. Res. 807. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 5, 2017, as "National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 5619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 5623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution: "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 5624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the authority to:

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 5625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 5626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 5627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

No section of Article I of the Constitution prohibits Congress from honoring flora and fauna of the United States.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.J. Res. 96.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution grants Congress the authority, "when-

ever both Houses shall deem it necessary," to propose Amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 292: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 378: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 391: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 508: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 546: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE, and Ms. MATSUL.

H.R. 556: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 581: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 605: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 649: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 711: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 916: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 921: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1002: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1055: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1076: Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 1111: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1112: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1114: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1147: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1192: Mr. VELA, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1220: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1284: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1380: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1449: Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1516: Mr. NEAL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1519: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1559: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1603: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1653: Mr. KIND and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1713: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1904: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1905: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 2014: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2114: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2151: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2205: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2254: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2285: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2311: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2315: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2342: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2404: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2446: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2610: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2624: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2646: Mr. HARDY and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 2656: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2698: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2846: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2903: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2963: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2972: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3014: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3051: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3229: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 3268: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 3337: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3339: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 3355: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3381: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, and Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 3411: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3445: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3520: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3535: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. TSONGAS.

- H.R. 3637: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 3706: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 3720: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 3742: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 3815: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 3846: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 3870: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3926: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 3929: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HILL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 3952: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 4043: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 4114: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 4118: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 4137: Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 4164: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 4223: Ms. HAHN.
 H.R. 4247: Mr. BARR and Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 4298: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 4381: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 4422: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4435: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 4474: Mr. COSTA and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 4481: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ASHFORD, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 4488: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4514: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. REED, Mr. MICA, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 4531: Ms. BORDALLO and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 4538: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4559: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 4567: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 4584: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 4640: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KIND, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4665: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 4695: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 4715: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 4740: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 4764: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. POLIQUIN.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MICA, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 4817: Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. LEE, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 4828: Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. YODER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 4869: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 4893: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4907: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 4922: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 4927: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4938: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 4941: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4979: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 4980: Mr. KLINE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 5001: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 5007: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5021: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 5025: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 5062: Mr. LEWIS.
 H.R. 5073: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 5090: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5094: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 5124: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 5143: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 5166: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H.R. 5167: Mr. REICHERT.
 H.R. 5171: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 5182: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DUFFY, and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 5204: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 5207: Mr. LEWIS.
 H.R. 5210: Mr. GRIFFITH and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 5230: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 5232: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 5235: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 5256: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 5265: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 5292: Mr. BARR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 5319: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 5332: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 5341: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 5344: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5355: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 5369: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 5392: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 5413: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 5457: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 5465: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 5474: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5489: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
 H.R. 5500: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 5506: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 5513: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 5523: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 5528: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 5534: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 5544: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 5560: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5592: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5605: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5608: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 5617: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BERA, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 112: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Res. 445: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 473: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H. Res. 584: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 590: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H. Res. 617: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 631: Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 642: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H. Res. 686: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H. Res. 694: Ms. MOORE.
 H. Res. 695: Mr. CLAY.
 H. Res. 740: Mr. WENSTRUP and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Res. 750: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H. Res. 782: Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 786: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFICERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 5611 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 5611 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 5611 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative Palmer, or a designee, to H.R. 4361, the Federal Information Systems Safeguards Act of 2016 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5580: Mrs. BUSTOS.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2016

No. 107

Senate

The Senate met at 9 and 2 seconds a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable CORY GARDNER, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The assistant bill legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 5, 2016.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CORY GARDNER, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GARDNER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 6, 2016.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9 and 25 seconds a.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 6, 2016, at 10 a.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4775

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO ADAM HACKFORT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Adam Hackfort, a member of the 2016 Iowa Boys 2A State Golf Tournament Championship Team.

Adam, and his teammates at Panorama High School, persevered through a tough season. With steady and consistent play at the state tournament, these students showed the state of Iowa that they were worthy of a state championship two years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, Adam's determination, hard work, commitment and team work is what contributed to the stellar success of his team. His willingness to give it his best effort is what will be valuable later in life and I am honored to represent Adam in the United States Congress. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Adam Hackfort and his team for competing and winning this rigorous competition. We all share in wishing him nothing but continued success.

RETIREMENT OF COLONEL SAMUEL D. GRABLE

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Director of the Air Force Office of Budget and Appropriation Liaison, Colonel Samuel Grable.

Colonel Grable is retiring after a long and impressive career in the Air Force. Here in Congress, we are especially grateful for his work in communicating the Air Force message in a clear and concise manner.

He played a critical role during the budget roll-out process in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016, setting the highest standards for clarity and honesty. His personal approach and respect for others helped rebuild credibility between the Air Force and the Congress.

Colonel Grable is a native of Seattle, Washington, and earned a Bachelor's degree in Accounting from Pepperdine University in Malibu, California, and a Master of Arts degree in Organizational Management from George Washington University in Washington, DC.

During his career he has served in a variety of operational, command and staff assignments in the United States and overseas. He deployed as the Chief of Plans to Multi-National Corps in Baghdad and as Mission Support Group Commander at Kandahar Airfield, Afghanistan in support of Operations Iraqi, and Enduring, Freedom.

Colonel Grable became the director of the Air Force Office of Budget and Appropriation

Liaison in July 2012. He became the principal strategist and advisor to both the Secretary, and Chief of Staff, of the Air Force and a critical conduit between their offices and Congress. Under Colonel Grable's leadership, his office was able to shape programs critical to the future of our national defense such as the KC-46 Tanker and F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.

The Congressional Appropriations Committees and our country owe Colonel Grable a debt of gratitude for his tireless work.

HONORING GARY BERBLINGER

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Gary Berblinger as he retires after 46 years in publishing. Gary began his career in Belleville, Illinois in 1973 and continued to work in journalism in St. Louis and in Bradenton, Florida. Since 2006, he has worked in Park Hills, Missouri, first as business manager and since 2008, as publisher of the Daily Journal, Farmington Press, and Democrat News.

Gary has distinguished himself in the communities he serves as a member of the St. Francois County Rotary Club, Greater Farmington Regional Chamber of Commerce, and the St. Francois County Community Partnership. He and his wife Mary have been members of St. Joseph Catholic Church in Farmington.

Mary says of her husband's retirement, "I'm looking forward to having him home. He's worked 50 years of his life. He has always loved his job. His work has been his hobby, too. Now is our time to travel and go see the kids and grandkids."

In celebration of his dedication to publishing, his community involvement, and his citizenship, it is my pleasure to recognize Mr. Gary Berblinger of Farmington, Missouri before the United States House of Representatives.

HONORING AND CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF JOSEPH E. RYAN

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of Joseph E. Ryan, a man who served his country, city and community in times of need. A leader on the field of battle so many times and in so many ways, Joe Ryan lived a life full of triumph and tragedy that is testament to his indomitable spirit and determination to make a difference in this world.

The first born in a family of ten, Joe Ryan graduated from St. Joseph's Collegiate Insti-

tute in 1961, where he was class president and an all-Catholic and all-Western New York football player. He went on to earn his degree in industrial and labor relations from Cornell University, while also capturing all-Ivy League honors as a center and linebacker on the football team.

Mr. Ryan served in the Navy from 1965 to 1969, in which he spent 17 months in Vietnam as a diving team commander. He earned the Bronze Star for his actions and rose to the rank of lieutenant before returning home from service.

Upon his return, Mr. Ryan's involvement and influence in the community began and grew for more than forty years. An engineering consultant in 1971, the late Mayor Frank Sedita tapped this rebel with a cause to serve as the executive director of the Citizens Advisory Committee, where he energetically directed the Community Development Block Grant program and fostered the growth of local nonprofit neighborhood groups.

In 1982, he helped found the local Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program and served as its first president. A horrific bicycle accident in 1985 would leave Mr. Ryan paralyzed but his efforts to assist others in need could never be contained as even from his hospital bed he finalized arrangements for his self-created Best of the Turtles race to raise scholarship money for the children of local Vietnam veterans.

In 1998, City of Buffalo Mayor Anthony Masiello appointed him as Community Development Commissioner. Mr. Ryan remained in that position for more than four years leading the creation of the Department of Strategic Planning and a focused effort to engage residents in planning initiatives to revitalize neighborhoods.

With staunch determination to be an advocate for others, Joe Ryan volunteered countless hours to the community and those in need. He served on the national board of directors of the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans, which advocated for veterans on health care issues. He took part in the Paralyzed Veterans America Wheelchair Games in 1987, helping raise money for the Erie County Medical Center spinal cord injury unit.

He served as a chairman of the Board of Managers for Erie County Medical Center in the 1990's and was President of the Friends of the Night People. Mr. Ryan had also been on the board of directors of St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute, and a board member of the National Spinal Cord Injury Association, the Buffalo Area Council of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, the United Cerebral Palsy Foundation, and the Cornell University Presidential Council.

Mr. Ryan was justifiably recognized many times for his life's work in public service. He received the D'Youville College Community Service Award, and was named Buffalo News Citizen of the Year in 1986. He was given the Clarkson Center's Courage to Come Back Award for devoting his talents to providing customized housing that allow people with disabilities to live independently.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

And while he lived an independent and purposeful life, little would have been possible without the unconditional, unyielding love and loyalty of his devoted wife of 44 years, Eileen and their greatest shared accomplishment, son Sean, a former NFL player.

Mr. Speaker, I honor the life of Mr. Joseph E. Ryan. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest condolences to all of the Ryan family, including his daughter-in-law, Mary Elizabeth, his grandchildren, Emmie, Sienna and Colin, his brothers, sisters and many friends and colleagues as they join together at a celebration of his life on Saturday, June 25 at St. Joseph's University Church.

The extraordinary story of his life will continue to be told by all those who will always remember: here was a man who could not stand himself, yet made it his life's work to always stand up for others.

OLNEY/RICHLAND CO. 175TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Dodransbicentennial, or 175th Anniversary of Richland County. Richland County was created in 1841 by combining sections of western Lawrence County and eastern Clay County. Olney was named the seat of Richland County due to its centrality and desirable proximity to the Fox River.

Over the years, many students have benefitted from being able to receive a quality and affordable education at Olney Central College. In addition to its support of education, Olney has a marvelously rich history of being a center of transportation, medicine, culture, and agriculture for Southeastern Illinois.

A large colony of albino squirrels first found sanctuary in Olney in the early 1900s. Because of this, inquiring visitors from near and far are attracted to the "Home of the White Squirrels." Olney and Richland County are the home to many churches and volunteer organizations, as well.

I look forward to the continued prosperity of Olney and Richland County largely due to its citizens who respect their history and have a vision for their future; I also offer my congratulations on the occasion of the 175th anniversary celebration which will take place from July 22–24, 2016.

HONORING THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INCORPORATION OF GEORGETOWN, MAINE

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 300th birthday of a town in my District. On June 13, 1716, Georgetown was incorporated as the 10th town in the Province of Maine.

Located on an island between the mouths of the Kennebec and Sheepscoot Rivers, Georgetown has a rich history that goes back far

longer than 300 years. For generations, the Abenakis knew the island as a place for good spear fishing. John Parker—to whom many current residents can still trace their lineage—built its first permanent homestead on land he purchased for a hogshead of rum and a few pumpkins in 1649. And its location on the border between what was then New France and New England brought several conflicts during the French and Indian Wars of the 1700s.

Thankfully, though, peace did eventually come to Georgetown. Since then, generations of Mainers have made their living there in boatbuilding, fishing, and other trades. And countless visitors have gone there searching for the best of what the Maine coast has to offer. Indeed, with the town's picturesque scenes, wicked good lobster, and hard-working people, that's exactly what they've found.

Mr. Speaker, it makes me very proud to represent a community with such a rich history and uniquely Maine character. My congratulations to Georgetown and all its residents on this wonderful occasion—and my best wishes for many more birthdays in the future.

TRIBUTE TO AL PIZZANO

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Al Pizzano, Chief of Police of Pleasant Hill, Iowa and retired Captain of the New York City Police Department's elite Emergency Service Unit. Chief Pizzano assumed his post as Chief of Police of Pleasant Hill in September 2015. He was recently honored in New York by the city's mayor and police chief during its annual Medal Day ceremony which pays tribute to the exemplary public servants whose selfless acts have made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting the lives and safety of all Americans. He was one of 53 recipients for the awards.

Chief Al Pizzano received the Police Combat Cross, the Department's second highest award, granted to members who have successfully and intelligently performed an act of extreme heroism while engaged in combat with an armed adversary. On April 8, 2012, Chief Pizzano and five members of the elite Emergency Service Unit were called to negotiate with an armed suspect, were injured in the ensuing gunfire, but avoided civilian casualties during the apprehension.

Chief Al Pizzano began his law enforcement career in 1987 with the New York Police Department, training and supervising 200 officers and 30 civilian employees while commanding the K-9 Resources throughout New York City. He left the Department to join Homefront Protective Group where he analyzed police agencies and administered police-related training courses before coming to Iowa as Police Chief of Pleasant Hill.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Chief Al Pizzano for this award and for sharing his servant leadership with an entire community. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Chief Al Pizzano and wishing him nothing but continued success.

CONGRATULATING THE WEST
VIEW MASONIC LODGE NUMBER 103

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the West View Masonic Lodge No. 103 for its 150th anniversary. Chartered on June 2, 1866, the West View Lodge has served the Millersville, MO area and has stood as a symbol for brotherly love, relief, and truth for one hundred and fifty years.

As a branch of the world's oldest fraternal organization, the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Missouri has over 36,000 members who work hard to serve and improve their communities. The millions of freemasons worldwide comprise various bodies, including the Shriners, Order of the Eastern Star, Tall Cedars of Lebanon, and nearly 30 others. These philanthropic groups donate over sixty million dollars to their communities each month.

As a result of its efforts and passion for service to the Millersville community, the West View Masonic Lodge No. 103 has helped countless citizens throughout the years. I'm proud of their achievements thus far, and I look forward to seeing the ongoing fruits of their mission. For the special place it holds in the hearts and lives of many in the community, it is my pleasure to recognize the 150th anniversary of the West View Masonic Lodge No. 103 before the House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD
NABAKOWSKI

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a true public servant and fellow Ohio politician, Ronald Nabakowski. Ron passed away Friday, June 10th after a long struggle with ALS, and will be dearly missed by his family and friends.

At the time of his passing Ron was retired, fully enjoying his time with family and actively promoting the redevelopment of downtown Lorain. He had been a public servant in government for forty-two years.

Prior to his retirement Ron served as Clerk of Court of Common Pleas in Lorain County for fourteen years, after a long career as State Senator, Lorain County Commissioner, and Director of the Ohio Lottery on Governor Dick Celeste's cabinet.

Throughout his long career Ron remained dedicated to making government work better for the people. A Democrat, Ron did not hesitate to reach across the aisle to create comprehensive legislation that could pass the State legislature, and to ensure the community he represented flourished.

One of his proudest moments in public service came while serving as Director of the Ohio Lottery. During his tenure, 17 cents of each state dollar went towards primary and secondary education in Ohio—a record that would remain unrivaled by subsequent Lottery administrations.

An outspoken politician at times, Ron had many admirers and critics. Regardless of party affiliation, there was no denying that Ron was genuine, and that he would certainly act in a fair manner. He was led by Christian values and his love for the Lorain community. These values served him well, establishing Ron as a public servant of the highest order.

Ron is survived by his wife of 55 years, Dorthea, and six of his children, having been preceded in death by a daughter and his parents.

We offer them our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories of our dear friend, Ron, who will be remembered with affection and gratitude for his probing intellect, kind heart, and utter dedication to advancing Lorain as a community, its people and its institutions.

RECOGNIZING JOAN M. FLANAGAN
ON HER RETIREMENT FROM U.S.
CITIZENSHIP & IMMIGRATION
SERVICES

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable Joan M. Flanagan on the occasion of her retirement after more than thirty years of accomplished and distinguished service with what was the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and is now United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.

Ms. Flanagan entered on duty on November 24, 1985 as a Mail and File Clerk in the Records unit at the INS Office then located at the Buffalo Federal Court House on Court Street. In June of 1987, she joined the Investigations Unit of INS as the Anti-Smuggling/Vehicle Seizure clerk where she participated in a pilot program to track data pertaining to vehicle seizures into the automated seizure/forfeiture system. That system was expanded when the data was entered into the Operation Activities Special Information System (OASIS) and rolled out to all Ports of Entry proving to be a very useful tool for the inspection program.

In January of 1990, Joan Flanagan joined the Information/FOIA-PA Unit (Freedom of Information Act/Privacy Act), as an Information Officer for Buffalo. At that time, the Buffalo Information Officers also staffed INS Information offices in Rochester and Syracuse several days a week.

In October 2002, Ms. Flanagan was promoted to Supervisory Information Officer. She was the leader of the Information employees of INS who answered sometimes extremely complicated questions from the public who appeared at the office in person. The Information Officers also answered phone inquiries, and reviewed and responded to those who had written letters to INS.

In 2004 she served as a core member and subject matter expert in the area of Immigration Information on the Government's Team known as the "Most Efficient Organization Team" during a Competitive Sourcing competition relating to all IIOs positions nationwide. At that time, the IIO positions nationwide were deemed commercial in the "Fair Inventory" and were placed in A-76 competition to

allow private companies to compete for these positions. The Team goal was to prepare the most cost effective proposal that would allow the IIOs to remain as federal employees.

As the subject matter expert, Ms. Flanagan conducted site visits to various offices to research and gather data to aid in the progress of new concepts. She helped streamline workloads and identify and implement the most cost effective measures during the development of the Government's competitive bid for the 1,300 IIO positions. This competition was cancelled in October 2004 prior to submission of final proposals after it was likely learned the work being done by the Information Officers was done as well as possible in terms of cost efficiency, accuracy and service to the public.

In September 2007 Joan Flanagan was promoted to District Adjudications Officer, now called Immigration Service Officer II. In this position, now as part of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service in the Department of Homeland Security, she interviewed applicants who had applied to become permanent residents of the United States and/or those who applied to become citizens of the United States through Naturalization. In January 2011 she was promoted to Supervisory Immigration Services Officer.

In June of 2013 Joan Flanagan was promoted to Chief of Staff of District 2, the Buffalo District, in USCIS which oversees USCIS field offices in Albany, New York, Hartford Connecticut and St Albans, Vermont and a sub office in Syracuse, New York.

While her dedication to country is well documented and her stellar reputation is well deserved, it is her love and loyalty to family and community that is also deserving of our deepest respect and recognition. The wife of William "Bill" Flanagan for 26 years, Joni is the very proud mother of the late Jeffrey Fuqua, Kristie (Daron) Moore, Karyn (Duane) Smith and Erin (Kyle) Kiminski. As a completely devoted grandmother to Marissa Stack, Nicholas Moore, Carolyn and Kameron Kiminski, Kaylee Reid and Madison Fuqua, there is no stopping her and Bill from cheering them all on at school programs and sporting events.

The tragic loss of her beloved son, Technical Sergeant Jeffrey Fuqua, to PTSD following more than eleven years of active service in the US Air Force, including tours of Iraq and Afghanistan, compelled her and her daughters to action. This fierce trio of warriors moved with a sense of urgency to help other veterans and their families struggling with PTSD as they brought the community together to raise awareness and funds for WNY Heroes and Horizon Health Services-Freedom Village. She recently joined with her family in unveiling a bench in memory of her son at her grandchildren's school, Notre Dame Academy in South Buffalo.

In sharing great joy as well, it is expected that Joni and Bill, a veteran and a retiree from federal service, will use this time to be together with family and visit the Magic Kingdom even more often.

From an entry level position as a GS-3 clerk, Chief of Staff Joan Flanagan rose through the ranks holding three supervisory positions. Her influence is found in significant policies and programs for USINS and USCIS, she has advised and mentored scores of other employees, and became one of the key players in the Buffalo District, a district known for many years to demonstrate the absolute high-

est standards of accomplishment, dedication, and service in the federal government to the people of the United States.

Throughout three decades of service, Joan became a reliable resource for information due to her expertise in a myriad of subjects. Joan's intelligence and compassionate personality have made her a truly valued individual and admired friend inside and outside of the office. Joan's dedication to her many positions throughout her career and incredible work ethic will leave her dearly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize and congratulate Joan M. Flanagan on her extensive service and remarkable achievements in both the Immigration & Naturalization Service and the U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services. We join with her colleagues and many friends in wishing Joan, her husband and family good health and happiness as she brings her extraordinary career to a close and begins a new chapter in her life.

IN RECOGNITION OF BARBARA
TAKEI

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Barbara Takei, who is being awarded the National Parks Conservation Association's Marjorie Stoneman Douglas Award for her work in the protection of the Tule Lake confinement site as a national park. As her family, friends and colleagues gather to celebrate her long list of valiant accomplishments, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this awe-inspiring individual who has served and contributed greatly to the National Park System.

Born in Sacramento, the daughter of camp internees, Ms. Takei was raised in Detroit and graduated from Howard University. She eventually became the chief financial officer of the non-profit Tule Lake Committee, an organization focused on the education and recognition of Tule Lake, one of the largest and most controversial sites where thousands of men, women, and children of Japanese ancestry were incarcerated and detained. Ms. Takei is being honored for spearheading the effort to prevent the construction of an intrusive fence for an airport on the Segregation Center Property, which would have disturbed visitor access to the site and its visual history. Without her longstanding and tireless leadership, the Tule Lake confinement site would likely not be a protected unit of the National Park System today.

In addition to her steadfast fight for national park protection, Ms. Takei has been active in the community for preserving the cultural history of Japanese-Americans, as well as spending the past decade researching and writing about Tule Lake's segregation history.

Mr. Speaker, as the members of the National Parks Conservation Association celebrate and recognize Ms. Barbara Takei for her accomplishments and value to the National Park System at the annual Tule Lake Pilgrimage, along with Tule Lake survivors and their families, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring this outstanding individual.

RECOGNIZING PENNRIDGE CITIZEN
OF THE YEAR: PATRICIA A. GUTH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Patricia Guth being named the Pennridge Citizen of the Year.

Dedicated to education and administration; Dr. Guth began her teaching career in the Central Bucks School District and in 1958 began teaching in the Pennridge School District. Throughout her career with the Pennridge School District, Dr. Guth was the director of Elementary Education as well as the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction.

In addition, Dr. Guth was the author and model presenter of Alternative Teaching Strategies for the federal grant awarded to the Pennridge School District.

In 1992 Pennridge School District Board of Directors, rededicated Perkasio Elementary School as Dr. Patricia A. Guth Elementary School. Patricia A. Guth Elementary School is a fitting tribute to Dr. Guth's work and the dedicated faculty and staff who have shaped it over the last five decades.

Dr. Guth is an example of countless individuals who have served their community professionally and continue to contribute their experience, time and service through their retirement years. Dr. Guth, has set the bar for citizenship and service for which others should aspire to.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN OVERTON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Overton of Indianola, Iowa for his 50 years of service in the funeral home industry, as recognized by the 2016 Iowa Funeral Directors Association Convention.

Mr. Overton was licensed as a funeral director and embalmer in 1966. He took over the family business, Overton Funeral Home, in 1983. It is one of the oldest businesses in Indianola, founded by his grandfather, Lewis Overton, in 1928. John's wife, Barbara, also helped the funeral home with bookkeeping, marketing and community outreach programs, as well as serving as treasurer.

Though he retired as President of Overton Funeral Home, he continued to serve as funeral director. Through all of his years in the funeral service, he has been an active member of his community. He is also an ordained elder at Trinity United Presbyterian Church, Past President of the Indianola Rotary Club, and a former board member of the Indianola Chamber of Commerce.

I commend John for his half century of service to families during those tough times we all face. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating John Overton for his dedication and years of service.

HONORING THE COAST GUARD
TRAINING CENTER PETALUMA

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Coast Guard Training Center Petaluma in Sonoma County, California, on their 45th year of operations. The Training Center, the Coast Guard's largest on the West Coast, plays an essential role in training and developing their workforce and carrying out the mission of the organization.

Originally known as Two Rock Station, the 876-acre property was purchased by the United States Army in 1942 to serve as an electronic intercept station during World War II. During the Vietnam War, it was expanded to include training facilities for Army soldiers. On July 1, 1971, the United States Coast Guard took over ownership of the facility, renaming the site and expanding the property's functionality with new barracks, family housing units, and a water treatment plant.

Today, the Training Center serves as home to more than 650 active duty service members, civilian employees, and military family members. Each year, more than 3,000 students attend basic and advanced career training courses to become cooks, medics, yeomen, information technicians, operations specialists, and more. The Training Center also hosts leadership courses like the Chief Petty Officers Academy, which prepares members of the service's senior enlisted corps for their roles as front-line leaders and mentors.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore fitting that we congratulate the United States Coast Guard Training Center Petaluma on its 45th year of operations, and thank the Center and its people for its contributions to our nation's safety, security and environmental stewardship.

HONORING IRONDALE UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Irondale United Methodist Church on its 150th anniversary.

The church has a rich history in Washington County. Known first as the Irondale Methodist Episcopal Church—South, its first building was constructed in 1866 and dedicated in 1867, free of debt. The first trustees of the church were: John Jamison, Stephen Denton, Garrett Tidwell, Elbridge Thompson, James D. Denton, James S. Evans and James B. Yeargin. It is the oldest church in Irondale.

Irondale Methodist celebrates its 150th with two days of celebration featuring Rev. Jimmie Robinson who grew up across the street from the church.

Known affectionately as the "Old Brick Church," Irondale Methodist currently has only 12 members. Although its numbers have diminished, its mission remains the same: To spread the Good News of Jesus Christ and reach the people of Washington County.

It is my great pleasure to recognize the Irondale United Methodist Church's sesqui-

centennial celebration today before the United States House of Representatives.

IN RECOGNITION OF TIM HILL,
CAPTAIN, PHOENIX FIRE DE-
PARTMENT, PAST PRESIDENT,
PROFESSIONAL FIRE FIGHTERS
OF ARIZONA, EXECUTIVE VICE
PRESIDENT, UNITED PHOENIX
FIRE FIGHTERS ASSOCIATION

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Tim Hill of the Phoenix Fire Department. Tim is retiring today and an incredible thirty one years as a first responder in our community. In addition to serving as a fire fighter, Tim also dedicated his career to serving the greater needs of the fire fighter community and Arizona as a whole.

Tim served as the President of the Professional Fire Fighters of Arizona and as the Executive Vice President of the United Phoenix Fire Fighters Association. In both roles he provided support to his brothers and sisters in the fire-fighting profession and worked with elected officials and the Arizona Legislature to make policy changes to help every Arizona first responder.

Tim served as President of the Professional Fire Fighters of Arizona when we lost 19 brave young fire fighters from the Granite Mountain Hot Shot team in June of 2013. That was such a tragic loss for our community and our state, and I am so grateful to Tim for the grace, leadership, and compassion he showed in such a difficult time.

Additionally Tim served on the Arizona Fallen Fire Fighter Memorial Commission which recently completed the construction and grand opening of the only memorial honoring the 119 fire fighters, paramedics and emergency personnel in Arizona. His work to make the memorial a reality is a testament to his dedication to his fellow fire fighters and emergency personnel and the entire State of Arizona.

CONGRATULATING MR. CARL
GOTZMER ON FIFTY YEARS OF
SERVICE TO THE UNITED
STATES NAVY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my congratulations to Carl Gotzmer of Accokeek, Maryland, in the Fifth District. On June 30, Carl will be receiving his fifty-year pin from the United States Navy in recognition of a half-century of civilian service at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head Division.

Carl is one of our nation's leading experts on energetics, the field of study concerning the movement of energy in a system. This field has wide application in defense technologies, and Carl has drawn on his deep knowledge of it to design systems that help seamen protect our homeland and carry out missions overseas in support of our interests

and our allies. He has published more than 100 papers and articles in the field and holds dozens of patents. Furthermore, Carl's analysis of the threat from foreign energetic materials has strengthened our intelligence, and it earned him a Letter of Appreciation from the Office of Naval Intelligence in 2014.

Praised for his ability to translate complex energetics concepts into plain English for policymakers, Carl has been an invaluable asset not only to the Navy but also to the other service branches, as well as to the CIA, FBI, and other national security agencies. In 2013, Secretary Ashton Carter presented him with the Distinguished Civilian Service Award—the Defense Department's highest civilian honor. Over the years, Carl has also received three Meritorious Civilian Service Awards in recognition of his having provided the Navy with solutions to difficult, large-scale problems.

Many of Carl's innovations and discoveries in energetics have subsequently been applied in industry and benefitted America's economy. He developed and named High Temperature Thermal Radiation (HTTR) devices and invented a new class of rocket propellants. Carl has also been a pioneer in the development of undersea explosives and reactive materials. Undoubtedly, his work at Indian Head has saved lives and aided our troops in countless missions around the world.

Before coming to Indian Head in 1966, Carl worked for a year at the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. He and his wife Kathleen, who also works for the Navy, run a small business in Accokeek that sells their hand-crafted dulcimers to collectors and musicians throughout the country.

On June 30, Carl's family, friends, and colleagues will celebrate his half-century of service at an All-Hands ceremony at the Indian Head Pavilion. Carl has said he intends to continue serving the Navy and our country, with no intention of retiring anytime soon. I congratulate him and wish him continued success in his service to the Navy and to our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 38TH ANNUAL BDPA TECHNOLOGY CONFERENCE

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to recognize and congratulate the National Black Data Processing Associates (BDPA) on its 38th Annual Technology Conference in Atlanta, Georgia.

BDPA was founded in May 1975 by Earl Pace and the late David Wimberly out of concern that minorities were not adequately represented in the IT field. Today, BDPA is comprised of over 2,000 African American IT professionals and has over 40 active chapters nationwide, making it the oldest and largest organization for African American professionals in the information technology field. Since its founding over 40 years ago, BDPA has remained committed to its mission of advancing diverse talent 'from the classroom to the boardroom.'

Each year, BDPA trains over 800 high school students across the nation in computer

programming and web development. The organization has trained more students to write code than any other non-profit in the country since 1986.

The theme for the 2016 BDPA Technology Conference—"BDPA Connect"—is especially fitting, as the conference is a time for professionals, employers, vendors, and all attendees alike to connect with one another in over 50 sessions on digital thought leadership preparedness for diverse students and professionals from across the country.

In addition to the innovative contributions provided by this organization, I am proud that BDPA continues to fulfill its mission to promote inclusion and diversity at all levels within the field by providing career growth opportunities for its members.

Last year, BDPA partnered with the Congressional Black Caucus to adopt an African American inclusion plan that outlines specific, measurable steps that the organization will take to increase the recruitment and retention of African Americans in the IT industry. BDPA fully understands that diversity spurs innovation. Infusing diversity and inclusion into various layers of the field will best reflect the communities it serves.

The steps taken by BDPA to promote and boost the contributions of African American professionals are earnest and effective. I applaud BDPA's decades-long commitment to enhancing diversity and inclusion in the information technology field.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the National Black Data Processing Associates for its outstanding achievements and on the occasion of its 38th Annual Technology Conference.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$19,381,591,140,792.22. We've added \$8,754,714,091,879.14 to our debt in 7 years. This is over \$8.7 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MR. JOHN AUSTIN WERTHING SR.

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and career of Mr. John Austin Werthing Sr. of Jackson, Tennessee. On June 25, 2016, hundreds of family, friends, and former students gathered for the dedication of LaBelle Street as "John Austin Werthing, Sr. Boulevard." I sincerely congratulate Mr. Werthing on this great honor.

Mr. Werthing was born, raised and schooled in Lexington, Tennessee and completed his

education with a Chemistry degree from Lane College. Upon graduation in 1952, Mr. Werthing was drafted into the United States Army where he served two years and is a veteran of the Korean War. While in uniform, he married Sallie Russell of Jackson. The two met in chemistry class years earlier while attending Lane College.

In 1954, Mr. Werthing began teaching in Lexington, Tennessee. Three years later, he moved over to Merry High School and joined the Jackson-Madison School System where he would dedicate the next 40 years of his life to educating students. Throughout his tenure, he touched the lives of thousands of students as a principal of Washington-Douglass, Merry Jr. High, Parkway Jr. High, and Northeast schools.

Mr. Werthing's lifelong love for education continued as he attended several institutes including St. Louis, Tennessee State, Memphis State, and Indiana University where he earned his Master's degree in 1960. Along with education, he participated in numerous community activities including Lane Alumni, Boys and Girls Club, the Airport Authority, NAACP, and was a member of Macedonia Baptist Church for over 60 years.

For his unwavering devotion to education and the children of Jackson-Madison County, Mr. Werthing certainly deserves this appreciation and recognition from his students, friends, and entire community. On behalf of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, I would like to congratulate and wish the best of luck for all future endeavors to the family and friends of Mr. John Austin Werthing Sr.

TRIBUTE TO REID COBB

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Reid Cobb, a member of the 2016 Iowa Boys 2A State Golf Tournament Championship Team.

Reid, and his teammates at Panorama High School, persevered through a tough season. With steady and consistent play at the state tournament, these students showed the state of Iowa that they were worthy of a state championship two years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, Reid's determination, hard work, commitment and team work is what contributed to the stellar success of his team. His willingness to give it his best effort is what will be valuable later in life and I am honored to represent Reid in the United States Congress. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Reid Cobb and his team for competing and winning this rigorous competition. We all share in wishing him nothing but continued success.

100TH BIRTHDAY OF DOROTHY WILSON

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable 100th birthday

of Dorothy Wilson. Dorothy was born on August 14, 1916 in Tipton, Indiana.

Dorothy is the daughter of Alta and Lou Pursley. She graduated from Summerville High School in Summerville, Missouri and then went on to work at Colling Radio in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Dorothy spent many cherished years with her loving husband, Bill Wilson.

Dorothy enjoys all of the time she gets to spend with her family. She is a kind and loving person that has brought joy to many lives throughout her years. She is known within her community for her generous heart.

Dorothy has reached a huge milestone in her life by celebrating her 100th birthday. The characteristics that she has displayed thus far in her life have proven to show her as an exceptional person. She has been an extremely beneficial member to our society and with that it is my pleasure to recognize Dorothy before the United States House of Representatives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, due to the severe weather in Washington on June 21, 2016, my flight was delayed and I unexpectedly missed roll call votes 334 and 335.

On roll call vote 334, passage of H.R. 5525, End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2016, I would have voted "yes."

On roll call vote 35, passage of H.R. 5388, Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016, I would have voted "yes."

HONORING RETIRED MARINE MASTER SERGEANT RODNEY BUENTELLO

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a San Antonio hero we tragically lost recently. Retired Marine Master Sergeant Rodney Buentello bravely served our nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan and was awarded the Purple Heart twice.

Last month, when he and his family were enjoying a day at Bandera City Park, Buentello unexpectedly had to tap into the courage and selflessness that served him so well overseas. He saw two teenagers in peril, drowning in rushing water by the park's dam. Disregarding his own safety, Master Sergeant Buentello dove in and rescued the teens, saving their lives. Sadly, he was pulled under the water himself and drowned before rescuers could reach him.

Master Sergeant Buentello lost his life a hero, sacrificing to help those in need. He is emblematic of the best our military has to offer. I offer my deepest sympathies to his wife, their three sons, and all of his loved ones in this time of grief. I also want to extend my prayers and condolences to the John Jay High School community, where Master Sergeant Buentello most recently served as a teacher's aide. His city and nation will forever be grateful for his life and his service.

HONORING L'DINA ROBINSON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Ms. L'Dina Robinson, the Daughter Ruler and State President of the Grace Jones Temple of Daughter Elkton's. Ms. Robinson has held this position since 1957. Ms. Robinson has been a daughter member of the L. K. Atwood Elk's Lodge Number 518 located on Lynch Street since 1952 some 59 years.

Ms. Robinson is a product of the city of New Orleans, Louisiana. She attended and graduated from Gilbert Academy High School. She also attended and graduated from Dillard University located in Louisiana. Ms. Robinson's work histories include: Office manager for the Historical Edward Lee Hotel of West Church Street and Instructor at Campbell College located on Lynch Street. Ms. Robinson worked many years for the United States Veterans Administration Regional Office. She was first employed as a clerk and she retired as a senior executive several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. L'Dina Robinson for her dedication to serving.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROFESSOR CARA DRINAN TO H.R. 5124

HON. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the contributions of Professor Cara Drinan in the development of H.R. 5124, the Equal Justice Under Law Act of 2016. It was her law review article, The National Right to Counsel Act: A Congressional Solution to the Nation's Indigent Defense Crisis, that initially proposed introducing a cause of action for Sixth Amendment violations prior to conviction. Her efforts were instrumental to the introduction of the bill, and her guidance was invaluable to its development.

TRIBUTE TO LEONA KESTER AND LEO (BILL) STALDER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate sister and brother, Leona Kester and Leo (Bill) Stalder, on the occasion of their 97th birthday which was celebrated June 2, 2016.

Our world has changed greatly during the course of Leona's and Bill's lives. Since their birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and wit-

nessed the birth of new democracies. They have lived through seventeen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In their lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Leona Kester and Leo (Bill) Stalder in the United States Congress. It is my sincere pleasure to wish them a very happy 97th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating them on reaching this incredible milestone together, wishing them even more health and happiness in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO MARY HEINEY ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable 100th birthday of Mary Heiney. Mary was born to George and Lola Newby on June 19, 1916 in Hartshorn, Missouri.

Mary has lived in the Hartshorn and Summersville areas all her life, before moving to Mountain View Healthcare. She attended and graduated from Black Valley School. Mary married Arthur Heiney with whom she shares four children, Harold, Joe, Doyle, and Kathy. Mary has a total of 20 sweet grandchildren who she loves to spend time with. An active member of the Valley Center Church, faith is of utmost importance to Mary.

Mary has achieved a great milestone in her life by celebrating her 100th birthday. She is a woman of character and is greatly beloved to all who know her. She has displayed exceptional leadership and has contributed greatly to our society throughout her many years. For all of these reasons, it is my pleasure to recognize Mary before the United States House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING THE TRI-CITY JEWISH CENTER ON ITS 80TH JUBILEE

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Tri-City Jewish Center in Rock Island, Illinois, on their 80th Jubilee.

Jews first came to Illinois' Quad-Cities in the 1850s, contributing greatly to the growth of our region. The Tri-City Jewish Center opened its doors in 1936, and is now the central location for Jewish life in the Quad-Cities area. Since then, they have been a warm and welcoming place for the Jewish community to celebrate, worship, and learn.

Members of the Tri-City Jewish Center pride themselves on providing a first-rate Jewish education to their young children, allowing them to appreciate their history and their heritage. They pride themselves on a strong community that comes together to support members in times of joy and in times of need. And they pride themselves on their service to the

broader Quad-City community: leading the charge on interfaith discussions, community service, and education. Countless members volunteer their time to speak with children and educators about Jewish heritage, Israel, the dangers of antisemitism, and the lessons of the Holocaust. This community truly values *tikkun olam*, or repairing the world.

In July, the center will celebrate its 80th anniversary with members current and past, young and old. Since its founding, The Center has been a credit to the rich history of Rock Island.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to wish a hearty *mazel tov* to Rabbi Jeffrey Lipschultz President Steve Geifman, and all of the members of the Tri-City Jewish Center on the celebration of their 80th Jubilee as they look forward to another successful 80 years.

HONORING JUDGE CAROL A.
CONNOR

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend, the Honorable Judge Carol A. Connor. Carol represented the best of our great State of New Mexico: she was a loving mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother, a loyal friend to many, a brilliant, hard-working and talented lawyer and judge, and a dedicated advocate for the rights of women, Native Americans, and the environment.

Carol was born in Wolf Point, Montana to Lora M. Worthington and Fred Whitebear Connor on December 31, 1941 and belonged to the Assinibone Sioux tribe. After she graduated from the University of New Mexico Law School in 1978, Carol began an extraordinary career representing numerous tribes across the country. The capstone of her career was her appointment to sit on the bench as a Federal Administrative Law Judge, where she served for 20 years.

In addition to her prolific career, Carol helped establish the New Mexico Women's Bar Association. She lived a life dedicated to serving others and fighting for the rights of those in need.

Carol's greatest joy in life was her family whom she cherished. After meeting in Normandy, France, Carol married Jacques Lacan. They spent their time together in Albuquerque, in the company of family, friends, and their three dogs: Bisoux Boy I, Bisoux Boy II, and Kissy Face. Carol's passion and love of life touched all those she encountered; her mark on the world is truly endless.

On May 10, 2016, Carol passed away at the age of 74 surrounded by her family. She was preceded in death by her loving son, Robert. Surviving her are her husband, Jacques, her daughters, Cindy Montgomery and Lori Matier Vittatoe, as well as her 4 grandchildren, and 5 great-grandchildren.

Carol was a true friend and we will all miss her dearly. I cherish our friendship and all of the wonderful contributions she has made to our state. Her memory and legacy is a blessing to us all.

IN CELEBRATION OF MR. JOHN
ATWOOD CHASE'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and career of Mr. John Atwood Chase as he celebrates his 90th birthday. John has dedicated many years to ensuring the safety and security of our great nation.

John Atwood Chase was born in Pepperell, Massachusetts on June 27, 1926 to his parents, Francis "Curly" Chase and Annabel Dougherty Chase. From a young age, John displayed many exemplary traits which ultimately led him to achieve many successes early in life. During his senior year of high school, he received the "Outstanding Citizen" and "Person Who Has Done the Most for Lawrence Academy" awards for the work he did as President of his senior class and the entire student body. In addition to his academic achievements, John was also a student athlete and captain of both the basketball and baseball teams. His success in sports led him to attract baseball scouts from the Boston Red Sox, but John declined their offer in order to serve our nation in the United States Navy.

John was accepted to the U.S. Navy Officer's Program at Bates College; however, he left ten months later to attend a school providing more of an Annapolis education and ultimately selected Tufts over Harvard. Upon finishing school, John went on to complete his training at the Chicago Naval Base and was later stationed at Camp Shoemaker in Dublin, California. He then joined the light Pacific cruiser ship, the Pasadena.

After the 1945 bombing in Hiroshima brought an end to the war, John was discharged from the Navy and went on to participate in a six month course with the Insurance Company of North America (ICNA). The experiences John had during this course led him to pursue a career in ICNA's Special Risk Division in New York City. Shortly after, in 1951, John left his career with the ICNA to join the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) as a Special Agent. During his time with the FBI, John had the opportunity to complete many assignments in cities such as: Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and San Francisco, California; Miles City, Montana; and the Washington D.C. Field Office. A few short years later, in 1958, John returned to FBI headquarters and took on the position of Assistant Agent in Charge at Quantico.

It was during this time that John was introduced to his wife, Janice Morgan, who also worked at the FBI headquarters. They were married a year later, in 1959, and were blessed with three beautiful children, John Jr., Lisa, and Julie. In 1963, John ended his career with the FBI to join a New York Securities Firm, McDonnell & Company which was later merged to become Butcher & Singer. Throughout the years, John had the opportunity to work with many prominent figures in the financial industry at firms including White Weld & Co., Kidder Peabody, Shearson Lehman, Merrill Lynch, Paine Webber, and UBS. Through his entire adult life, John was an avid golfer, even shooting a hole in one at the Bethesda Country Club in 1963. He now spends his time swimming at the Columbia Country

Club and entertaining his four grandchildren, Madeline, Ryker, Kendall and Finn.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the career and noble service of Mr. John Atwood Chase. John's many accomplishments are a direct reflection of what can result from hard work and perseverance. It is with great pride that we thank him for his service, and wish him continued health and happiness with his friends and family.

HONORING GEORGE LEE ADRAIN
OWEN

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor George Lee Adrain Owen of Douglas County, Missouri for his lifelong work and dedication to this country.

Mr. Owen was born and raised in Douglas County before being drafted into the United States Army when he was 18 years old. He was immediately sent overseas where he served as an infantryman for the 75th Infantry Division. He fought in several battles, including the Battle of the Bulge, where he earned the Purple Heart for an injury he sustained in that battle. He also received three Bronze Stars, the Combat Infantry Badge, and several other commendations for his valiant actions in the war before being discharged on March 14, 1946.

Upon reentering the civilian workforce, Mr. Owen worked as a dairy farmer, as well as at the Rock Island Arsenal for 30 years before retiring in 1980. He then moved back to Douglas County and bought a farm that he owns to this day. Mr. Owen enjoyed nearly 56 years of marriage to his wife Laverne, before her passing in 2002. Together, they have three children: Linda, James, and Brenda.

Mr. Owen continues to be active in his community to this day, serving as the Chaplain for the local VFW, American Legion, and Douglas County Veterans Memorial Association. He is also the Deacon at Bethany Baptist Church and is a strong supporter of the Senior Center and their activities. For his outstanding career and community achievements, it is my pleasure to recognize George Lee Adrain Owen before the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO WILL BABCOCK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Will Babcock, a member of the 2016 Iowa Boys 2A State Golf Tournament Championship Team.

Will Babcock and his teammates at Panorama High School, persevered through a tough season. With steady and consistent play at the state tournament, these students showed the state of Iowa that they were worthy of a state championship two years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, Will's determination, hard work, commitment and team work is what contributed to the stellar success of his team. His

willingness to give it his best effort is what will be valuable later in life. I am honored to represent Will in the United States Congress. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Will Babcock and his team for competing and winning this rigorous competition. We all share in wishing him nothing but continued success.

IN HONOR OF LADY RUTH
SKINNER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a dear friend of long-standing to my wife, Vivian and me, Lady Ruth Skinner, on 60 years of life and 40 years devoted to the ministry of Jesus Christ. David Viscott once said that, "The purpose of life is to discover your gift. The work of life is to develop it. The Meaning of life is to give your gift away." Ruth Skinner has given her life away in service to God, her family, the Columbus community and the broader faith community. Truly, we and the world are all better for it.

Ruth Skinner, affectionately called "Lady", was born and reared in Columbus, Georgia where she attended Columbus Technical College and became a Master Cosmetologist and businesswoman, in her own right. Furthermore, she is a member of Bread of Life Christian Center Ministries, Inc., where she has served as the Founding First Lady for over 31 years alongside her loving husband, Bishop L.D. Skinner, Sr.

Lady Ruth Skinner's passion and dedication for her faith inspired her to lead. She has dedicated 40 years of her life to the ministry and has taken the gifts with which she had been endowed by God to better support her community. As a Ruling Elder of Bread of Life Christian Center Ministries and National Director of Explosion Ministries Fellowship Association of Churches (EMFAC), a fellowship of interdenominational ministries and churches, she demonstrates her leadership and unwavering faith in God.

She is the mother to three sons—Pastor Darnel Skinner, Jr., Darrell Skinner, and Darius Skinner—and loves spending time with her siblings and grandchildren. Her 60 years of life, thus far, have been filled by travel with her husband, expanding her knowledge through literature, and nurturing her relationship with both God and God's people. Lady Ruth lives by the idea that only what you do for Christ will last, and her selfless dedication and service make it clear the lives she has touched over the years have been irreversibly changed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me in extending our gratitude and best wishes to Lady Ruth Skinner on the occasion of her 60th birthday, and the celebration of 40 years of faithful service in the ministry of Jesus Christ. To God be the glory for the things He has done through the life of Lady Ruth Skinner.

HOWARD L. CHAMBERS, LEG-
ENDARY LAKEWOOD CITY MAN-
AGER TO RETIRE

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Howard L. Chambers, who has served as the city manager of the City of Lakewood for four decades, is the California city manager with the longest tenure in the same city—this in a profession where the average length of service in California is about seven years.

A lifelong member of the Lakewood community, Howard grew up near Mayfair Park, went to neighborhood schools, and worked at the YMCA.

After earning his degree at Cal State Long Beach, Howard interned at the City of Lakewood for two years, handling youth services. He then went to work with the City of Rosemead as an assistant city manager.

Howard returned to Lakewood in 1972 in the role of an executive assistant to the city manager. In 1976, he was named acting city administrator and shortly thereafter hired to permanently fill the position, which was later re-titled as city manager, by the city council.

During his 40-year tenure as a city manager, Howard Chambers has become a respected leader among area city managers, always willing to take the time to share his professional experience with his colleagues on issues affecting Southern California, its residents, and its infrastructure.

Howard has also worked tirelessly and effectively on ad hoc committees and coalitions to address federal, state, and local issues, and has never shied away from a principled battle. As a long-term member of the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), Chairman of the Southeast Los Angeles County Municipal Management Group, the California Contract Cities Association, and a member of the League of California Cities' City Managers Division, Howard has worked with elected and appointed city officials, legislators, regulators, the business community, residents, and others to achieve solutions to the critical issues affecting local governments.

In addition to his public service, Howard Chambers has made community service a priority. His involvement includes the Lakewood Rotary Club, the Weingart-Lakewood Family YMCA, Lakewood Special Olympics, the American Heart Association, Su Casa Ending Domestic Violence, Lakewood Regional Hospital, Kris Kringle Charity Golf Tournament, and Project Shepherd.

For his sustained excellence, he has been recognized throughout his career by a variety of organizations including ICMA, Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, California Jaycees, YMCA, Lakewood City Council, Lakewood City Employees Association, and Su Casa Ending Domestic Violence.

During his tenure, Howard Chambers managed the city's largest public works project in its first 50 years: the \$16 million improvement of the Lakewood Civic Center and construction of The Centre at Sycamore Plaza. He later oversaw the \$21-million expansion and modernization of the Lakewood Sheriff's Station, the largest single project in the city's history.

The sheriff's station expansion project was completed without a new tax, tax increase, or special assessment.

Howard Chambers is considered a legend in the city management profession and is known for his ability to build working relationships with city staffers, civic leaders, and state legislators. He also is a role model for his peers. Known for his "teachable moments," he has become a mentor and teacher to new city managers. He has been and will continue to be passionate about local government, and his involvement in community activities and achievements in public service have resulted in significant benefits to Lakewood and surrounding communities.

During his four decades of service, Lakewood has deservedly earned many awards for the quality of its services, its commitment to responsive government, and its innovations.

IN RECOGNITION OF WILLIAM B.
PITTARD

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize William B. Pittard who is leaving the House to reenter the private practice of law. Mr. Pittard has served in the Office of the General Counsel for five and one-half years, initially as an Assistant Counsel; then, for nearly four and one-half years, as Deputy General Counsel; and, most recently, as Acting General Counsel. We will miss him.

Mr. Pittard provided frequent and invaluable legal advice and representation to Members of the House (including me and my staff), the officers of the House, the committees of the House, and the leadership of the House—most often in connection with their interactions with the other branches of the Federal Government. He did so professionally and without regard to partisan identity and, as a result, we came to rely on his expertise and guidance. Over the years, Mr. Pittard played a very significant role in safeguarding the legal and institutional interests of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Pittard has served the House with great distinction, and I am confident he will exhibit that same level of distinction in representing private clients. On behalf of myself and the entire House community, we thank Mr. Pittard for his many years of devoted service, and extend to him our very best wishes for his continued success.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH
PAUL GROVER OF PENSACOLA,
FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to remember Coach Paul Grover from Florida's First Congressional District. Paul passed away on Wednesday June 22, after six courageous years of battling with cancer.

Coach Grover was born in Pensacola, graduating from Pensacola Catholic High School in 1988. After graduation, he attended Livingston University before returning home and completing his degree at the University of West Florida.

In 1997, Paul began his coaching career at his alma mater, Pensacola Catholic High School, coaching football and baseball. However, in 1998, he began his true passion, coaching girls' basketball, where he remained the school's assistant coach until 2000. In 1999, under his leadership, the girls won a state title, and in 2000 they were runner ups. Finally, last year, Paul moved to Jay High School, becoming head coach of the girls' basketball team, and working with his dear friend and Jay Athletic Director, Lance Youngblood.

Coach Grover's friends, family, and students will remember him as a selfless man, hard-working and encouraging. Outside of love of organized sports, Paul was also an avid sportsman and active member of Olive Baptist Church.

My wife, Vicki, and I will keep all who love him, especially his mother Lily; brothers, George and Richard; sisters Sharon, Barbara, and Marianne, as well as his numerous nieces, nephews, and godchildren in our thoughts and prayers.

TRIBUTE TO MAX MONTHEI

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Max Monthei, a member of the 2016 Iowa Boys 2A State Golf Tournament Championship Team.

Max, and his teammates at Panorama High School, persevered through a tough season. With steady and consistent play at the state tournament, these students showed the state of Iowa that they were worthy of a state championship two years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, Max's determination, hard work, commitment and team work is what contributed to the stellar success of his team. His willingness to give it his best effort is what will be valuable later in life and I am honored to represent Max in the United States Congress. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Max Monthei and his team for competing and winning this rigorous competition. We all share in wishing him nothing but continued success.

H.R. 5456

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following extraneous materials on H.R. 5456, the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016:

FOSTER FAMILY-BASED
TREATMENT ASSOCIATION,
Hackensack, NJ, June 15, 2016.

Re: H.R. 5456 Family First Prevention Service Act

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chair, House Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Chair, House Human Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chair, Senate Finance Committee, Washington,
DC.

Hon. SANDER LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, House Human Resource Subcommittee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Ranking Member,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER LEVIN; SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR BUCHANAN AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT, AND CHAIRMAN HATCH AND RANKING MEMBER WYDEN: The Foster Family-based Treatment Association congratulates you on the important bipartisan work and agreement reflected in H.R. 5456 Family First Prevention Service Act.

Title I will provide crucial funding to keep families together, in particular those facing substance abuse problems, mental health, and generational deprivation of health parenting skills. Providing funding to address these crises is the first step to reforming our child welfare system so that families might stay together whenever possible and safe and avoid additional trauma of family breakup.

Title II will provide clarity about professional roles and responsibilities to assess each child and provide the most appropriate, least restrictive placement when a child must be removed from their home. Overall the bill recognizes the importance of a continuum of care from family support to family-like out of home placement to congregate care placements as needed by a child and family contingent on on-going, individualized assessments.

We look forward to working with the 115th Congress to be sure that this full continuum is supported and efficient: that qualified residential programs are able to meet these new requirements and serve youth clearly needing that level of care, and that community-based, family-like settings are supported and sustained so that youth who would otherwise be at the residential level of care can be served safely and professionally in the community in placements with biological family, with kin or guardians, or with non-kinship foster families.

We furthermore support the important reauthorization of Title IV-B programs and are especially pleased to see continuation of the adoption-kinship incentives, court improvement funds, and the regional partnership grants.

Again, thank you for your work on H.R. 5456. Please call on FFTA as we move forward in improving the family preservation and foster care systems for all of America's youth requiring such support.

Sincerely,

JODIE A. AUSTIN,
LCSW, Board President.

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES AND
CONFERENCE OF STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATORS, GOVERNMENT
RELATIONS OFFICE,

June 15, 2016.

Re: Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 (H.R. 5456)

Hon. KEVIN BRADY
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. VERN BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources,
Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY, RANKING MEMBER LEVIN, CHAIRMAN BUCHANAN, AND RANKING MEMBER DOGGETT: On behalf of the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators, we are writing in support of your efforts to promote and improve outcomes for the children and youth who come to the attention of the child welfare system, including children in foster care. Over the decades the House Ways and Means Committee, with bipartisan support, has taken significant steps forward on behalf of our most vulnerable children.

We are aware that the House Ways and Means Committee is considering the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 (H.R. 5456), which would allow funds under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act to be used for prevention services to help keep children at risk of placement in foster care safely at home with their parents or kin and would take important steps to ensure that children who need to enter foster care will be placed in the least restrictive setting appropriate to their needs, by targeting federal dollars on smaller family-foster homes and on other care settings for children and youth with special treatment needs or those in special circumstances, such as pregnant and parenting teens or older youth in independent living settings.

For your information, we enclose resolution, In Support of Reforms to Improve the Outcomes for Children in the Child Welfare System, recently adopted by our respective Conferences. We commend your efforts to promote and improve outcomes for the children and youth who come to the attention of the child welfare system. We hope that you consider our resolutions and support as you move forward to adopt this legislation.

Additionally, the legislation reauthorizes child and family services programs under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act, including the three Court Improvement Program (CIP) grants through FY 2021 at the current \$30 million level. The three CIP grant programs are critical for state courts as they provide the only federal funds to state courts for the purpose of improving state court oversight of abuse and neglect cases; and have been invaluable in assisting courts to improve and expedite our processes and procedures. These funds have resulted in abused and neglected children moving more expeditiously to safe, permanent homes and improved outcomes for children in need of protection. Our work, however, is not complete, so the reauthorization of these funds will allow us to continue our work to improve results for these children.

We look forward to working with you to ensure these child welfare reforms will truly benefit children who come to the attention of the child welfare system and to continue to explore additional improvements on their

behalf to ensure they all have safe, permanent families. Thank you for your continuing leadership on behalf of these children.

Sincerely,

Hon. DAVID GILBERTSON,
*President, Conference
of Chief Justices.*

PATRICIA W. GRIFFIN,
*President, Conference
of State Court Ad-
ministrators.*

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES AND CON-
FERENCE OF STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS
RESOLUTION 5—IN SUPPORT OF REFORMS TO IM-
PROVE THE OUTCOMES FOR CHILDREN IN THE
CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM

Whereas, the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators recognize the importance of securing safe and permanent homes for children and the importance of moving children in state custody to permanent and safe homes as quickly as possible through the efficient and effective handling of child abuse and neglect cases; and

Whereas, the Conferences have made child welfare system reform a priority and undertaken initiatives to strengthen court oversight of child welfare cases; and

Whereas, Congress is considering a number of legislative proposals that seek to improve the outcomes for children coming to the attention of the child welfare system; and

Whereas, the legislative proposals have provisions that would:

allow states to use Title IV-E funds for time-limited prevention services for eligible children who are candidates for foster care at “imminent risk” of entering or re-entering foster care but who can safely remain at home or with a kinship caregiver if provided services, or pregnant and parenting youth in foster care, or parents or kin caregivers of children at risk of entering foster care;

allow Title IV-E funds to be used to provide evidence-based time-limited prevention services for up to 12 months when an intervention is necessary;

require state child welfare agencies to develop a prevention plan for each case that lists the services or assistance needed and identifies the permanency goal for a child, how services are tied to the placement and permanency goal and are trauma-informed in order to receive time-limited prevention services;

allow for a child to receive a Title IV-E maintenance payment when placed with a parent in a residential substance abuse treatment facility;

provide short-term financial assistance through Title IV-B for up to three months for a child’s parent or kinship caregivers when it can be demonstrated that such assistance can prevent a child from entering foster care;

eliminate the time limit on the use of Title IV-B funds for family reunification services for children in foster care;

require states to take steps to safely reduce the inappropriate use of congregate/group care for children in the child welfare system;

require state child welfare agencies, at the initial placement and subsequent state reviews and permanency hearings, to demonstrate why the child cannot be served in a least restrictive placement and document efforts it has made to place the child into a more family-like setting;

require state child welfare agencies to conduct an assessment of appropriate placement prior to each permanency hearing or review;

require courts to review the assessment of the initial congregate care placements and

updated assessments of congregate care placements and approve or disapprove those placements;

condition receipt of Court Improvement Program funding on the provision of training for judges about new federal policies on placement of foster children in non-family settings;

amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require a state plan for academic content and achievement standards to describe how the state will ensure the educational stability of children in foster care and include assurances that: a foster child will remain or be enrolled in the child’s school of origin absent a determination that such enrollment is not in the child’s best interest; if such a determination is made, the child will be immediately enrolled in a new school, which must immediately contact the child’s previous school to obtain relevant records; and the state will designate a point of contact for child welfare agencies; and

allow states to certify that the state will provide assistance and services under the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained age 23; and

Whereas, state courts, in their oversight role, have a responsibility to insure that state child welfare agencies are complying with these new federal policies and requirements; and

Whereas, while these added responsibilities will lengthen the time of court hearings, the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators are committed to working with Congress and the United States Department of Health and Human Services to effectively implement the new policies and requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators urge Congress to give favorable consideration to these legislative proposals; and be it further

Resolved, That the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators further urge Congress and the United States Department of Health and Human Services to provide adequate funding to state courts to: provide training for judges and court personnel so that they understand and comply with the federal policies and requirements; develop resources and best court practices; and fully implement these resources and best practices.

Adopted as proposed by the CCJ/COSCA Courts, Children, and Families Committee at the Conference of State Court Administrators 2015 Midyear Meeting on December 5, 2015 and at the Conference of Chief Justices 2016 Midyear Meeting on February 3, 2016.

THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS,

Austin, Texas, June 20, 2016.

Re: Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 (H.R. 5456)

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR KEVIN: I understand the House may vote tomorrow on the Family First Prevention Services Act of 2016 (H.R. 5456), and that the bill has broad support so far. It would allow Social Security Title IV-E funds to improve the foster care system. It would also reauthorize child and family service programs under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act including the three Court Improvement Program grants through FY 2021 at the current \$30 million level. These grants are critical for state courts in improving oversight of abuse and neglect cases and generally improving procedures.

As you well know, improvement in the foster care system is of growing concern in

Texas as well as a national issue. I enclose a recent resolution of the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators “In Support of Reforms to Improve the Outcomes for Children in the Child Welfare System”.

Thanks, as always, for your consideration.
Cordially,

NATHAN L. HECHT,
Chief Justice.

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES AND CON-
FERENCE OF STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS
RESOLUTION 5—IN SUPPORT OF REFORMS TO IM-
PROVE THE OUTCOMES FOR CHILDREN IN THE
CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM

Whereas, the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators recognize the importance of securing safe and permanent homes for children and the importance of moving children in state custody to permanent and safe homes as quickly as possible through the efficient and effective handling of child abuse and neglect cases; and

Whereas, the Conferences have made child welfare system reform a priority and undertaken initiatives to strengthen court oversight of child welfare cases; and

Whereas, Congress is considering a number of legislative proposals that seek to improve the outcomes for children coming to the attention of the child welfare system; and

Whereas, the legislative proposals have provisions that would:

allow states to use Title IV-E funds for time-limited prevention services for eligible children who are candidates for foster care at “imminent risk” of entering or re-entering foster care but who can safely remain at home or with a kinship caregiver if provided services, or pregnant and parenting youth in foster care, or parents or kin caregivers of children at risk of entering foster care;

allow Title IV-E funds to be used to provide evidence-based time-limited prevention services for up to 12 months when an intervention is necessary;

require state child welfare agencies to develop a prevention plan for each case that lists the services or assistance needed and identifies the permanency goal for a child, how services are tied to the placement and permanency goal and are trauma-informed in order to receive time-limited prevention services;

allow for a child to receive a Title IV-E maintenance payment when placed with a parent in a residential substance abuse treatment facility;

provide short-term financial assistance through Title IV-B for up to three months for a child’s parent or kinship caregivers when it can be demonstrated that such assistance can prevent a child from entering foster care;

eliminate the time limit on the use of Title IV-B funds for family reunification services for children in foster care;

require states to take steps to safely reduce the inappropriate use of congregate/group care for children in the child welfare system;

require state child welfare agencies, at the initial placement and subsequent state reviews and permanency hearings, to demonstrate why the child cannot be served in a least restrictive placement and document efforts it has made to place the child into a more family-like setting;

require state child welfare agencies to conduct an assessment of appropriate placement prior to each permanency hearing or review;

require courts to review the assessment of the initial congregate care placements and updated assessments of congregate care placements and approve or disapprove those placements;

condition receipt of Court Improvement Program funding on the provision of training for judges about new federal policies on placement of foster children in non-family settings;

amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require a state plan for academic content and achievement standards to describe how the state will ensure the educational stability of children in foster care and include assurances that: a foster child will remain or be enrolled in the child's school of origin absent a determination that such enrollment is not in the child's best interest; if such a determination is made, the child will be immediately enrolled in a new school, which must immediately contact the child's previous school to obtain relevant records; and the state will designate a point of contact for child welfare agencies; and

allow states to certify that the state will provide assistance and services under the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program to youths who have aged out of foster care and have not attained age 23; and

Whereas, state courts, in their oversight role, have a responsibility to insure that state child welfare agencies are complying with these new federal policies and requirements; and

Whereas, while these added responsibilities will lengthen the time of court hearings, the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators are committed to working with Congress and the United States Department of Health and Human Services to effectively implement the new policies and requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators urge Congress to give favorable consideration to these legislative proposals; and be it further

Resolved, That the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators further urge Congress and the United States Department of Health and Human Services to provide adequate funding to state courts to: provide training for judges and court personnel so that they understand and comply with the federal policies and requirements; develop resources and best court practices; and fully implement these resources and best practices.

Adopted as proposed by the CCJ/COSCA Courts, Children, and Families Committee at the Conference of State Court Administrators 2015 Midyear Meeting on December 5, 2015 and at the Conference of Chief Justices 2016 Midyear Meeting on February 3, 2016.

HONORING COMMAND SGT. MAJ.
TONIA WALKER

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Command Sgt. Maj. Tonia Tuwarne Walker on her retirement from the United States Army.

Tonia is a native of Columbia, S.C., and enlisted in the Army in 1987. Tonia has served our nation honorably over her long and distinguished career spanning numerous assignments, most notably two deployments to Iraq. A decorated combat veteran, Tonia earned dozens of awards, including a Bronze Star.

In 2012, Tonia joined the Pentagon as a Congressional Legislative Liaison. I was fortunate to have her on my staff as a Department

of Defense Fellow. Her hands-on experience and in-depth knowledge of national security affairs assisted me greatly in my role as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Tonia has dedicated herself to the United States Army every day for nearly 30 years. I want to thank Tonia, her husband Ray, and their beautiful family for serving our community and country and for the many sacrifices they have made. I also want to thank Tonia for her friendship, and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE APPLESETH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate George Appleseth, a member of the 2016 Iowa Boys 2A State Golf Tournament Championship Team.

George, and his teammates at Panorama High School, persevered through a tough season. With steady and consistent play at the state tournament, these students showed the state of Iowa that they were worthy of a state championship two years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, George's determination, hard work, commitment and teamwork is what contributed to the stellar success of his team. His willingness to give it his best effort is what will be valuable later in life and I am honored to represent George in the United States Congress. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating George Appleseth and his team for competing and winning this rigorous competition. We all share in wishing him nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING BOETJE'S STONE
GROUND MUSTARD'S SUCCESS
AS 2016 GRAND CHAMPION

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Boetje's Stone Ground Mustard, which recently was named Grand Champion in the 2016 World-Wide Mustard Competition.

In the late 19th century, Fred Boetje began making stoneground Dutch mustard in his garage in Rock Island, Illinois. To this day, Boetje's is still a Quad Cities-based company and is gaining international recognition for their excellent and unique product. In fact, Boetje's is the first grainy mustard to win the Grand Champion award in the World-Wide Mustard Competition's history. Previously, in 2008, it took first prize in the "Best Coarse Grained" category at the World-Wide Mustard Competition, and in 2002, their mustard was named the "Best Illinois Food Product" by Illinois Magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again recognize Boetje's Mustard's victory in being named Grand Champion at the 2016 World-Wide Mustard Festival, and I wish them even more success in the future.

RESOLUTION HONORING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAMES
MEREDITH MARCH AGAINST
FEAR

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bipartisan resolution I introduced today with my colleagues TRENT KELLY, BENNIE THOMPSON and GREGG HARPER in honor of the 50th anniversary of the James Meredith March Against Fear.

Senator ROGER WICKER recently offered a similar resolution in the Senate with his colleagues Senator THAD COCHRAN and JEANNE SHAHEEN. The Senate swiftly passed that resolution, and I hope the House will do the same with the one we introduced today.

Fifty years ago last month, after already making history at the University of Mississippi, James Meredith risked his life once again by organizing a march from Memphis, Tennessee to Jackson, Mississippi to encourage African Americans to register to vote. This was not long after passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act, and a march like this—into the heart of Mississippi—was anything but safe.

Sure enough, Meredith was brutally shot and wounded.

Civil rights leaders quickly met at the Centenary United Methodist Church in Memphis to plan a resumption of the march. They were aided by the church's courageous Reverend James M. Lawson.

They were also aided by the Memphis chapter of the N.A.A.C.P. and civil rights leaders Maxine and Vasco Smith, Jesse Turner, Russell Sugarmon, and A.W. Willis, among others.

The next day, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Floyd McKissick, and Stokely Carmichael resumed the Meredith March Against Fear.

By the time marchers reached Jackson, 4,000 African Americans in Mississippi had registered to vote.

This was a great moment in the history of voting rights in our country, and I urge my colleagues to help us pay homage to it by passing this resolution.

RECOGNIZING KAREN J. LEE

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Karen J. Lee, a Community Programs Specialist with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Karen retired on June 30, 2016, after 33 years and 11 months of federal service.

Karen started her federal career working for the Department of Defense from 1980 to 1992. In May of 1992, she began working as a Temporary Clerk Typist within the Rural Housing agency of USDA Rural Development. Later that year, she was converted to a permanent member of the Community and Business Programs staff. In December of 1993, she was promoted to State Loan Technician and in January 2002, further promoted to Community and Business Programs Specialist.

During 2005, she was assigned to her current position as Community Programs Specialist.

Throughout her career, Karen assisted Illinois in processing loans and grants to rural communities and nonprofit organizations to improve and construct infrastructure projects. The projects she assisted on ranged from water and wastewater systems, public safety, and health and community services. She received numerous awards for outreach, marketing, and processing, and served on various national task forces which ultimately benefited residents in rural Illinois.

I am proud to honor Karen for her work on behalf of the people of Illinois, and I wish her the best in her retirement.

HONORING BLAIR FREDERICK
KARGES

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Blair Frederick Karges of Douglas County, Missouri for his lifelong care and service to this country.

Mr. Karges graduated from Pine City, Minnesota High School in May of 1939. At the age of 20 he was drafted into the United States Army. He served with the 544th Engineer Boat and Shore Regiment, 4th Engineer Special Brigade as a Company Armor & Squad Leader in the Cargo Control section moving cargo, troops, and anything else the army might need. He served on islands in the Netherland East Indies, Luzon, Philippines, and the occupation of Japan following their surrender. He received numerous awards, including the Philippine Liberation Ribbon Bronze Star, before being discharged on January 9, 1946. He later went on to serve in the Colorado Air National Guard as a Staff Sergeant from October of 1953 until October of 1956.

Mr. Karges then worked as an insurance agent for Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. until he retired in April of 1981. He married his loving wife, Pamela, on November 21, 1984 and they have lived happily together since.

Mr. and Mrs. Karges moved to Douglas County thirty years ago in May of 1986. Here he has remained very active in the community. Mr. Karges distributes meals for the Senior Center every week, works at Heart of the Hills distribution center one day a week, and is a member of the Douglas County Veterans Memorial Association. For his outstanding career and community achievements, it is my pleasure to recognize Blair Frederick Karges before the United States House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JACQUELINE A.
YOUNG

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Jacqueline A. Young on her retirement from the

Essex Regional Educational Services Commission in June 2016.

Dr. Young has been an educator for 42 years. She received her B.A. from Douglas College and her M.Ed. and Ed.D. from Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. Dr. Young began her career as an Elementary School Teacher in the Newark Public Schools. She then worked as an Elementary School Teacher and a Reading Resource Teacher for the East Orange School District. In 1980, she joined the New Jersey Department of Education as a Basic Skills Consultant and soon became a School Program Coordinator. In that capacity, she served as a facilitator between the Essex County Office of Education and the special needs urban districts for school improvement activities.

Since 1982, Dr. Young has been at the Essex Regional Educational Services Commission (ERESC) where she has held several positions including Supervisor of Instruction and Director of Services to Nonpublic Schools. In 1992, she assumed the position of Superintendent. Under her leadership and direction, the ERESO has grown into the largest educational services commission in the State of New Jersey. The ERESO provides services to local school districts, agencies and nonpublic schools throughout northern New Jersey.

Over half of Dr. Young's career has been spent championing the needs of special education and at risk students. During her tenure at the ERESO, she has assisted school districts by developing programs and establishing schools to meet the needs of those students who have difficulty functioning in traditional school settings. These schools incorporate strategies and techniques conducive to the educational and emotional needs of the students in an environment with a low student/teacher ratio. In September 1997, Dr. Young assumed the responsibility of establishing a school for pre-adjudicated adolescents in the Essex County Juvenile Detention Center in Newark which is now called Sojourn High School. Sojourn High School addresses the specific needs of the students using a combination of thematic instruction and service learning. For the past 19 years, she and her staff have provided these students with the opportunity to earn high school diplomas from their resident school districts or GEDs. Presently, the ERESO operates the following schools: Essex Campus Academy in Fairfield; Essex Junior Academy in Cedar Grove and Essex High School in Passaic in addition to Sojourn High School.

Dr. Young has received awards from a variety of organizations and communities for her work with this population of students. She was inducted into the Rutgers African American Alumni Alliance Hall of Fame Award in October 2011 and received the Shirley Chisholm "Catalyst For Change" Award. She is a member of the National Association of School Administrators, New Jersey Association of School Administrators, New Jersey Network of Superintendents, New Jersey Superintendents' Study Council, Essex County Superintendents' Group, Association of Educational Service Agencies, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, International Reading Association and Phi Delta Kappa. In addition, she is a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Montclair Alumnae Chapter. At this time, she is Co-Chairperson of Delta GEMS which stands for "Growing and Em-

powering Myself Successfully". This program services teenage girls between the ages of 14 and 18 in grades 9–12 addressing the following areas: sisterhood, community service, scholarship, college preparation and career options. Dr. Young's sincere concern for these young people and dedication to helping them has been a source of inspiration throughout her career.

Mr. Speaker, I know my fellow members of the U.S. House of Representatives agree that Dr. Jacqueline A. Young deserves to be recognized for a job well done and for many years of service to the people of New Jersey.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF WEST
DES MOINES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of West Des Moines, Iowa for its recognition as a 2015 Tree City USA sponsored by the Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the National Association of State Foresters and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry program (the Forest Service).

The City of West Des Moines has met the core standards for tree care during the past year. Over 135 million Americans live in Tree USA communities. In its 40th year of celebration, the Tree City USA program is critical to the U.S. Forest Service. This federal partner delivers technical and financial resources to states, cities and communities across the nation with each community adhering to a State Action Plan, guiding investments in each state while accomplishing local projects and programs.

The U.S. Forest Service and Arbor Day Foundation cooperate with communities to establish healthy forests, improve air and water quality and contribute to important national energy conservation goals. These local investments create long term major environmental improvements nationwide.

I commend the City of West Des Moines and urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the community on this award and in wishing the city nothing but continued success.

POPE COUNTY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I wish to acknowledge the residents of Pope County celebrating their Bicentennial Anniversary.

Pope County was established on January 10, 1816, when it received its name from Nathaniel Pope, then Secretary of the Illinois Territory. In 1818 when Illinois entered the Union as a free state, the population of Pope County mostly reflected the emigration of Europeans to America that occurred in the 19th century.

Pope County has since been the home to many notable citizens including: American

Civil War General James L. Alcorn, Military Governor of South Korea (preceding the Korean War) John R. Hodge, and American Civil War General Green B. Raum.

Pope County is also home to the Shawnee National Forest, which covers one third of the county, and provides residents and tourists with lakes, creeks, caves, rock formations, valleys, and wooded hills that are excellent for hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, horseback riding, and to just get away.

Pope County hosts many yearly events, including the 9-day Trail Ride, the River-to-River Relay, and the Deer Festival.

The residents of Pope County began celebrating their county's bicentennial on January 10, 2016, and will hold a multitude of festivities throughout the rest of the year.

I congratulate the residents of Pope County on the 200th anniversary of the county's founding, and I extend my best wishes for many more.

RECOGNIZING MS. BETTY REID
SOSKIN

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Betty Reid Soskin, a constituent, friend, and influential figure in my congressional district in Contra Costa County, California.

For my colleagues who may not know Betty, she is a fabled Park Ranger with the National Park Service at the Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historic Park. She also enjoys the unique distinction of our nation's oldest Park Ranger at age 94.

Betty has a tremendous life story. Born in Detroit, Betty and her family lived in New Orleans before relocating to Oakland, California in 1927. She worked as a file clerk for the Boilermakers Union A-36 during World War II, a Jim Crow all-African American union auxiliary. In the 1950s, she moved with her family to Walnut Creek where she fought against discrimination in her new mostly-white neighborhood, became active in her local church, and became a well-known songwriter during the civil rights movement during the 1960s.

In 1995, Betty was named a "Woman of the Year" by the California State Legislature and was named one of the nation's ten outstanding women in 2006 by the National Women's History Project.

As a field representative for members of the California legislature, Betty was active in the development of the Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historic Park to acknowledge the role of black neighborhoods surrounding the Richmond, California site, which had been bulldozed after the war. She now serves the park as a Ranger. In 2015, the White House recognized Betty with a Presidential Coin after she introduced President Obama at the National Christmas Tree lighting ceremony at the White House.

Last week, Betty was brutally assaulted and robbed when an unknown assailant broke into her home. True to form, Betty fought off her assailant, but during the encounter the thief managed to steal various personal items—among them, a special commemorative coin

given to her by President Obama when she helped light the national Christmas tree last winter.

Thanks to her strong spirit and perseverance, Betty is recovering quickly. Our office has been in touch with the White House to ensure Betty receives a new commemorative coin from the President to replace the one that was stolen.

We are thankful that Betty was not more seriously injured, and we look forward to welcoming her back to full health. Her spirit and drive are an inspiration to Californians everywhere.

HONORING LAKE FOREST POLICE
CHIEF JAMES HELD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Lake Forest Police Chief James Held.

Chief Held's career is a testament to his hard work. He rose through the ranks from being a student at the College of Lake County and a security guard in 1984 to being police chief thirty-two years. His creation of the Bike Rodeo and the twenty-year-old Citizen's Police Academy programs helped increase community outreach and education on behalf of local police forces.

Chief Held leaves behind a legacy of outstanding leadership at the Lake Forest Police Department, where he connected with his fellow officers and innovatively engaged with the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to express my gratitude to Police Chief James Held for his thirty-one years of laudable service.

CELEBRATING THE DEDICATION
OF THE SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE
VISITOR CENTER TO SENATOR
DIXON

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the dedication of the Scott Air Force Base Visitor Control Center, which will be named in honor of Senator Alan J. Dixon.

Senator Dixon dedicated his life to public service, fighting for our country in the United States Navy during World War II before representing Illinois in the United States Senate for 12 years, from 1981 to 1993. The Scott Air Force Base will honor Senator Dixon's commitment to our country and his tireless work on behalf of Illinois families—and given his lifetime of service, I cannot think of a more appropriate celebration of Senator Dixon's life. I was able to witness his dedication to Illinois first hand when my father worked for Senator Dixon as his Chief of Staff. As my father would often say, "he was a senator from Illinois, for Illinois."

As chairman of the subcommittee that authorized spending on armed services, Senator Dixon was known for reaching across the

aisle. His support for Illinois ensured that the Scott Air Force Base became one of the largest employers in the state, which now employs approximately 13,000 people and its airfield serves both military and civilian planes.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Scott Air Force Base for honoring Senator Dixon for his lifetime of service to our country and the State of Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE VOINOVICH

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a fellow public servant from Ohio, George Voinovich, who passed away Sunday, June 12th.

George was a pillar of the Republican Party, though he occasionally opposed the establishment in the name of good governance. His intellect was unsurpassed, helping him to become a two-term Governor of Ohio, and later to win a seat in the U.S. Senate.

Among his numerous achievements, George was proudest of passing the global anti-Semitism bill, efforts to expand NATO, and a bill to protect intellectual property. These accomplishments are a testament to his character, one which helped restore the city of Cleveland in the late 1970s.

In addition to political accomplishments, George prided himself on his frugality, in both his public life and private life. Throughout his governorship, his mantra was "working harder and smarter, doing more with less." Occasionally this mantra put George in juxtaposition with his party, such as when he pushed a tax increase that would help stabilize the state's finances.

Born in Cleveland on July 15, 1936, George Victor Voinovich was the son of Eastern European immigrants. His culture would strongly shape the man he became, endearing him to the ethnic communities that thrived in the Cleveland area.

Sadly, tragedy would also shape his life in later years, after the death of his youngest daughter, Molly, when she was 9 years old. George readily acknowledged this incident as one that elicited a greater depth of feeling and understanding, all of which he reflected back on his work in public service.

George passed away suddenly on Sunday, in the company of his wife, Janet. He had just made a public appearance the Friday before at the 25th Slovenian Independence Day event at Cleveland City Hall, and was a delegate to the upcoming Republican National Convention.

George is survived by his loving wife and three children. We offer them our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories of our dear friend and colleague, George, who will be remembered with affection and gratitude for his probing intellect, kind heart, and utter dedication to our wonderful state of Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO AARON KLING

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Aaron Kling, a member of the 2016 Iowa Boys 2A State Golf Tournament Championship Team.

Aaron, and his teammates at Panorama High School, persevered through a tough season. With steady and consistent play at the state tournament, these students showed the state of Iowa that they were worthy of a state championship two years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, Aaron's determination, hard work, commitment and team work is what contributed to the stellar success of his team. His willingness to give it his best effort is what will be valuable later in life and I am honored to represent Aaron in the United States Congress. I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Aaron Kling and his team for competing and winning this rigorous competition. We all share in wishing him nothing but continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEESBURG COMPOSITE SQUADRON AND THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) which is celebrating its 75th year of service to this country as an auxiliary of the United States Air Force. The Civil Air Patrol helps bring together citizens with a passion for aviation to volunteer in defense of our great nation. Furthermore, in light of the approaching appointment of its new squadron commander, I would like to specifically acknowledge the Leesburg Composite Squadron, of Leesburg, Virginia, for its exemplary service as part of the CAP, not only through its performance of duties such as search and rescue and disaster relief, but also through promoting community service, leadership, and health in our youth.

The Civil Air Patrol has a rich history beginning in the wake of the attacks on Pearl Harbor where over 150,000 brave citizens offered themselves towards answering the nation's call to arms. These volunteers provided essential assistance to the U.S. War Department, logging over 500,000 hours of flight time during the Second World War alone. Their service helped rescue hundreds of crash victims and sink several enemy submarines.

The Leesburg Composite Squadron of the CAP traces its roots back to 1973, under the vision of Captain Dorothy Tuller, and has continued to uphold the values and reputation set by the original CAP volunteers. They have displayed integrity, professionalism, and excellence in the performance of their duties and this is reflected by the institution's growth from under 40 volunteers to its present day size of over 100 cadets and 68 senior staff. They are more than worthy of their motto 'Citizens Serving Communities'.

Mr. Speaker, these fine men and women embody the greatest strengths of our nation through their service and sacrifice and make me proud to call myself an American. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the Civil Air Patrol and the Leesburg Composite Squadron for all their achievements, and wishing its new commander good luck in all their future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF STERLING VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY'S 50TH YEAR OF SERVICE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the Sterling Volunteer Fire Company, which is celebrating its 50th year of service to the good citizens of the Sterling community this year. I would like to personally commend the courageous men and women who so selflessly volunteer themselves and put themselves in danger on behalf of neighbors, friends, and strangers, without asking anything in return. These brave citizens embody the very best of this nation's values through their service to our community and their exemplary performance in the line of duty.

The Sterling Volunteer Fire Company has grown exponentially since its inception in 1966, which at the time was little more than an old barn on Holly Avenue housing a single tanker and two used pumbers. Within a short two years, this small institution had flourished, now settled into two larger locations: Station 11, which it shares with the Sterling Volunteer Rescue Squad, as well as Station 18, also known as SVRS 25. Even more recently, the company expanded into Station 24 in 2013. This is a clear testament to the outstanding work which is conducted by these everyday heroes and they are deserving of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me immense pride to recognize such a fine group, and I sincerely hope that we all can live up to their tremendous example. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Sterling Volunteers. I wish them good luck and hope that they remain safe in the fulfillment of their future duties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 21, 2016, I was unable to vote due to a cancelled flight. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On roll call no. 334, Yea.

On roll call no. 335, Yea.

On roll call no. 336, Yea.

IN RECOGNITION OF GUILFORD ELEMENTARY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Guilford Elementary School of Sterling, Virginia, on their 50th anniversary. This is an important milestone for this wonderful school in my District. Guilford Elementary School celebrated this anniversary in Loudoun County earlier this month on June 9th and it is my pleasure to briefly highlight the impact this school has had on my constituents.

Guilford Elementary School has a terrific history of success since first opening their doors in 1966. With the creation of Dulles Airport, this once rural space of Northern Virginia has developed into one of the most diverse and rapidly growing communities in the nation. Boasting one of the premier English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in the region, Guilford Elementary produces some of the highest test scores in the county. Equipped with top tier teachers and staff, this school has produced countless student success stories.

Coming from a family of educators, I understand how important a strong education is to the future of our nation. It is schools like Guilford Elementary that will continue to help shape the United States' role in the increasingly global economy, while also producing many of our nation's future leaders. Over the years, the faculty has shown an impressive dedication not only to its students, but to the Loudoun community as a whole. The success of this school is a tremendous accomplishment that should make past and present faculty proud.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Guilford Elementary School for their half-century of serving children and their families. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on Tuesday, June 21, 2016 because my flight from Oregon was delayed because of inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have supported passage of H.R. 5389, Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act, and H.R. 5388, Support for Rapid Innovation Act, and I would have opposed H.R. 5525, End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act.

The Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act and the Support for Rapid Innovation Act are commonsense bills that will make it easier for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to identify threats to cybersecurity and develop strategies to partner with industry to combat these cyber threats. Cybercrime is—and will continue to be—a serious threat to families, the United States economy, and our national security. I am proud to support two bills that will provide more tools for DHS to use when combating cybercrime.

I would have opposed the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phone Act, a shortsighted bill that seeks to eliminate access to affordable cell phones and broadband for low-income individuals and families. Currently the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Lifeline program provides subsidies for low-income families to obtain landline or wireless cell phones. This service is critical for people looking for jobs, children working on homework after school, and families scattered across the country who need to stay in touch. Under the End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phone Act, the Lifeline subsidy would only be available for landline phones. In our increasingly mobile economy, it is neither practical nor fair to force people to rely only on a landline phone. This bill would do nothing to level the playing field for those who need it most, and it would impede families who are trying to make ends meet and struggling to get ahead.

IN HONOR OF STANLEY LICKEY,
SR.

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Stanley Lickey, Sr., former Fire Chief of the Philomont Volunteer Fire Company Number 8, located in Loudoun County, Virginia.

A lifelong volunteer, Chief Lickey served dutifully for 32 years as Fire Chief, making him one of the longest continuously serving fire chiefs in the United States. He was instrumental in forming Loudoun County's Fire and Rescue Commission, whose mission was to create a county-wide fire and rescue system. Thanks to Chief Lickey's tireless efforts, today's system has become a model for career and volunteer cooperation.

He dedicated his life to serving his community and his enduring legacy is his willingness to lead by example, placing service to his neighbors in their time of greatest need above service to self.

Chief Lickey passed away at the age of 80 on May 27, 2016, surrounded by family, friends, and colleagues. Blessed to have been a grandfather and great-grandfather, he is survived by an extensive family who misses him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Fire Chief Stanley Lickey, Sr. and expressing gratitude for his life of service to our community.

RESTORATION TUESDAY: ALABAMA RULING ON VOTER REGISTRATION REQUIRING PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today on Restoration Tuesday, I rise to draw attention to U.S. District Judge Richard Leon's egregious ruling on June 29, 2016 allowing U.S. elections officials to change proof-of-citizenship requirements on the federal voting registration form at the request of Alabama, Kansas, and Georgia and without public notice. This ruling marks yet another example in a long line of restrictive voting practices used to suppress the right of eligible voters under the guise of circumventing voter fraud. This ruling means residents of Kansas, Georgia and Alabama will have to prove they are U.S. citizens when registering to vote for federal elections without prior public notice. One of the missions of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission which implemented this new law is to help make voting easier and not harder for eligible voters. Enforcing a new law and process without notifying the public falls far short of that goal. Instead, the court has sanctioned yet another "solution" to a problem that doesn't exist.

This new proof of citizenship requirement joins the other restrictions efforts like photo ID laws, DMV closings, poll site closings—which put up barriers to voter access. Mr. Speaker, Alabama has a storied history of voter suppression, and Judge Richard Leon's ruling last week yet again underscores the importance of the need for federal preclearance for changes to voting practices and procedures that could have a discriminatory impact. Unfortunately, these stories continue to be far too common in states across the country.

As the 2016 Presidential Election cycle continues, it is critically important that we recognize and defend against any attempts to create modern day barriers to the ballot box, instead of making voting more difficult, we should be working to ensure that every American is able to exercise their constitutionally protected right. It is reprehensible that in 2016, many Americans continue to face barriers to the ballot box. Now, citizens in Alabama, Georgia and Kansas have to show proof of citizenship to register to vote. These states have not shown a propensity for voter fraud due to lack of citizenship. It is another example of overzealous election officials putting up barriers to voting. Such suppression must stop! Our democracy is built on the premise

that every citizen is able to have their voices heard and vote counted! No Vote, No Voice! America cannot and must not be silenced.

I continue to call upon Congress to pass and enact meaningful legislation that restores key protections under the Voting Rights Act. All who believe in our great democracy should fight to ensure a fair and inclusive election process for all. The time is always ripe to do what is right.

IN RECOGNITION OF WOODGROVE
HIGH SCHOOL

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the students of Woodgrove High School for their incredible determination in earning the Class 4A Wells Fargo Cup for academics. Formerly the Wachovia Cup, this prestigious award has been given to one academic and one athletic winner in each of the six enrollment classifications of the Virginia High School League (VHSL) since 1990. Throughout the year, schools across Virginia compete in 12 academic challenges, such as the scholastic bowl, creative writing, theater, forensics, debate, film festival, broadcast, newspaper, yearbook, and magazine. Woodgrove High School students especially proved themselves more than capable in the areas of film festival, forensics, yearbook and newspaper. This award signifies excellence, with the winner commonly referred to as the 'state champion of state champions'.

Coming from a family of educators, I truly appreciate the significance of this award. This is the first time that a Loudoun County school has been awarded this trophy, and I am sure that it will not be the last. It is therefore with great pleasure and enthusiasm that I congratulate the students of Woodgrove High School on their excellent achievement. I cannot emphasize how proud I am to be their representative in Congress.

Education is the cornerstone of American innovation and these students are championing their generation towards greater success. It is my hope that additional schools will follow the standard of academic excellence set by Woodgrove High School, and encourage their students to be the best that they can be.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Woodgrove High School, its staff, and its students in making this result possible, and for setting a great example for others to follow. I wish them all continued success in the future.

Tuesday, July 5, 2016

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate met at 9:00:02 a.m. in pro forma session, and adjourned at 9:00:25 a.m. until 10 a.m., on Wednesday, July 6, 2016.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 5619–5627; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 96; H. Con. Res. 140; and H. Res. 802, 804–807 were introduced. **Pages H4275–76**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4276–77**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 210, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–655);

H.R. 3080, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception to the employer health insurance mandate for Indian tribal governments and tribally owned businesses, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–656);

H.R. 3590, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the income threshold used in determining the deduction for medical care, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–657);

H.R. 3734, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide support to mining schools, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–658);

H.R. 4538, to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–659);

H.R. 4854, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an exemption

from the definition of an investment company, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–660);

H.R. 4855, to amend provisions in the securities laws relating to regulation crowdfunding to raise the dollar amount limit and to clarify certain requirements and exclusions for funding portals established by such Act, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–661);

H.R. 5385, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–662);

H.R. 4511, to amend the Veterans' Oral History Project Act to allow the collection of video and audio recordings of biographical histories by immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces who died as a result of their service during a period of war (H. Rept. 114–663);

H.R. 4733, to permit the United States Capitol Police to accept certain property from other Federal agencies and to dispose of certain property in its possession (H. Rept. 114–664);

H.R. 4734, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate (H. Rept. 114–665); and

H. Res. 803, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4361) to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security

of Federal information systems, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Rept. 114–666). **Page H4275**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Womack to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4195**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:06 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H4201**

Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 796, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4768) to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; providing for proceedings during the period from June 23, 2016, through July 4, 2016; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 168 noes, Roll No. 344, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 168 nays, Roll No. 343. **Pages H4208–15, H4240–41**

Restoring Access to Medication Act—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 793, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements, by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 168 noes, Roll No. 346, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 168 nays, Roll No. 345. **Pages H4215–22, H4241–42**

Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 794, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 172 noes, Roll No. 348, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 169 nays, Roll No. 347. **Pages H4222–30, H4242–44**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Patient Access to Durable Medical Equipment Act of 2016: H.R. 5210, amended, to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program; **Pages H4230–35**

Supporting America's Innovators Act of 2016: H.R. 4854, amended, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to expand the investor limitation for qualifying venture capital funds under an

exemption from the definition of an investment company, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 388 yeas to 9 nays, Roll No. 349; **Pages H4235–36, H4244**

Fix Crowdfunding Act: H.R. 4855, amended, to amend provisions in the securities laws relating to regulation crowdfunding to raise the dollar amount limit and to clarify certain requirements and exclusions for funding portals established by such Act, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 394 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 350; **Pages H4236–40, H4244–45**

Tule River Indian Reservation Land Trust, Health, and Economic Development Act: H.R. 4685, to take certain Federal lands located in Tulare County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tule River Indian Tribe; **Pages H4245–46**

Bureau of Land Management Foundation Act: H.R. 3844, amended, to establish the Energy and Minerals Reclamation Foundation to encourage, obtain, and use gifts, devises, and bequests for projects to reclaim abandoned mine lands and orphan oil and gas well sites; **Pages H4246–48**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To establish the Bureau of Land Management Foundation to encourage, obtain, and use gifts, devises, and bequests for projects for the benefit of, or in connection with, activities and services of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.”

Page H4248

Senior Safe Act of 2016: H.R. 4538, amended, to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens; **Pages H4248–51**

Amending the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir: H.R. 2273, amended, to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir; **Pages H4251–52**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend the Definite Plan Report for the Seedska-dee Project to enable the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir.” **Page H4252**

Save Our Salmon Act: H.R. 4582, amended, to exclude striped bass from the anadromous fish doubling requirement in section 3406(b)(1) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act; **Pages H4252–53**

Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act: H.R. 1838, amended, to establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and to designate additional components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; **Pages H4253–55**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To establish the Clear Creek National Recreation Area in San Benito and Fresno Counties, California, to designate the Joaquin Rocks Wilderness in such counties, and for other purposes.” **Page H4255**

Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Act: H.R. 5244, to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928; **Pages H4255–57**

Taking certain Federal land located in Tuolumne County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians: H.R. 3079, amended, to take certain Federal land located in Tuolumne County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians; **Pages H4257–58**

United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016: H.R. 4875, amended, to establish the United States Semiquincentennial Commission; **Pages H4258–60**

400 Years of African-American History Commission Act: H.R. 4539, amended, to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission; and **Pages H4260–63**

Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act: Concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3766, to direct the President to establish guidelines for United States foreign development and economic assistance programs. **Pages H4267–70**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Global Food Security Act of 2016: S. 1252, to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations. **Pages H4263–67**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4230.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4240, H4241, H4241–42, H4242, H4243, H4243–44, H4244, and H4244–45. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS SAFEGUARDS ACT OF 2016

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4361, the “Federal Information Systems Safeguards Act of 2016”. The committee granted, by record vote of 8–1, a structured rule for H.R. 4361. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–59 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 2, the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 7, 2016, or July 8, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to a measure addressing the Federal Aviation Administration. Testimony was heard from Chairman Chaffetz, and Representatives Connolly, Meadows, and Norton.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider the nomination of Andrew Mayock, of Illinois, to be Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine ISIS online, focusing on countering

terrorist radicalization and recruitment on the internet and social media, 2 p.m., SD-342.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Past, Present, and Future of SNAP: Evaluating Error Rates and Anti-Fraud Measures to Enhance Program Integrity”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, markup on the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 2017, 10:30 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled “Aviation Readiness”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Alternate Approaches to Federal Budgeting”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled “A Review of EPA’s Regulatory Activity During the Obama Administration: Energy and Industrial Sectors”, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Financially Rewarding Terrorism in the West Bank”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, markup on H. Res. 210, affirming and recognizing the Khmer, Laotian, Hmong, and Montagnard Freedom Fighters and the people of Cambodia and Laos for their support and defense of the United States Armed Forces and freedom in Southeast Asia; H. Res. 634, recognizing the importance of the United States-Republic of Korea-Japan trilateral relationship to counter North Korean threats and nuclear proliferation, and to ensure regional security and human rights; H. Res. 728, supporting human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Cambodia; and H.R. 4501, the “Distribution and Promotion of Rights and Knowledge Act of 2016”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, hearing entitled “The Judicial Branch and the Efficient Administration of Justice”, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Task Force on Executive Overreach, hearing entitled “The Federal Government on Autopilot: Mandatory Spending and the Entitlement Crisis”, 1 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, hearing entitled “Assessing the Obama Years: OIRA and Regulatory Impacts on Jobs, Wages and Economic Recovery”, 3 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 5577, the “Innovation in Offshore Leasing Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, hearing on H.R. 4531, to approve an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Palau, and for other purposes, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Firearms and Munitions at Risk: Examining Inadequate Safeguards”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on S. 2943, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017”, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Foreign Cyber Threats: Small Business, Big Target”, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled “Independent Leasing Authorities: Increasing Oversight and Reducing Costs of Space Leased by Federal Agencies”, 10:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture, hearing entitled “Future Overhead Satellite Requirements”, 10 a.m., HVC-304. This hearing will be closed.

Joint Meetings

Conference: meeting of conferees on S. 524, to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, 10 a.m., 2123, Rayburn Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3100, Sanctuary Cities.

At approximately 2:45 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Brian R. Martinotti, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Following disposition of the nomination of Brian R. Martinotti, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3100, Sanctuary Cities.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, July 6

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the following measure under suspension of the rules: H.R. 2646—Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2016. Consideration of H.R. 4361—The Federal Information Systems Safeguards Act of 2016 (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H.R. 5485—Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barton, Joe, Tex., E1028
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E1028
 Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E1034
 Buchanan, Vern, Fla., E1029
 Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1026, E1031, E1033
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1025
 Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E1026
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1025
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1031
 Comstock, Barbara, Va., E1034, E1034, E1034, E1035,
 E1035
 Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E1031

Costa, Jim, Calif., E1027
 Davis, Rodney, Ill., E1031
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E1033
 Dold, Robert J., Ill., E1033
 Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E1025
 Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1024
 Granger, Kay, Tex., E1021
 Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E1034
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1021, E1023
 Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1024
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1024
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1022, E1033
 Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E1028
 Lujan Grisham, Michelle, N.M., E1027

Maloney, Sean Patrick, N.Y., E1026
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1026
 Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1023
 Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1028
 Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E1032
 Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1022
 Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1035
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E1022, E1032
 Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E1024
 Smith, Jason, Mo., E1021, E1022, E1024, E1025, E1026,
 E1027, E1032
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1026
 Young, David, Iowa, E1021, E1022, E1024, E1025, E1026,
 E1027, E1029, E1031, E1032, E1034



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.