



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016

No. 113

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 13, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

### FREE OSCAR LOPEZ RIVERA

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I will not be on vacation or traveling on junkets to far-off lands during the next 6 or 8 weeks that Congress is in recess because I am going to be involved in a campaign to free Oscar Lopez Rivera from incarceration.

Oscar Lopez Rivera is regarded as the last political prisoner from Puerto Rico that is still being held in a Federal penitentiary. Oscar is a friend and a mentor. And at 73 years old, he is not

beaten, broken, or sad, as you can see by the smile on his face.

Even after spending 35 years in jail, nearly half of his life, he is a hero to many people in Puerto Rico and throughout the Puerto Rico diaspora. It warms my heart that people from every walk of life now understand that the 35 years Oscar has served for crimes that were not violent is too long to be in jail. There is a groundswell of support to tell President Obama that, after 35 years, it is time to let Oscar Lopez Rivera come home to his family, his island, and his community.

Enough is enough—ya basta. Thirty-five years is enough. And this comes from people of every political background: conservatives, liberals, statehooders, Democrats, Republicans, Populares, and, yes, those who believe in independence like I do. And every generation from the youngest, hippest kids, like Residente of Calle 13, to old people like me, from the richest to the poorest, whether you live in Bayamon, Ponce, Orlando, Chicago, or New York City, the Puerto Rican people are united in our call to free Oscar Lopez Rivera.

Internationally, Bishop Desmond Tutu is with us, and a long list of Nobel Peace Prize winners have joined the campaign to free Oscar Lopez, along with world leaders, community leaders, and average people across Europe, Latin America, and the world.

Oscar Lopez is a decorated Vietnam war veteran, a father, teacher, mentor, and a friend. Yet, he has languished in Terre Haute, Indiana, for three-and-a-half decades.

President Obama has less than 200 days left as President, and the chorus of supporters for the freedom of Oscar Lopez Rivera will continue to call on the President every day to release our brother Oscar back to our community so he can live out his days in peace and with his family. Commutation is the only option—the only option.

It will be a minimum of 10 years before Oscar can talk—that is just talk—to a parole board. It is now or never, and President Obama holds all the cards. We could not allow Oscar to die in jail. Obama must commute his sentence.

A coalition, La Coalicion por la Liberacion de Oscar Lopez Rivera, has formed with lawyers, union leaders, elected officials, community leaders, and citizens from every walk of life in Puerto Rico and wherever Puerto Ricans live in the United States. This coalition just announced a unity event, a gathering in Lafayette Square across the street from the White House, on October 9, 2016.

So, Madam Speaker, when the Congress leaves this week for 6 weeks or more, I am not going to go on vacation. I am going to go work to build awareness about Oscar Lopez Rivera and build awareness about October 9 right here in Washington, D.C., at Lafayette Square.

The 9th of October in Washington—el 9 de octubre en Washington. We all have to show up and show our support for Oscar and his family.

So I will be in Lorain, Ohio, this Saturday and in Philadelphia and New Jersey later this month. I will be in Puerto Rico and California. Wherever I go, I will be telling people to come to Washington to show support for Oscar Lopez Rivera on October 9, 2016. If you live in New York, it is about a 3½ hour drive to D.C. Oscar Lopez Rivera has been in jail for three-and-a-half decades, so I don't want to hear any excuses.

October 9th is a Sunday. So if you live anywhere up and down the eastern seaboard, you can go to sunrise service at your church and still make it in time to show your solidarity with Oscar.

If you live in Chicago or Orlando, okay, it is going to take you a little longer. You might even have to pay for

□ 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.

H4817

a hotel or airplane ticket, but your Boricua nation needs you to represent.

I ask everyone who is watching today or who sees my remarks online to commit yourself to joining me and others in Lafayette Square on October 9 in Washington, D.C. It is up to us. It is up to you.

President Obama has done so much to address injustice, to address unfair prison sentences for nonviolent offenses, to address the inherent injustice that all too often characterizes our system of justice. I thank him and praise him for that.

In this case, with this elder statesman of the Puerto Rican diaspora for this nonviolent, exemplary inmate, for this father and war hero, for Oscar Lopez Rivera, we respectfully say enough is enough—ya basta. Free Oscar Lopez Rivera.

#### 26TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

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

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 26th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Twenty-six years ago this month, this landmark legislation was put into effect to eliminate discrimination against individuals with disabilities. This month, organizations and advocacy groups across my district in central New York are coordinating events to recognize this milestone and the significance of the ADA to so many in our community.

In my district, ARISE—the designated independent living center for Cayuga, Onondaga, and Oswego Counties—is vital to our local efforts to ensure that people of all abilities live fully integrated and self-directed lives. ARISE provides an array of services to assist central New Yorkers, including my brother-in-law, with disabilities and to help ensure that our local communities are inclusive for people of all abilities.

While the ADA has been in law for 26 years now, our work in Congress continues today. I am a proud cosponsor of the IDEA Full Funding Act to help remove barriers for children with disabilities and to expand special education services. And I will continue to be supportive of efforts in the House to ensure people with all abilities are provided opportunities and independence.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 3 weeks ago today, House Democrats conducted a sit-in to demand a commonsense debate and votes on gun violence. Americans gath-

ered around their televisions, computers, and phones and rooted for this Congress to do the right thing.

Across the country, families demanded that this body take up two commonsense measures to reduce our country's epidemic of gun violence. Phones in our offices throughout Capitol Hill were ringing off the hook. Thousands of Americans—students, teachers, grieving parents, strangers to the political process—saw something that inspired and excited them, and they picked up the phone because they had hope. Their message: Thank you for fighting for us. Make sure something is done.

What did this Congress do with that hope? Well, instead of allowing a vote to expand background checks to keep Americans safe, instead of allowing a vote to close the terrorist gun loophole, instead of even having a debate on gun safety, the Speaker turned his back on the American people and sent the House home early.

Since Orlando, hundreds have died from gun violence. Just in the streets of Chicago, more than 300 people have been hurt or killed by guns in the last month. An average of 91 Americans are killed every day by guns.

There was a time when unthinkable violence and mass shootings shook our Nation to its core, and our elected leaders would find a way to bring us together like the bipartisan calls we heard for unity in Dallas yesterday. They would struggle to get it right, but ultimately they would and save lives.

It happened 82 years ago with the New Deal for Crime. It happened 48 years ago with major gun violence reforms. And it happened 23 years ago when Americans stood up to the powerful gun lobby and passed the Brady Handgun Violence Program. Each time, a frustrated, grieving, but determined Nation took a stand together to say enough is enough.

It has been 23 years since our country passed any meaningful gun violence legislation. Since then, gun-related crimes have claimed more American lives than AIDS, war, and illegal drug overdoses combined. Since Newtown, tens of thousands of lives have been lost to this deadly crisis. The number of bills that have been debated and passed by this Congress to prevent these deaths remains at zero.

This Republican Congress may find comfort in remaining silent, in doing the bidding of the NRA, in turning its back on our people. But our inaction disserves our constituents and the tens of thousands of families who have lost loved ones to gun violence. Millions more worry that they and their families are not safe. And if mothers can't sleep at night knowing their children are safe from harm, neither should this Congress.

I challenge my colleagues who have been silent on gun violence to engage their communities when they go home, to try and find a way to reject the gun lobby's heavy hand and bring the will

of the American people to this body and to help us reduce gun fatalities.

The number of Americans who are resolved to taking steps to reduce gun violence is growing. I ask my colleagues to take stock of their solemn duty to keep families safe from harm. I ask them to take stock of history. Do not bet against the American people. Stand with us to end Congress' deadly silence.

#### INEQUITABLE BUSINESS PRACTICE IN AUSTRALIA

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, last year, I spoke on the House floor about my serious concerns about the Export-Import Bank's interference of energy companies and the country of Australia.

In 2013, the Export-Import Bank approved a loan of \$640 million in financing for U.S. equipment to develop an open-pit iron ore mine in Australia. The mine is owned by the wealthiest woman in Australia. This is not an appropriate use of U.S. taxpayer dollars.

According to unions, public officials, and the Iron Mining Association, these subsidies threaten to displace nearly \$600 million worth of U.S. iron ore exports and cause a reduction of \$1.2 billion in domestic sales.

Today, injustice toward U.S. companies in Australia has been continued regarding a Florida company, APR. APR constructed an \$80 million power plant in western Australia to help the people and businesses of western Australia.

Once the power-generation facility was almost built, an Australian bank, ANZ Bank, seized the power plant, even though it had no legal title or ownership interest in the plant. It claimed an ownership interest in the plant based on an unfair law in Australia which is unique to that country. This incredibly unfair Australian legislation allows U.S. companies and U.S. banks to lose their title or lien interest to their own assets, even though the Australian companies and banks are expressly barred from doing so by contracts they signed with U.S. companies.

APR lost its \$80 million power plant, lost the use of equipment and ability to generate electricity for western Australians, and lost the revenue associated with the plant. That power plant and revenue was wrongfully taken by the bank.

Australia legislates that U.S. companies that lease assets in Australia are at peril of losing their assets based on this unfair and inequitable law. This law is called the Personal Property Securities Act and is contrary to the basic right to own and possess private property guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution and the fundamental right to due process and equal protection, also guaranteed under the U.S.

Constitution. This law has the demonstrated ability, such as with APR, and the potential to seriously harm many other U.S. businesses and U.S. interests in Australia and must be immediately addressed.

□ 1015

Last night I conducted a telephone townhall meeting in my district and was asked by a constituent about the status of the Trans-Pacific Partnership legislation. This matter is important and topical for us because of the pending Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement which the Obama administration is supporting and many in Congress are pushing for a vote on soon, such as this year.

Laws like the Australian Personal Property Securities Act should make it very difficult for any Member of Congress to vote for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If Australia is going to continue to be our trading partner, there must be a level playing field for all parties involved. U.S. companies cannot be at a disadvantage when they do business in Australia or any other country.

I strongly encourage our U.S. Trade Representative to address the situation so an inequity caused to APR and the potential inequities presented for other U.S. companies be corrected before a vote is called on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

#### COMMEMORATING OFFICER BRENT THOMPSON

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Madam Speaker, to protect and serve isn't just a slogan on the side of police cars all across the country. It is a promise—a promise that our men and women in blue keep every day as they serve to uphold the law and order in our cities and our towns. Without their bravery and sacrifice, our communities would be lawless and our families, our friends, and our loved ones would be in constant danger.

I can't adequately express the sadness I felt last week when five Dallas police officers were targeted as victims in a horrific ambush simply for choosing to put on their uniform and to protect their community. Among the officers whose lives were unjustly taken was DART Police Department Officer Brent Thompson, who was a resident of Royse City in my home district. It just breaks my heart that this brave man's life was mercilessly and needlessly cut short at 43 years of age just because he reported for duty simply wanting to do his job.

So I join the greater Dallas community, the Fourth District of Texas, and our entire country in mourning over the loss of Officer Thompson, as we remember him for his selfless commitment to our country. His family remains in our prayers, and we will be forever grateful to him for his service.

Officer Thompson, you will not be forgotten. Your memory will continue to inspire us to stand up for those who stand up for us because this violence targeted towards our police officers is unacceptable, it is outrageous, and it needs to stop.

#### RAISING ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every month should be Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month, and I rise today to share my efforts to help Alzheimer's patients and their families. Having lost my mother due to complications from Alzheimer's, I am all too familiar with how it impacts the patient and their loved ones.

I continue to push for more NIH research funding because it represents our best chance to save lives and restore hope to millions of families. I am a cosponsor of Congressman ELIOT ENGEL's Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act, a bill to make sure that Alzheimer's patients receive the care and the compassion they deserve and they need.

I am also a cosponsor of Congressman CHRIS SMITH's HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, to help families and caregivers plan for the costs and complications of Alzheimer's.

I urge all of my colleagues and the public to join together with the Alzheimer's Association in supporting these efforts to fight this tragic disease.

#### SUPPORTING PEOPLE WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS THROUGH NATURE LINKS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the efforts that the one nonprofit organization that is based in my south Florida district is making on behalf of young adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Nature Links for Lifelong Learning is forming a valuable national model of education and inclusion for south Florida. For far too long, many young adults with an autism spectrum disorder, Asperger's, or Down syndrome have been forgotten as they were released into the world following their time in the public school system, but Nature Links has exceptional skills-based educational training which works to identify the character of each individual's unique identity and takes the time to tap into each student's potential to develop civically engaged, job-ready, and fully functioning adults.

I congratulate Nature Links on its contributions to our south Florida community, and I urge everyone to learn more by visiting their Web site at [www.naturelinks.net](http://www.naturelinks.net).

#### CELEBRATING VIZCAYA'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the 100th anniversary

of the completion of the main house at Vizcaya on the shores of Biscayne Bay in my fabulous south Florida congressional district.

Since 1916, Vizcaya has served as a south Florida landmark and a symbol of Old World elegance and cultural influence. Unfortunately, James Deering, the former vice president of International Harvester and the visionary founder of Vizcaya, died in 1925 before his plans for the estate were completed in full.

Now, as part of the Miami-Dade County Parks system, the Vizcaya Museum and Gardens preserves some of south Florida's early history among significant collections of orchid specimens and European artwork.

With plans to continue historic preservation and the creation of an attractive new open space for public enjoyment to be known as Vizcaya Village, the future beyond 100 is indeed very bright for Vizcaya.

#### EXCITING RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding contributions that the University of Miami researchers are making to America's health care. In becoming one of the leading research universities in the country over the last decade, the University of Miami has developed a pool of world-class talent and advanced infrastructure that is helping lead the science and tech boom that is shaping south Florida's future for the better.

Among the exciting research breakthroughs taking place in Coral Gables is the work of the Lampidis lab at the Miller School of Medicine. This is where Dr. Lampidis and his associates have found that, when given in combination with a common cholesterol medication, nontoxic 2-DG therapy effectively kills tumors without the use of harsh, conventional chemotherapy drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Lampidis and everyone at the University of Miami for their efforts to improve our community, our Nation, and the world.

#### THE PATH FORWARD ON GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come today to draw attention to the fact that tomorrow evening we are going to be hosting a SpeakOut on the west front of the Capitol, the west lawn, and we are going to be highlighting four pieces of legislation: H.R. 1217, H.R. 1076, H.R. 3051, and H.R. 4603.

I am particularly interested today in H.R. 3051. That is the legislation that seeks to close what has become known as the Charleston loophole. The reason I am particularly interested in it today is because yesterday the General Accountability Office issued a 57-page report. Now, that report is so voluminous

I am not going to ask that it be entered into the RECORD, but I will include the one-page summary into the RECORD. Here is what you are going to find in this report:

[From GAO Highlights, July 2016]

#### GUN CONTROL

#### ANALYZING AVAILABLE DATA COULD HELP IMPROVE BACKGROUND CHECKS INVOLVING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORDS

##### *What GAO Found*

Most of the 50 states submit domestic violence records—misdemeanor crime of domestic violence (MCDV) convictions and domestic violence protection orders—to the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for use during National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) checks, but states vary in their efforts to identify ("flag") such records that prohibit an individual from obtaining a firearm under federal law. For example, in 2015, 22 states voluntarily participated in a program to identify criminal history records that prohibit individuals from obtaining firearms, which can include domestic violence records. FBI data also show that 47 states identified domestic violence protection orders that prohibit firearm purchases. Since not all domestic violence records that states submit to the FBI meet federal prohibiting criteria, flagging prohibiting records can help expedite NICS checks. The total number of prohibiting domestic violence records that states submit to the FBI is generally unknown because states are not required to flag prohibiting records and there is no automated process to disaggregate such records from other records checked by NICS.

For fiscal years 2006 to 2015, FBI data show that most NICS checks involving domestic violence records that resulted in denials were completed before firearm transfers took place (see table). However, about 6,700 firearms were transferred to individuals with prohibiting domestic violence records, which resulted in the FBI referring these cases to DOJ's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives for firearm retrieval. Under federal law, firearm dealers may (but are not required to) transfer a firearm to an individual if the dealer has not received a response (proceed or denial) from the FBI after 3 business days.

#### BACKGROUND CHECK DENIALS AND FIREARM TRANSFERS FOR MISDEMEANOR CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (MCDV) CONVICTIONS AND PROTECTION ORDERS, FISCAL YEARS 2006 TO 2015

Category—MCDV convictions, Total denials—59,000, Within 3 days—41,000, After 3 days—18,000, Firearm transfers—6,221.

Category—Protection Orders, Total denials—30,000, Within 3 days—28,000, After 3 days—2,000, Firearm transfers—559.

FBI data also show that during fiscal year 2015, the FBI completed 90 percent of denials that involved MCDV convictions within 7 business days, which was longer than for any other prohibiting category (e.g., felony convictions). The FBI completed 90 percent of denials that involved domestic violence protection orders in fewer than 3 business days. According to federal and selected state officials GAO contacted, the information needed to determine whether domestic violence records—and in particular MCDV convictions—meet the criteria to prohibit a firearm transfer is not always readily available in NICS databases and can require additional outreach to state agencies to obtain information. DOJ has taken steps to help states make prohibiting information more readily available to NICS—such as through training and grant programs—but does not monitor

the timeliness of checks that result in denials by prohibiting category. Ongoing monitoring could help the FBI determine if specific prohibiting categories present greater challenges in making determinations than other categories and, in turn, the FBI could provide the results to other DOJ entities to help them establish priorities, such as for grants, state outreach, or training.

#### GAO HIGHLIGHTS

Highlights of GAO-16-483, a report to the Acting Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

##### *Why GAO Did This Study*

The FBI and designated state and local criminal justice agencies use the FBI's NICS to conduct background checks on individuals seeking to obtain firearms. Persons prohibited by federal law from possessing firearms include individuals who have domestic violence records that meet federal disqualifying criteria. Under federal law, firearm dealers may transfer a firearm to an individual if the FBI has not made a proceed or denial determination within 3 business days.

GAO was asked to review NICS checks involving domestic violence records. This report (1) describes the extent to which states identify domestic violence records that prohibit an individual from obtaining a firearm and (2) evaluates the extent to which NICS checks involving domestic violence records are completed before firearm transfers take place and any related challenges in completing these checks.

GAO reviewed laws and regulations; analyzed FBI data from 2006 through 2015 on domestic violence records that states submitted to the FBI, FBI total checks and denial determinations, and DOJ firearm retrieval actions; and interviewed officials from DOJ and eight states (chosen based on number of domestic violence records submitted to NICS and other factors). State interview results are not generalizable but provide insights on state practices.

##### *What GAO Recommends*

GAO recommends that FBI monitor the timeliness of NICS checks to assist DOJ entities in establishing priorities for improving the timeliness of checks. FBI agreed with the recommendation.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this report says that the General Accountability Office has found that between the years 2006 and 2015, 89,000 people have been blocked from purchasing weapons who were not eligible to purchase weapons because of their records.

But the report says that 6,800 others were able to purchase firearms because the 3-day limit expired before they had the chance to complete the background checks. That is what happened to those nine souls at Emanuel AME Church when the gentleman, if I might call him that, who purchased a weapon and murdered those nine people was not eligible to purchase a weapon. He was joined by 6,800 others.

Now, we have heard from people who tell us—and this report says—that this is the biggest contributor to domestic violence. 6,800 people who have been convicted of domestic violence were able to go and purchase guns simply because of this loophole.

We have been asking for years now that the Centers for Disease Control be authorized to go and study this issue to

help better inform us on the impact of gun violence, but this House has passed prohibitive legislation that will not allow funds to be used to do that study.

I don't quite understand. Why is it not proper for the Members of the United States Congress to be equipped with information that will allow us to make better decisions about how to protect the American people?

People who are guilty of domestic violence and have been proven in the courts to be guilty ought to not be allowed to go onto the Internet and purchase a weapon. We have case after case where these weapons were then almost immediately used to injure, maim, and, in some instances, kill wives, spouses, and children because of this loophole.

I would have hoped that after June 17 of last year that we would come to our senses in this body and close this loophole, but tomorrow evening we are going to once again draw attention to this loophole because the American people are deserving of being protected by those of us who are elected to protect them, secure them, and to make sure that they can live out their lives in security.

#### ALL EDUCATION IS CAREER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for far too long there has been a discrepancy in what students are learning in the classroom and what employers say they need in the workplace. The passage of the bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014 was an important step for the millions of Americans who are looking for work and for the employers who have job opportunities that remain unfilled due to the skills gap. However, great jobs are still going unfilled. Americans are still missing out on rewarding careers, and many businesses are still suffering.

The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act has provided Federal support to State and local career and technical education programs for more than 30 years. H.R. 5587, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, updates the law to reflect today's economic needs and the challenges that students and workers currently face.

In particular, I am pleased that the bill streamlines the number of performance measures for postsecondary programs and aligns them with the performance measures in WIOA, retaining that law's precedent-setting accountability standards that let taxpayers and lawmakers see clearly which programs work and which programs don't. This bipartisan bill goes a long way toward ensuring that individuals who pursue a technical education have the knowledge and skills they need to succeed.

□ 1030

However, I believe it is time we acknowledge that all education is career education and stop dividing the path to a high school degree into two tracks.

Students pursue education to develop the necessary skills to find a job—preferably a career—in a chosen field. It is the same objective, whether the student is pursuing a medical degree at an Ivy League university or taking automotive performance courses at the local community college.

Unfortunately, there is an unnecessary stigma attached to career and technical education. It is too often referred to as the “other” track, with the incorrect implication that it is the path individuals take if they won’t be able to handle the rigors of college.

In reality, students who pursue CTE complete a diverse curriculum where they learn important skills for succeeding in the workplace, such as problem solving, research, time management, and critical thinking. They are more engaged, perform better, and graduate at higher rates than their college-bound counterparts. We should be celebrating that success and studying how we can translate it across the board.

As long as we have two educational tracks, we have a problem in the way people perceive those who choose career and technical education. We need to shift our perspective away from the idea that every student must attend an expansive and expensive 4-year program to succeed in the workforce. Educational success is about more than just a degree. It is about quantifiable skills that employers need in their employees.

#### WOLVES IN THE WEST

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

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are, doing so-called morning-hour debate after a very late evening here in the House doing a pretend bill. We are providing the very similitude of a representative Congress by having endless series of votes on bills that are going nowhere in the appropriations process because the Senate isn’t doing appropriations bills. Everyone knows there will be some gigantic omnibus or continuing resolution year-end deal. Nonetheless, to make it look like we are actually doing something, instead of taking up issues, as mentioned by Mr. CLYburn earlier, we are holding endless vote series and then debate late at night.

At 1:45 a.m. the gentleman from Washington introduced an amendment to remove all protections for wolves in the United States of America. Now, of course, wolves only occupy a tiny fraction of their range. He did this under strong urging from the cattlemen and some hunting groups. There is only one thing wrong with what he is doing. It is actually going to have a countereffect.

The wolf predation on cattle is unbelievably insignificant. 7.8 percent of the losses of cattle are due to disease and weather. Better husbandry would help a lot with the cattlemen. And then, 2.7 percent is due to other predators, principally, coyotes, who the animal damage control and wildlife services people have been trying to extirpate for 70 years. Well, 70 years after they tried to eliminate all the coyotes in America, there are many more coyotes much more widely dispersed across the country, and there are huge packs in the West which do predate on cattle.

Now, why is it a problem if they want to kill off the wolves?

Well, wolves eat and kill coyotes. Here is a predator that does not prefer cattle; it prefers wild game. In fact, wolves do help also with wild game. They aren’t trophy hunters. They aren’t going after the 50-point elk. They are going to go after the slowest and weakest that are out there, or caribou up in Alaska.

They actually improve the health of the herds, but the hunters say: Wait a minute. They are killing some of our elk. We should be killing the elk.

But the hunters are going after the trophies. The wolves aren’t going after the trophies. So you are doing exactly the wrong, stupid thing here.

I think a majority of the American people, as indicated by the 1.2 million comments against delisting the wolf submitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, would agree that we want to restore ecosystems and make them more healthy.

Look at Yellowstone. Since the wolves have come back into Yellowstone, the park has changed dramatically for the better. The elk herds don’t just hang around now down in the rivers and eat all of the riparian vegetation and ruin the water quality. They have got to act more like elk and hide out in the forest. If they make themselves into targets, they are going to get eaten. So the health of the park has improved unbelievably due to the presence of wolves.

This is a keystone species in a natural order. And because of this horrible depredation, this 0.9 percent loss due to wolves, compared to almost 10 times that due to bad husbandry practices, the answer is: Kill the wolves.

We have got a 2.7 loss due to coyotes and other predators who actually are targeted by the wolves. The answer is: Kill the wolves.

This is stupid, irrational, unscientific. In fact, there is a study from the University of Washington that found killing wolves actually increased livestock losses.

The gentleman from Washington wants to persist in the myth that somehow, by eliminating wolves, it will help the livestock industry. It is just yet another misbegotten amendment on a fake bill that isn’t going anywhere, but I would still urge my colleagues to vote against it.

#### 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 1-year anniversary of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the so-called Iran nuclear deal.

President Obama made a series of promises to the American people. One was that Iran would cease its illicit nuclear activity. And yet, last week, Mr. Speaker, Germany reported that Iran has increased its illegal proliferation of nuclear technology.

President Obama also promised that the nuclear deal would moderate Iran. In other words, there was a gentle, nice Iran that was waiting to come out, if only we would be more understanding. But in the past year, the Islamic Republic has launched nuclear ballistic missiles in violation of U.N. security resolutions, kidnapped U.S. sailors, shot rockets within 1,500 yards of U.S. Navy ships, and increased their support for terror regimes and terror groups, and remain the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The President also stated that the U.S. sanctions regime would stay in place against Iran’s terror activity while it was being lifted against the nuclear activity.

But, instead, the U.S. has become Iran’s negotiator in chief on the world stage and has rewarded companies that continue to support the Iranian National Guard Core and is devising ways to give Iran access to the U.S. financial system.

One year after the President agreed to a dangerous nuclear deal, Iran continues to be a major adversary. Congress needs to highlight and spotlight Iran’s malevolent activity. The good news is Congress is doing just that, Mr. Speaker.

I am encouraged that the House will take up three very important pieces of legislation. It will deal with the heavy water bill.

Think about this. Iran gets caught manufacturing heavy water. Rather than calling out the Iranian regime, in clear violation of the nuclear deal, what does the administration do?

The administration says: Well, we are going to help Iran comply with the deal that they have just violated by using United States taxpayer money to buy the heavy water from Iran.

You can’t make this up. It is so absurd. We are only given excuses. We have got to focus in on what else is happening on this issue.

Now, Boeing and Airbus have failed to understand the deep risks that come from doing business with Iran. These aren’t necessarily risks for their bottom line. They are very willing to sell to a terrorist regime. But they are risks to freedom-loving people around the world.

Both Airbus and Boeing want to do what?

They want to sell a product that can be used for terrorism. They can use airlines for the purpose of moving things into illicit areas.

We all know that Iran Air was sanctioned for ferrying weapons and troops to rogue regimes and terrorist groups. We know that Iran Air was implicated in North Korea's ballistic missile tests. And we also know that Iran systematically uses their commercial aircraft to transport weapons, troops, missiles, cash, and other supplies to terror groups.

Mr. Speaker, on my left is a display. This is a computer printout that shows a flight from Tehran to Damascus last week. Now, think about this. This is the hubris of the Iranian regime: the Iranian Air Force flying a Boeing 747 in the middle of the night from Tehran to Damascus.

Do we think that this is for commercial purposes? Of course, not.

Did we think that this is for tourism? Of course, not.

Do we think that they are flying baby formula or textbooks? Of course, not.

What they are doing is a bad act, and we ought to not be complicit in this.

Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, this House passed, on a bipartisan basis, limitations to the Financial Services Appropriations bill that would prevent this sale. And we did it by voice vote. What a voice vote means is that nobody substantially rose in opposition.

Why? Because there is no real reason to rise because more and more people are recognizing that these types of sales should not go through.

In response, the CEO of Boeing, Dennis Muilenburg, essentially said: Well, look, us selling to Iran is a good business opportunity to do business with the Iranians.

And then he also said: Well, if Boeing can't sell, then nobody else should be able to sell.

But did you notice something, Mr. Speaker, in those two comments?

He didn't say: Look, we have got this under control. He didn't say: We are positive that nothing is going to be used for terrorism. He didn't say that this wouldn't jeopardize national security. He just said: If we can't do it, nobody should be able to do it.

Look, I agree, if Boeing can't do it, nobody should be able to do it. It is well known that all of Boeing's competitors—Airbus of France, Bombardier of Canada, Embraer from Brazil, Comac from China—each of these companies sources at least 10 percent of their components from the United States. They require the same license that Boeing does.

But that is not the point. What we need are iconic American companies following the lead of companies like Lockheed Martin—which has said they won't pursue this—Northrop Grumman, and others that haven't sullied their reputation.

It is time for Congress to continue to do its good work.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF COACH PAT HEAD SUMMITT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee, the 24,000-seat Thompson-Boling Arena will be filled with people to celebrate the life of Coach Pat Head Summitt.

Coach Summitt was buried last week in the little farming community of Henrietta, Tennessee, where she grew up. As most people know, she was diagnosed with Alzheimer's at the age of 58, 6 years ago. She fought this disease with such courage that, about 5 years ago, I had the privilege of sitting with Coach Summitt as she received the top award presented by the National Alzheimer's Association. This was the Sargent and Eunice Shriver Profiles in Dignity Award, and it was presented by their well-known daughter, Maria.

No one could have been more deserving of this award than Coach Summitt. She made the decision to both go public with this diagnosis and continue coaching her beloved Lady Vols. Later, she decided to give up her coaching job after 38 years to help lead the fight against Alzheimer's. She and her son, Tyler, have established the Pat Head Summitt Foundation to carry on this battle that is and will be so very, very important to millions of people.

Coach Summitt became head coach of the UT Lady Vols at the very young age of 22 because nobody was interested in the job. At that time, only the players and their parents attended the games. Thanks largely in part to Pat Head Summitt, women's basketball gained major support, drawing crowds of 20,000 and more.

She certainly was the most respected woman in Tennessee and my most famous constituent and longtime friend. I was honored on two occasions to be her honorary assistant coach. The first time was on her 25th anniversary as a coach, and the second time was several years later in a game against Vanderbilt on the last home game of the season. Before that game, we were given a scouting report. Tennessee had beaten Vanderbilt in Nashville by 30 points. So it is accurate to say that the team was fairly confident about this game.

□ 1045

However, at halftime, the game was almost tied, and the Lady Vols came into the locker room with their heads hanging down. That is when I saw Coach Summitt go into action. She got into each young woman's face like a baseball manager arguing with an umpire.

She started with Lady Vol Teresa Geter and told her in a drill sergeant's voice that she was going through a pity party out there, and Coach Summitt was having no part of it and was giving her 2 minutes to make her presence known on that court or she was going to yank her out of there so fast it would make her head spin.

When we went back out for the second half, the first thing that happened was that Teresa Geter stole the ball, and she took it down court for a lay-up and her first 2 points of the game. The Lady Vols went on a 20-0 run, and Vanderbilt called a timeout.

A spectator in the stands, whom I had not seen because there were 20,000 people there, sent his card down to me, and on the back he had written: "Jimmy, great halftime coaching, come again."

But it was not me; it was Coach Summitt. In fact, when she was staring each one of her players in the face at halftime in an intensely angry, very loud voice, I was just glad I was not one of those players.

Coach Summitt was the winningest coach in basketball history, with 1,098 victories. Her teams won 16 Southeastern Conference championships and eight national championships. She coached in 18 Final Fours. She had an 84 percent winning record as a head coach.

But to me, her most impressive statistic was a 100-percent graduation rate by her players. And she did not allow her players to take easy courses because she wanted them to be prepared for life after basketball, and almost all of her players have been successful after leaving the University of Tennessee.

On top of this, she never had a question raised about her recruiting or any NCAA violation. She showed through the years that you do not have to cheat in sports to win and be very successful.

She succeeded at her most important job, being a mother and raising her son, Tyler.

Coach Summitt was inducted into the Women's Basketball Hall of Fame and was NCAA Coach of the Year an unprecedented seven times. In 2000, she was named Naismith Coach of the Year.

Pat Head Summitt was a woman of great honor and integrity. She was a great, great success because of her very hard work, dedication, determination, and discipline. Most of her success she credited to her hardworking parents and lessons she learned on her family's Tennessee farm.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is a better place today because of Coach Pat Head Summitt and her work with young people and the inspiring example that she set for all of us.

#### FALLEN HEROES MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Fallen Heroes Memorial in Nueces County, Texas.

After first being proposed in 2011, the Nueces County Fallen Heroes Memorial will be open in early August. This memorial honors local emergency responders who have sacrificed their lives

for our community going back to 1860. Instead of fading into history, these men and women will be remembered each time someone visits the memorial.

The project has been a community-driven effort since its inception. I would like to commend Nueces County Commissioner Mike Pusley, who has been the leader on this effort from the very beginning. It was Mike who noticed a defunct and over-budget water fountain in front of the County Courthouse and decided to take action. The Nueces County Fallen Heroes Memorial is possible because of Pusley's leadership, leadership everyone in the public sector should aspire to.

Pusley is an example for others in public service, men and women who go above and beyond their duties to imagine and create solutions to problems in the community.

While it was Pusley's vision that got the ball rolling on this, it was the financial support of the Durrill family and others in the community that helped make this a reality. Along with the Coastal Bend Community Foundation, the Durrills have provided a majority of the funding for the project. This family is a prime example of what community-driven efforts can accomplish.

I wish to express how deeply grateful we are to those first responders who have given their lives in service of their country and our community. Here are just a few of the first responders this memorial honors: Lieutenant Stuart J. Alexander. In 2009, Lieutenant Alexander was intentionally struck and killed by a suspect fleeing police.

Officer Matthew B. Thebeau. In 2008, Officer Thebeau was killed in an automobile accident while responding to an assault-in-progress call.

And Sergeant Juan Rincon Prieto, who, in 1963, was struck and killed by a truck while directing traffic.

The Nueces County Fallen Heroes Memorial remembers these and 28 other first responders who have fallen in service to Nueces County over the years, all leaving behind friends and loved ones, police officers, members of the Sheriff's Department, constables, firefighters, and other first responders. These are the men and women who put their lives on the line every day for our community. They keep the law. They keep the peace. And they keep us safe.

The memorial will be opened at a celebration attended by members of the community, including State Representatives Todd Hunter and Able Herrero, Nueces County Judge Loyd Neal, and Mayor Nelda Martinez. I look forward to attending as well.

I urge everyone to visit this memorial and remember those who have died in the line of duty.

CONGRATULATING JIM LAGO FOR HIS INDUCTION  
INTO THE TEXAS RADIO HALL OF FAME

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to congratulate my friend and mentor, Texas radio icon, Jim Lago, for his in-

duction into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame. Lago and I have been together on the radio now for more than 15 years.

Lago is a 30-year radio veteran, and he got his start when the crew he was working on in the oil field pressured him to take a part-time DJ job in Longview, Texas. Over just 4 years, through determination and talent, he moved his way up to doing mornings in Beaumont and afternoons at KILT in Houston.

He also spent some time in Oklahoma City, where he covered the Oklahoma City bombings after feeling the buildings rock from the nearby explosion. He was also live on the air in Corpus Christi when the 9/11 attacks occurred.

In 1991, he was working at KEYS in Corpus Christi, where he got his start in talk radio. In 2005, he and I moved to 1360 KKTU to host his popular morning talk show, "Lago in the Morning," where I am on almost every morning.

Lago's success comes from his never-giving-up attitude. Jim isn't afraid to discuss tough topics. He isn't afraid to speak his mind and take full ownership of his beliefs. In his words, Jim is on the air to let people know that there are people with similar beliefs out there, and they shouldn't be afraid to speak up. It is clear Lago is doing just that and doing what he was born to do.

I would like to congratulate my good friend, Jim; his wife, Pamela; and his family, on this well-deserved, in my opinion, long overdue induction into the Radio Hall of Fame in Texas.

#### PITTSBURGH'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the city of Pittsburgh which, this year, is celebrating the 200th anniversary of its incorporation as a city.

For two centuries, Pittsburgh has embodied the very best of the American spirit. Waves of immigrants, the tired, poor, and huddled masses from distant lands, as well as Americans from other parts of this country, found opportunity in Pittsburgh for themselves and their descendants, and the neighborhoods they settled still reflect that diversity.

Together, these individuals built a city out of coal, steel, and hard, honest work that epitomized the industrial character of our Nation. And while the vast furnaces that once lined the three rivers are a shadow of their past, the perseverance of Pittsburgh citizens have allowed the city to become a world leader in medicine, education, and technology, with world-class universities, hospitals, and research centers.

It is a success story no one could have predicted, and the story is far from over. The past 200 years have

firmly cemented Pittsburgh's place in the history books, leaving future generations of Pittsburghers with vital roles to play in the coming years.

Happy birthday to America's most livable city, the city of champions. Many happy returns.

CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH'S LIBRARY  
FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the work of an institution that improves the lives of the blind, visually impaired, physically handicapped, or reading disabled by providing them free access to books in braille or audio format, mailed directly to recipients or instantly downloadable.

The National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, or NLS, was established by an act of Congress in 1931 and falls under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress. It started out as a network of only 19 libraries in 1931, and it has grown to 56 regional and 65 subregional libraries throughout the United States. These libraries provide audio-described DVDs, books, and magazines as well as large-print and braille books.

I was honored to do an audio recording of myself reading a children's book via the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. The book I read was "Uncle Andy's Cats," by James Warhola, the nephew of Pittsburgh's native son, pop artist Andy Warhol. The audio book will be archived by the Library of Congress and available for children. I encourage others to do the same.

#### THE STANDARD OF LAW DOES NOT APPLY TO THE CLINTONS

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's top law enforcement officials took a very dangerous turn last week when they essentially rewrote the law for the well-connected and privileged in America. This should be deeply troubling to all ordinary Americans, both on the left and on the right.

For those of us who work hard every day, play by the rules, and live by the law, when we cross the line, it is the law that holds us accountable. But that standard of law does not seem to apply to the Clintons.

John Adams warned during the formation of our Constitution that we must be a nation of laws, not a nation of men. Undermining this founding principle for the privileged not only demonstrates poor judgment, it further erodes our trust in the institutions of government.

So it is left for us to now ask whether what we have come to is a nation of laws, or is it a government of the rich and powerful?

Do we have a Department of Justice or a department of "just us"?

FBI Director James Comey testified before Congress to the many laws that former Secretary of State Clinton

broke, acknowledging “extreme carelessness” while denying “gross negligence,” which by definition are one and the same.

Then, incredibly, Mr. Comey said that there was no need for prosecution. Therefore, the choice not to apply the law equally to Hillary Clinton is not only a major blow to public confidence and the rule of law and equal treatment under the law, it also suggests that the rule of law has become nothing more than a word game. It confirms everything that we hate about the current state of politics in our country.

The FBI basically just wasted millions of dollars to confirm that everything Secretary Clinton has been telling the American people is nothing but a bunch of lies, and it doesn't matter.

However, it has mattered greatly to far less powerful Americans in similar circumstances who have had their careers and their lives destroyed. Public servants and military servicemembers who are not in positions to hold private meetings with the Attorney General, as Mrs. Clinton's husband did just days before this decision, have been jailed, fined, and lost their jobs and their security clearances.

We may never know just how much damage was caused by Clinton's callous disregard for the law and our national security secrets. Were informants killed? Were they lost or compromised due to her negligence?

Do foreign intelligence services now retain tens of thousands of emails from her private, unsecured servers that can now be used against the United States or against her to the detriment of the United States of America?

We have an absolute duty to find out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward a presumptive nominee for the Office of President.

#### URGING CONGRESS TO FUND ZIKA ERADICATION EFFORTS

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a strong sense of urgency for this Congress to pass legislation that will fund Zika response efforts. It has been 20 days since this House adopted the conference report to include \$1.1 billion of funding to combat the Zika virus.

While I still fully support the administration's request for \$1.9 billion, this House-passed measure is a step in the right direction. I implore my colleagues in the Senate to unite and provide funding to eradicate a disease that could devastate our communities, especially young mothers and their infants.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the southernmost district in the United States that spans from Miami

to Key West. We have a vibrant community and an economy based off trade and tourism. But we are also ground zero for the Zika virus, with over 239 cases in Florida, 75 of those being in Miami-Dade County. Just yesterday, the Florida Department of Health announced six new travel-related cases of Zika.

I have consistently advocated for full funding at the administration's request to stop the spread of Zika and will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get this done. But in the meantime, I strongly encourage the Senate to adopt the Zika conference report and provide our healthcare officials with the resources they need to fight this dangerous virus.

#### PROMOTING TPP AND PROTECTING AMERICAN JOBS

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the issue of trade has been much discussed in the current political season. Candidates all across the political spectrum are twisting the facts and telling half-truths in an effort to confuse the American people.

The reality is that trade has afforded American workers and businesses the opportunity to sell the products they make all over the world, and it has reduced the cost of goods for all American consumers. Trade has lifted millions out of poverty and has contributed to the proliferation of American values and the advancement of our interests. South Florida being the gateway to the Americas, our community knows the many benefits of robust trade policies.

However, free trade must also be fair trade, and American workers and companies should not be at an unfair disadvantage. Many citizens have contacted my office complaining about Chinese practices that do not allow Americans to compete. But even strong U.S. allies are guilty of such practices. An example is Australia's Personal Property Securities Act.

Because of this law, U.S. companies that lease assets in Australia are at peril of losing them. This notion is contrary to the elemental right to own and conduct international business as well as the fundamental right to due process and equal treatment, both of which are key principles of justice in virtually all nations in the Western world. At least one Florida company has been aggrieved by this law, and it is important we discuss these issues while we finalize trade negotiations.

Those of us who believe the Trans-Pacific Partnership has the potential to be a powerful policy instrument that will benefit America's economy and increase our influence in the world also hope that it will level the playing field for American workers and entrepreneurs and address the policies and practices that give trade a bad name. I look forward to following this issue very closely as negotiations continue.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

Reverend Malcolm J. Byrd, Jackson Memorial AME Zion Church, Hempstead, New York, offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou in whom we live and move and have our being, God of our weary years and God of our silent tears, Thou who hath spangled the heavens with Thy glory, descend now, we pray, upon the United States of America.

Grant unto our Nation the gifts of truth and justice. Imbue our Nation and its leaders with wisdom and courage to speak truth to power in love, even if that power happens to be themselves.

Grant unto them Thy grace that You extend to all, not based upon sociopolitical status, but upon Thy omnipresence. As You are present from sea to shining sea, be Thou our guide as we are caused to traverse through our respective districts, engendering hope in oft hopeless situations.

Our hope and trust, O God, is in Thee. We channel in the midst of our various strivings the words of Joseph Charles Price: It matters not how dark the night, we believe in the coming of morning. May our Nation be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction this day and forever more. In Thy great and splendid name we pray.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LANGEVIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

# WELCOMING REVEREND MALCOLM J. BYRD

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Reverend Malcolm J. Byrd, the Pastor of Jackson Memorial AME Zion Church in Hempstead, New York, and to thank Reverend Byrd for leading us in prayer on the House floor today.

I first met Reverend Byrd 1 year ago yesterday, just a few weeks after nine Black men and women were murdered inside Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina. Reverend Byrd held a service and presented a colorful patchwork quilt that the children of his church created to send to the Mother Emanuel congregation.

Leading us in prayer, Reverend Byrd said that day: "O, God, there is a long road that leads from Hempstead to Charleston, but there is one thing that makes us closer than the miles that separate us: We are all part of the family of God."

Today, as we find ourselves once again in the wake of tragic violence, we are blessed to have Reverend Byrd here with us. He is a man of God, a man of faith, a man of peace and hope. He is also a man of vision, a man who sees America as it is, as it can be, as it must and will be: a patchwork quilt in which people of all colors and creeds are sewn together as brothers and sisters, united in our common humanity.

There is a long road that leads from Hempstead to Orlando and to Baton Rouge and to Falcon Heights and to Dallas. There is a long road that leads from Hempstead to Washington, D.C., but I thank God that Reverend Byrd has traveled that road safely today. I pray that we all take his message to heart and never forget that, no matter what distance lies between us or what walls may divide us, we are all a part of the family of God.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

## MY THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS ARE WITH DALLAS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the city of Dallas and all who call north Texas home. Last week our community experienced a horrific tragedy when five police officers were murdered in cold blood, and they were gunned down while safeguarding a peaceful rally.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families, friends, and fellow

law enforcement officers of the five brave men we lost. I also pray for peace, comfort, and for hearts to be healed.

The memorial service in Dallas yesterday reminds us of what many Texans already know: we are a family. While we may not always agree, all Americans should have mutual respect for one another, and we must have an ultimate, mutual respect for our constitutional rights, first and foremost being life and liberty.

God bless Dallas. God bless America.

## GOOD GUYS WITH GUNS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, ever since the Sandy Hook shooting, Republicans have told us that the silver bullet solution to a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun.

After the Pulse nightclub massacre, Donald Trump said it would have been a beautiful sight if people had fired back. Though Trump's endorsement of combining alcohol with firearms was too extreme even for the NRA, they still encourage people to carry guns to campuses, public parks, and everywhere else.

Let's talk about the good guys with guns. Twelve good guys, Dallas law enforcement officers, men and women, trained to shoot, were stopped by one bad guy. Five officers were killed and seven were wounded.

Whether it is a security guard or an entire police force, there is no stopping a single bad guy with a military-style assault rifle. If our best trained officers can be thwarted, how could the average shooter stop another shooter?

It is time for Congress to focus on the needs of our constituents over gun manufacturers' profits. Instead of flooding the streets with more guns, let's vote on commonsense gun laws.

## HONORING TOM ALLGEIER'S SERVICE TO THE KUHL HOSE COMPANY

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of 60 years of dedicated service by Thomas "Tom" Allgeier to his community as a volunteer firefighter. Since 1956, Tom has volunteered to serve the citizens of Greene Township, Erie County, as a member of the Kuhl Hose Company. As a volunteer firefighter myself, I know how important people like Tom are to the communities they serve.

Tom Allgeier joined the Kuhl Hose Company at the age of 18, when the company was in its early days. He has held many positions during his 60 years with the company, including fire chief,

deputy chief, fire captain, first lieutenant, and EMT. He has also served in administrative roles for the department, from president to vice president and treasurer. He has chaired many fundraising committees and helped to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for the department over the past six decades.

Tom remains among the leaders in training, hours logged each year, both in weekly drills and attending classes to keep his training current. At 78 years old, Tom is still running emergency calls.

I know I speak for countless members of his community in applauding Tom's hard work and his dedication.

## GUN VIOLENCE SHOULDN'T BE A PARTISAN ISSUE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, in the 1 month since 102 people were shot and 49 were killed in Orlando, Republican leadership in this House has done nothing to help stop the kind of mass gun violence that has claimed the lives of more than 34,000 people in the last 3½ years. No votes have been cast. No bills have been debated. No proposals have even been considered.

Our side wants background checks and no fly, no buy so criminals, the dangerously mentally ill, and terrorists can't get guns. If you don't like our ideas, join with us and let's find common ground.

Gun violence shouldn't be a partisan issue. When deranged gunmen open fire in a nightclub, a movie theater, a school, or on policemen, they don't care if you are a Democrat or a Republican. Let's pull together and address this problem. It is within our power to help save lives. Let's not waste it.

## SPEAKER RYAN'S "A BETTER WAY" AGENDA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, in recent weeks, Speaker of the House PAUL DAVIS RYAN has presented the A Better Way agenda on how to build a more confident America. I am grateful for the Speaker promoting A Better Way to defend America's families and create jobs.

Recent terrorist attacks at home and overseas confirm what House Republicans have warned about for years—that the current foreign policy is failing. To promote peace through strength to protect American families, we need a real plan, one that protects the homeland, defeats terrorism, tackles new threats, and defends freedom around the world.

As the chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging

Threats and Capabilities, I am grateful that A Better Way emphasizes the importance of combating new threats. Each element of A Better Way presents real solutions for the biggest problems facing our Nation.

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

Congratulations Prime Minister Theresa May for your success for the citizens of the United Kingdom.

#### ADDRESSING THE CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise to speak on the provisions included in the fiscal year 2017 Interior appropriations bill to address the California drought.

The language is well intentioned and seeks to alleviate some of the issues that we Californians are facing because of the drought. However, we have to take into account all impacts of increased pumping and how it affects our river ecosystems, our fishing economy, and our wildlife associated with the San Joaquin River.

I support increased pumping to aid those affected by the drought, especially in the Central Valley. If you had gone to see some of those homes, it is really damaging.

But we also have to take a look at the long-term impact. We need to look at developing our long-term water sustainability and our infrastructure, as we have done in Orange County, in my home district, where we were able to avoid some of the terrible effects of this drought because we invested, over the last 15 years, in water reclamation and water recapture. About 90 percent of the water that we use in my hometown is completely recycled.

As I have said before, we need to pass drought legislation, and we need to listen to all of the stakeholders.

#### 75 YEARS IN THE TURKEY INDUSTRY

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the anniversary of an outstanding Minnesota company that has been providing quality food for the past 75 years.

Jennie-O Foods markets over 1,500 products to more than 70 countries around the world. Since its founding in 1940 by Earl B. Johnson, this company has been recognized as a leader in the turkey industry.

Jennie-O Foods had humble beginnings, which all began when Earl started raising turkeys while managing a small creamery. Nine years later, Earl

bought a turkey processing plant in Willmar, Minnesota, and the company flourished. Jennie-O Foods has had nothing but success over the years with the invention of products like the first turkey hot dog, eventually catching the eye of another great Minnesota company, Hormel Foods in 1986.

I want to not only congratulate Jennie-O for their 75 years of success, but I join the great State of Minnesota in thanking them for their contribution to our State and our Nation. We wish you nothing but continued success.

#### PERKINS REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, last week the Committee on Education and the Workforce unanimously reported H.R. 5587, the Strengthening CTE for the 21st Century Act, out of committee. This bipartisan bill reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which expired in 2012.

I am so proud to be an original cosponsor, and I would particularly like to thank Representative G. T. THOMPSON from the great State of Pennsylvania, my good friend and colleague and co-chair of the CTE Caucus, for his outstanding efforts to reauthorize these programs. The program is certainly far better off where it is because of his due diligence, the hard work that he put into the bill.

Thanks also to Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member SCOTT for their commitment to bipartisanship on this critical legislation. As I said, it passed out of committee unanimously. When does that ever happen around here these days?

H.R. 5587 is a bill that we can all be proud of. It aligns skills training with employer demands, allows teachers to gain direct knowledge of workplace skills, and ensures that all students have access to high-quality CTE.

Madam Speaker, I urge you to bring this bill to the floor at the earliest opportunity.

□ 1215

#### FACEBOOK SUPPRESSING CONSERVATIVE VIEWS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, recently, it was revealed that the tech giant Facebook may have altered its popular trending news section to suppress conservative views. Facebook's CEO promised to make changes.

Now it has been reported that Facebook removed a viral video that showed how media company NowThis was editing footage of Donald Trump

to make him seem insensitive and racist. And last week, a gun range owner in Houston, Texas, said his Facebook page had been blocked after he advertised free concealed handgun classes.

If these allegations are true, Facebook will not be a credible source of information for the American people. Let's hope that Facebook will demonstrate it has no bias against conservatives.

#### 21ST CENTURY HEARTLAND TOUR

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I proudly come from a rural district in the State of Illinois. We have some of the best farmland anywhere in the world and what I would consider to be some of the hardest workers in America. But too often, communities like ours have been left behind or left out.

We have had manufacturing jobs that have been sent overseas. We have had access to health care that has been very challenging. Net farm income has dropped. Many of our rural communities are without high-speed Internet. That hurts our businesses and even affects our children doing their homework.

But even with these challenges, rural America holds tremendous potential. That is why I am kicking off what I am calling the 21st Century Heartland Tour. I am doing this to put Illinoisans in rural communities back to work, position ourselves to lead the Nation in clean energy, and to support our growers and producers who put food on the table of millions of Americans every single day.

Madam Speaker, let's work together to ensure a strong and thriving 21st century heartland.

#### ADDRESSING OPIOID PROBLEM WITHIN MEDICARE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, last week, the House passed a comprehensive opioid bill.

I am pleased my Medicare part D drug management program was included in this legislation to help address the growing opioid problem within Medicare.

This measure, which has the support of CMS and is recommended by the inspector general and GAO, would leverage a program successfully used in commercial insurance, Medicaid, and TRICARE.

The growth in commonly prescribed opioids in part D increased by 56 percent from 2006 to 2014. This part D drug management program will help address this growing opioid problem within the Medicare program while assuring those who need medications will have access to their prescriptions.

I am proud we could get this done for our seniors and all who are struggling across the country.

#### THANKING HEADCOUNT.ORG

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

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and thank HeadCount, a nonpartisan organization that uses the power of music to register voters and promote participation in democracy. They reach young people and music fans where they already are—online and at concerts across the country—from Dead & Company to the Dixie Chicks.

Their message is not about what political party you support or what issues you care about but, instead, that, as younger voters, you must be heard.

Let's face it. The single greatest determining factor to whether or not you vote is likely age. That means older people often get heard on issues that are important to them, which can be different than those of younger voters.

Whether you care about common-sense gun violence protections, global warming, or equality for everyone, HeadCount is a platform to help people get heard.

Thank you, HeadCount.org, for all you do in broadening our democracy.

#### RECOGNIZING STEVE AND DIANE SPURLING WITH CITIZEN HERO AWARD

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and award St. Charles School Board member Steve Spurling and his wife, Diane, with a Citizen Hero Award for acting quickly to protect the life of a woman in distress.

On May 3, the two were walking their dog when a woman ran out of her house bloodied, falling on the driveway, and calling for help. While the Spurling family rushed to aid their distressed neighbor, a man exited the house yelling for the woman before pulling out a gun and shooting five times at the group.

Reacting quickly and selflessly, Mr. Spurling tackled the shooter from behind, disarmed him, and held him down. The woman was rushed to Delnor Hospital in Geneva and has recovered from her injuries.

Steve serves our community by providing educational leadership, and both he and his wife acted courageously to save the life of their neighbor. The 14th District Citizen Hero Award recognizes exemplary constituents in my district who inspire others with their commendable actions.

Steve and Diane, it is my pleasure to represent you and extend our district's heartfelt gratitude with this award.

#### HONORING KEVIN HANRAHAN

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and fellow Omahan, Kevin Hanrahan, the Tally Clerk of the House. He retires this September, after 38 years of distinguished service to the House of Representatives.

In 1978, Kevin left Omaha with former Congressman John Cavanaugh, with whom he remains friends to this day, and shortly thereafter joined the Clerk's Office, where he has worked in the Tally section for the past 37 years—29 as an Assistant Tally Clerk and the last 8 as a Tally Clerk.

Kevin is a workhorse, not a show horse. His depth of parliamentary and institutional knowledge is matched only by his love of this institution. He has played a pivotal role in making the process operate smoothly, and his knowledge and guidance will be deeply missed.

While Kevin's upcoming retirement is a big loss for his colleagues and the House, we wish him and his lovely wife, Peggi, nothing but the best in their next chapter of life. I am pretty sure most of that chapter will be written on the golf course. With that, I wish them long drives and birdie putts.

I might also add that Kevin and I played rugby at Creighton University a few years ago.

Thank you, Kevin, for your outstanding service and for being a remarkable example to your colleagues of what serving this institution is all about.

#### PRECISION FARMING

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, despite the Internet being an integral part of modern American life, there are still many rural farmers across our Nation who do not have access to this essential tool.

The Internet has the power to revolutionize the agriculture sector, and North Country farmers have shared with me various ways that increased broadband access could provide them with opportunities for innovation and improved agribusiness. For instance, a dairy farmer from Potsdam who spoke with my office uses broadband to automate feeding plans for his cows.

To support our North Country farmers, I will be introducing the Precision Farming Act of 2016. This legislation will encourage the construction of rural broadband connections to farms by allowing providers to receive reimbursements for the costs related to construction. Furthermore, this legislation would put our Nation's farmers first by prioritizing their loan applications for additional construction.

To compete in a 21st century economy, our farmers must have access to broadband technology. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

#### GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I want to bring to light the fact that we are still trying to get two bills passed in the House. How many more innocent lives will be lost before that happens?

My people, everybody's people, the American people want gun reform. My Republican colleagues are blocking the vote. But we need to have a voice. No more silence.

Stop blaming mental health issues for mass shootings. The fact is, more often they are the victims rather than the perpetrators. Anger, hate, and racism are the main causes of mass shootings.

Reducing the mental health stigma would save lives, as two-thirds of gun deaths are suicides. I encourage those who need help, to seek help, reduce self-harm, and learn the signs of mental illness. We need to focus on prevention and training, especially of police and the public, on mental health, not more guns. We need to educate youth on how to peacefully resolve problems by conflict resolution and anger management.

We must change the culture of violence. Violent images are too common in media, entertainment, and video games. Learn to have less hatred, more tolerance, and focus on what unites us.

Allow us a vote to prevent terrorists and others on the no-fly list from buying guns and universal background checks for guns.

#### PRESIDENT'S SUPREME COURT RECORD

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

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, since taking office in 2009, President Obama and his administration have taken a position in 175 cases before the Supreme Court, but the President has only won 79 of those cases. That comes out to just about 45 percent.

Indeed, over the course of his Presidency, the Obama administration argued 44 cases before the Supreme Court where their position failed to get a single vote. Not even the people the President appointed to the Court agree with his position.

This number stands in stark contrast to the results from President George W. Bush, who won over 60 percent of his cases before the Court, and Bill Clinton, who won 63 percent of his cases.

Most of the cases President Obama has lost have only one thing in common: the President's view that Federal

power is virtually unlimited. Under this President, citizens must submit their liberty and freedom to whatever the government experts determine is best. The administration believes they can operate above or around the law.

Madam Speaker, the President's record in front of the Court is a disturbing trend and something that should alarm every single American.

#### GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to talk about an issue that has affected my community in San Bernardino very personally and continues to impact our neighborhoods on almost a daily basis: gun violence.

Over the past several weeks, Americans have stood together to demand action on commonsense measures to reduce gun violence. My office has dealt with full voice mails, flooded social media sites, and received countless letters asking for these commonsense reforms.

The message is the same: Background checks are basic measures that will make our communities safer while respecting the Second Amendment rights of responsible gun owners. And if you are too dangerous to fly on a plane, you are too dangerous to buy a gun.

Madam Speaker, these measures are not controversial. Keeping guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists and criminals are basic measures where both Democrats and Republicans should be able to find common ground.

I ask that this Chamber remain in session until we vote on this legislation. By foregoing bipartisan legislation to end gun violence—bills our constituents are demanding us to consider—House Republicans are playing favor to special interests.

We owe the American people a vote. If we are too scared in this body to vote on these commonsense measures out of loyalty to our special interest groups instead of our own constituents, then we need to reflect on our roles here.

□ 1230

#### INCREASING TRANSPARENCY IN AMERICA'S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, each year, families across the country face difficult decisions about where they can afford to send their children to college and what institution is the best fit for them.

Students must wade through massive and often conflicting amounts of information in order to make an informed choice. Taking time to fully under-

stand the available data can be an aggravating task that may get put off and ultimately ignored, often with disastrous consequences.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support this week of my legislation to help students gain access to the facts they need to make an informed decision about where to pursue higher education.

H.R. 3178, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act, will begin to streamline the overwhelming maze of information currently provided to students and families at the Federal level.

It is crucial that we continue to increase transparency in the country's higher education system. This legislation is a positive step forward in that effort.

#### RESPONDING TO THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, last evening, we, the members of the Democratic Caucus, came together in an evening of remembrance to mark the 1-month anniversary and honor the lives of the 49 individuals who were massacred in Orlando at the Pulse Nightclub.

We are about now to leave Congress, adjourn for 7 weeks, failing in our sacred responsibility to keep the American people safe. During that time, during our recess, about 5,000 Americans will die at the hands of guns.

Too many communities have been stained by the blood of gun violence, and Congress has done nothing. We have begged and pleaded and implored and argued to bring to the floor responsible gun safety legislation, to do something to honor the lives that have been lost. Yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused—have refused to show the courage to stand up and do what is right for the American people. I pray that they find the courage to do that, and that we finally do something to reduce gun violence in this country and to honor the lives that have been lost, and to finally leave this Chamber knowing that we have responded and done something to respond to the epidemic of gun violence in America.

#### CONSCIENCE PROTECTION

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

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, this Nation was founded by those seeking to escape the coercive forces of governments across Europe.

This basic freedom is under assault today as radical advocates for abortion are using the coercive forces of Federal, State, and local governments to compel pro-life individuals, businesses, and healthcare providers, to act

against their deeply held religious convictions in order to keep a job or to hold a medical license or to operate a hospital, clinic or health insurance plan.

No one should be forced to violate their deeply held convictions against taking innocent lives. Yet, the Obama administration has simply refused to enforce the current conscience law, most recently in California.

With the passage of our bill, pro-life Americans will no longer be forced to appeal to this administration for relief. This bill will enable Americans to file suit in court and, once and for all, end this coercion. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this very important legislation so that the rights of pro-life Americans are restored.

#### CONGRESS HAS NO ZIKA PREVENTION PLAN

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, what will we tell American families when their child is born with microcephaly caused by the Zika virus?

It is not a hypothetical question. Families in Puerto Rico are already answering it. Over 276 travel-related cases of Zika have been reported in my home State of Florida, 43 cases affecting pregnant women.

In Florida, we are on the front line and we are at risk of local outbreaks. The Florida delegation on both sides of the aisle supports funding to prepare for and prevent local infections, but we still don't have a bill.

Over the 7-week recess, while Federal, State, and local officials try to prepare for Zika without the resources they need, we will need to prepare answers for these families.

Did we do all that we could to prevent an outbreak? Did we follow recommendations from scientists and infectious disease experts? Did we assure women that they don't need to be afraid to become pregnant in my State of Florida?

I wish we could say that the leadership of this Congress put the health and security of American families above partisan politics. I hope, and they better hope, that it is not too late.

#### WHY WE'RE HERE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to try to do justice to a beautiful poem that won a national contest by Eliana Jaffee. And the contest is "Why I'm Glad America is a Nation of Immigrants." And Eliana Jaffee's poem is "Why We're Here."

"That morning when the sun had risen, my shores, my seas, my hopes

freed from prison, the poor, the rich, and all the forgiven came to me.

"Go, ask that girl to compare, a life of despair to a breath of free air, ask her: Why are you here, not somewhere over there?"

"She'd say to you, that long ago, her ancestors came here, through hail, sleet and snow. Sunrise and sunset, they stayed there until the end, and when my job was finished, their hearts all had mends.

"I have been many things, and most are quite clear, a haven, a refuge that people hold dear.

"These waters of mine, so brilliant, so light, with hopes of tomorrow, a future, so bright. Coming from places of sadness and fear, I open my arms, and welcome them here."

By Eliana Jaffee, a fifth grader at the Pardes Jewish School in Scottsdale, Arizona.

#### RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CLEONE CREQUE

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cleone Creque. "Cle," as many of us call her, was the first female in the Virgin Islands to be elected to territorywide office after she was elected Senator-at-Large in the Virgin Islands Legislature in 1976. This past weekend, the legislative annex conference room in St. John was named in her honor.

During her legislative career, she held key leadership positions on important Committees on Welfare, Health, and Labor. Aside from her distinguished legacy as a political stalwart and advocate for less fortunate in her community, she is a nurse, a mother, and a businesswoman, and she speaks her mind.

She is a positive and inspirational role model for Caribbean women, for all women, and she is my friend and my mentor.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO GLORIA JOSEPH

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I would like to, at this time, extend happy birthday wishes to Gloria Joseph, a community organizer, public servant, matriarch, and Ph.D of haute cuisine.

I wish her happy birthday.

Both of these women are ultimate public servants, true Renaissance women, and true Virgin Islanders.

#### DEMOCRACY MATTERS

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my concern about events that are happening now in Brazil. In Brazil, President Dilma Rousseff was reelected because a majority of Brazilians wanted to pursue

her progressive policies further. But shortly after her reelection, some members of the rightwing opposition started to question the election results and, aided by the conservative media in Brazil, they accused her of manipulating the state budget in order to pay for social programs.

But now they have taken it further than that, and beyond mere accusations, and they have forced her temporarily out of office by impeaching her and putting her out of power while those proceedings take place.

The interim government is implementing the exact policies that were rejected by a majority of Brazilian voters, austerity, cutting social programs, cutting education, cutting housing, cutting health care. These are the things that people wanted; it is what they voted for. Yet, the interim government is undermining democracy by denying these things to the people who voted for them.

My message is simple. Democracy matters. Votes matter. All around the world we are seeing rightwingers trying to deny the democratic forces their rightful power for winning elections.

In Britain, we have seen an effort to undermine the results of Brexit. In Portugal, the same thing happened when a leftwing majority won parliament. And here in the United States, we have efforts to undermine the President. This must end. Democracy matters.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 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 July 13, 2016 at 9:13 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4875.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 764, NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 304, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WHISTLEBLOWER ACT; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 822 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 822

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-61 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 Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of July 14, 2016, or July 15, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam 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

Ms. FOXX. Madam 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 822 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act, and a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 764, GMO labeling requirements.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act.

This bill protects rights of conscience for healthcare providers who choose not to participate in abortion.

The bill reinforces current law and makes clear that Federal, State, and local governments, including subsidiary agencies, cannot discriminate against healthcare providers who choose not to provide abortions.

This bill is necessary because the California Department of Managed Health Care has mandated that all health plans must cover elective abortion. This includes health plans offered by religious nonprofits, and even churches.

This action by the State agency violates a provision of Federal law known as the Weldon Amendment, which provides that States receiving Federal funds may not discriminate against health plans based on their decision not to cover or pay for abortions.

Religious employers in California who offer group health plans to their employees lodged an objection with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which oversees enforcement of the Weldon Amendment. HHS massively and incorrectly reinterpreted the Weldon Amendment to allow California to continue to force these employers to pay for and provide coverage for elective abortions.

In addition to providing commonsense protections, S. 304 also allows a private right of action, giving providers recourse should they face penalties or punishment for exercising their conscience rights.

To be clear, this bill does not ban or restrict abortion in any way. If enacted, abortion will remain just as legal as it is today. In spite of this fact, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to protest this sensible legislation.

The Conscience Protection Act is not the only important legislation the House will consider this week. This rule also provides for consideration of a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 764, GMO labeling requirements.

The Senate amendment establishes a national labeling standard for bioengineered food, with exceptions for foods and products primarily composed of meat, poultry, or eggs.

This measure represents a truly bipartisan effort to prevent a complicated patchwork of State laws and regulations for labeling food products sold throughout the country that inevitably would lead to increased prices, confusion, and more than a few frustrated customers.

□ 1245

Americans would be well served to have both S. 304 and S. 764 considered this week, and I commend both bills to my colleagues as deserving of their support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this closed rule, which provides for consideration of S. 764, legislation to create, in my view, inadequate GMO labeling requirements, and S. 304, yet another Republican attack on women's health.

Both pieces of legislation are being rushed to the floor this week by the Republican leadership as they ignore urgent calls from the American people for action on a number of pressing public health crises like gun violence and the Zika virus.

Speaker RYAN promised a new way of doing business in this House when he became Speaker, but we continue to see more of the same broken promises and failed leadership. During the past several weeks, I have joined my Democratic colleagues in calling upon Speaker RYAN to hold a vote on two commonsense, bipartisan pieces of legislation that are overwhelmingly supported by the American people: the no fly, no buy bill, and legislation to expand and strengthen our background check system.

Communities in my home State of Massachusetts and across our country are raising their voices and coming together to demand that Congress do something, not hold more moments of silence but actually take action. At the very least, we can keep guns out of the hands of criminals and suspected terrorists. We have that power to do something about that, and, yet, the Republican majority continues to sit on their hands and be indifferent in the face of the tragedies that we read about each and every day in this country.

Recognizing this call for action, Speaker RYAN announced on June 30 that the House would vote during the coming week on Republican gun-related legislation. But instead of working with both Democrats and Republicans on a bipartisan bill, Speaker RYAN hastily pushed out a toothless, NRA-written and -backed bill that would do nothing to keep Americans safe.

But even more frustrating, but sadly not surprising, is the fact that even this bill was too much for some of the hardliners on the Republican side. So, instead of answering the call of the American people, eager for Congress to finally act to disarm hate and help prevent gun violence, Speaker RYAN has canceled any votes on gun safety legislation. It is really a sad situation, Madam Speaker.

One month after 49 lives were lost in Orlando to an act of hate and senseless gun violence, Speaker RYAN is ready to adjourn the Congress for the rest of the summer, failing to take any action at all to protect the American people and

keep guns out of the hands of criminals and suspected terrorists. Americans deserve better from their leaders, and I predict that the American people will not forget this.

But, look, we shouldn't be surprised. This is just the latest in a string of broken promises and failed action from this Republican majority and its leadership.

This week, instead of addressing the pressing issues I previously mentioned, the House will be voting on a weak—on a very, very weak—GMO labeling bill and yet another piece of legislation that attacks a woman's right to choose.

Every American has a fundamental right to know what is in the food that they eat, plain and simple. I believe they ought to have that right, and that is what today's debate is about. To be clear, today's debate is not about the science behind GMOs. It is also not about whether GMOs are good or bad. Whether you love GMOs or hate them, we should all agree that you ought to know if they are in the food that you are feeding to your family and your children.

Madam Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration requires labeling of thousands of ingredients, additives, and processes, many of which have nothing to do with safety or nutrition. For example, the FDA requires mandatory labeling of juice when it is from concentrate. It is just one of the ways we tell people what is in their food and how it is made.

This piece of legislation would require companies to label their products if they contain GMOs, and I strongly support that sentiment. But the way this legislation is written, it provides three options for labeling: words on the package, which makes sense; a symbol to be developed by USDA, which makes sense; but then there is this, a so-called quick response, or QR, code. It was at the behest of big industry that the QR code be listed as an option, not what is in the interest of the American consumer but what is in the interest of a few special interests.

Now, I would be much more comfortable with a bill that requires either words or a symbol, but a QR code is something that I cannot support. Nobody here should support that. In order to access the information through the QR code, an individual must have a smartphone and must have access to the Internet. The reality is that not every American has access to a smartphone or the Internet. Look, I don't get reception at a local grocery store here in D.C. just a couple of blocks from where we are here in the U.S. Capitol. It is frustrating. What good would a QR code do if I can't get a data signal using my phone? One in five Americans in the United States does not have a smartphone. That includes 50 percent of Americans who are low-income and living in rural areas and over 65 percent of elderly Americans. If we end up going down the route

of a QR code, all of these people will be prevented from accessing the information that this bill is supposed to make available to all consumers. Even if someone has a smartphone, they will have to scan every single item they purchase in order to obtain the desired information, and this is assuming they will have access to the Internet in the grocery store. That is anything but a quick response. It is a bad idea. It is a bad idea. It is an intentional measure to deny consumers information.

We considered what we call the DARK Act on this House floor a few months ago. This is the son of the DARK Act. It keeps people in the dark about what is in their food that they are buying. The debate about GMO labeling is about transparency and the right of every American to know what is in the food they eat. It is very simple. The best approach would be a clear and easy-to-understand label or symbol, not some crazy QR code that only creates more hassle and confusion.

From the very beginning of the debate about GMO labeling, some in the food industry have stuck to two main arguments. They have said that GMOs are perfectly safe and that it would cost far too much for them to add a symbol or words to their packaging. But once they came up with the idea to put a large QR code on their packaging that they hope consumers will just simply ignore or not be able to access, they suddenly dropped their complaints about the financial cost of changing their packaging.

The truth is that the QR code will take up more space on their packaging than any symbol or simple written label would, and the QR code is going to have to include wording as well. It would be so much easier and better for consumers for the food industry to just use wording or a symbol and not this complicated, confusing QR code.

We know that food companies change labels on their products all the time. Jerry Greenfield of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream said that it is a normal cost of business to change their packaging. Campbell Soup is committed to including words on their packaging and has said that in doing this, there will not be an increase in food prices. I want to thank Campbell's as well as Mars and Dannon for all committing to using words on their label and not some kind of confusing QR code.

The majority of Americans favor mandatory GMO labels that are clear, straightforward, and easy to understand.

Wouldn't it be nice if—and I know this is a radical idea in this Congress—but wouldn't it be nice if, for once, this Congress actually did what the American people want? Keeping our constituents in the dark should not be tolerated. And, therefore, this bill should be soundly defeated by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Madam Speaker, we are also considering a totally unrelated bill, H.R. 4828, the so-called Conscience Protection

Act, which ironically is yet another unconscionable attempt to take away women's right to health care.

Under current law, hospitals and other healthcare providers can already refuse service to an individual based on the practitioner's own moral objection. But this legislation would take this a step further and actually permit the withholding of medical information about a patient's condition if the physician believes that such information could potentially lead to an abortion. Bosses would be permitted to impose their own religious beliefs across their entire company by withholding abortion services on employer-sponsored health plans. It is not an employer's decision what type of medical care is needed by their employees. Women have the same rights to access health care as men do, and no boss should be able to deny them that right.

This will be the House Republicans' 13th vote to attack women's health care in this Congress alone. Thirteen times we have gone down a similar road. How can we possibly consider a bill that would allow insurance companies, doctors, or healthcare facilities to substitute their own religious opinions for actual medical information? Every woman should be able to trust that, when they go to their doctor, they are receiving all the facts and information that they need to make their own health decisions.

Encouraging doctors to withhold vital information from women about their health is outrageous and incredibly dangerous. Such a reckless bill has no place in Congress. This bill is nothing more than the latest attempt by House Republicans to appeal to their extreme rightwing base.

This legislation does not include any exemption in the case of rape, incest, or endangering the life of the woman and would preempt any State law that does allow for the coverage of abortion.

Madam Speaker, we have countless women sharing their stories of how these types of laws have had devastating and tragic effects on them. One woman's water broke at 20 weeks prematurely, and doctors determined that the fetus would not survive birth. The Catholic hospital she was at refused to perform an abortion since the fetus still had a heartbeat. For 7 weeks, this woman had to carry a fetus in her with the knowledge that it had no chance of survival. It wasn't until she was suffering from severe hemorrhaging that a hospital would finally induce labor. The baby died almost immediately after birth, as doctors expected.

Another woman's water broke prematurely at 18 weeks. She was rushed to the nearest hospital, which was a Catholic hospital. Doctors knew that the fetus was no longer viable and would die immediately upon birth. However, this information was withheld from the woman. She was simply given two Tylenol and sent home unaware that there was no chance her

child would survive birth. The woman returned twice more, each time with severe bleeding, and it was only at the end of the second visit as they were sending her home, she went into labor and gave birth. The baby died within hours, as the doctors expected.

Women's health must always come first, and this only puts more lives at risk.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to support this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Conscience Protection Act, a bill I cosponsored to protect pro-life healthcare providers from discrimination.

Doctors, nurses, employers, social service agencies, and insurance plans that choose not to take part in abortions as a matter of conscience should not face discrimination or penalty.

This bill reaffirms protections already in place by prohibiting the Federal Government and entities that receive Federal funding from discriminating against or penalizing those who are exercising their conscience rights while, most importantly, it gives victims of discrimination legal recourse to defend themselves.

Currently, it is up to the Department of Health and Human Services to enforce the law—and that is something that this administration has not always been willing to do.

The Conscience Protection Act will give pro-life healthcare providers and employers full conscience protections without loopholes or uncertainty.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this essential bill to protect life and those who exercise their conscience rights.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I oppose this closed rule on an obnoxious bill. This bill is just another attempt in a long line of Republican attempts to interfere with women's health choices. This bill is part of a disturbing national trend. Some legislators at the Federal, State, and local level are attempting to insert religious exemptions into antidiscrimination and pro-women's health laws with which they do not agree.

Rather than trying a frontal assault on the laws themselves—which they know they would lose—they seek instead to use the premise of religion to allow further discrimination against women. We must not let them succeed.

Let's be clear what this is really all about. The Republicans are not happy with the Supreme Court's pro-choice decisions. They are not happy with the Affordable Care Act, which provides contraceptive coverage to millions of women with no out-of-pocket costs.

□ 1300

But try as they may, they cannot overturn *Roe v. Wade* and they cannot repeal *ObamaCare*. The American people won't let them do that. So now they are trying to bring religion into the discussion and dare us to oppose what they call basic First Amendment principles about freedom of religion. Well, guess what: that is not going to work either.

We see their bias, we see their intent, and we will not let them enshrine discrimination into Federal law. We won't let you punish women just because you are not pro-choice. That is not going to happen.

Let's be honest. This is not about religion; it is about abortion and contraception. So let's stop the charade.

In this case, the bill's sole purpose is to deny access to, and create more barriers to women seeking medical procedures that are legal and constitutionally protected. The bill would enable employers and healthcare companies to override women's personal reproductive health decisions. We have said this before and we will say it again: women's reproductive healthcare decisions simply should not be their boss' business.

Religious convictions should be protected but cannot be permitted to infringe on the rights of others. Employers, other than religious institutions, have no right to impose their religious opinions on their employees. An employer's opinion about the propriety of birth control or abortion must have no bearing on whether an employee can get access to abortion or birth control services.

Certainly no woman should be denied information about her medical condition or about birth control or abortion because of the religious opinions of her employer; that is not protecting the religious opinion of the employer. That is projecting the religious opinion of the employer onto the employee in derogation of her rights. Religious protections must not be used as a sword against the rights of third parties. They must be used as a shield to protect your own religious liberty, but not to hurt other people.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, predictably, our colleagues are misrepresenting the contents of this bill. This bill does not affect any abortion provider who currently performs the procedure and who wishes to continue.

If the Conscience Protection Act becomes law, abortion will still be just as legal and accessible as it is today. The bill seeks only to ensure that healthcare providers will not be forced by government to violate their moral or religious convictions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I am honored to stand before the House today to speak on the Conscience Pro-

tection Act. I am speaking today on behalf of the over 55 million children who are unable to speak for themselves. I grieve their deaths.

Abortion not only brutally ends the life of children, it also forever changes the lives of their mothers. Because of the negative outcomes of abortion for mothers and children, many healthcare providers choose not to participate in this abhorrent practice. We must protect healthcare providers who reasonably—and conscientiously—object to participating in abortion.

At a speech in 2009, President Obama said clearly: "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." But that is no longer the practice of this administration.

Today, across the country, in flagrant violation of Federal law, churches are being forced to buy healthcare plans that pay for abortions, and nurses have been forced to assist in abortions.

The Conscience Protection Act would stop the government from discriminating against providers that exercise their right of conscience. It would ensure that those who have been penalized for exercising this right are allowed their day in court.

Madam Speaker, nobody should be forced to choose between their values or their job. Our country was founded on the right of conscience. We cannot abandon them now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let's be clear, and I want all of my colleagues to be clear on this issue. This bill would allow a woman's boss to decide whether or not she could have an abortion—her boss—because this bill allows employers who offer healthcare plans to deny women access to abortion services. This is outrageous, and I can't believe that this kind of bill has come to this floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote against the Conscience Protection Act. This is just another attempt by the Republican majority to create barriers for women as they make personal decisions about their reproductive health care. This legislation would expand and make permanent existing refusal policies, which would erode important patient protections.

If this law were enacted, employers and companies could refuse to provide information to women about their health care. That is unacceptable.

Women have a right to receive all of the information they need as they make important decisions that are personal to them. Women's access to care, our ability to make choices about our health, and our right to be informed should always be protected.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this damaging legislation for women's health.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, if laws already enacted in the religious liberty protections enshrined in our Constitution were actually being protected, we wouldn't be here. We wouldn't be needing to vote on the Conscience Protection Act in the House of Representatives today.

Is it an attempt to prevent something? Yes. It is an attempt to protect all Americans' rights under our First Amendment. It is just that simple. Unfortunately, the right to exercise one's own conscience is under attack in the United States at the Federal and State level.

Let's be very clear on this. Conscience, as defined, is the "inner sense of what is right or wrong in one's conduct or motives, impelling one towards right action." It is the feeling that one has done something morally right or wrong. You cannot deny people rights that were enshrined in our Constitution and in our Bill of Rights just because it doesn't happen to fit a popular narrative right now.

If we cannot come together as the people's House and protect what we have been given by our forefathers and has been enshrined in our Bill of Rights and try to make it into something different, then we have totally missed the mark, and America should be greatly disappointed in whom they have sent to represent them.

None of us can turn our back on the Constitution. None of us can say that somehow this is something different than what it is. It is the protection of one's freedoms and liberties under our Bill of Rights and in our First Amendment. It is that simple.

Conscience—conscience—why should somebody have to sacrifice their religious conscience because somebody says let's redefine it into something else? It is nothing more than doing the right thing because it is the right thing to do, and I am talking about religious conscience.

Why would we limit our schools and our hospitals of religious founding? Why would we say to them, no, you don't have the right to do this; we are going to supersede that?

It is protection for the rights of the First Amendment. That is something we all took an oath to do, and that is what we need to do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again, if you believe that a woman's boss should make the decision about whether or not she could have access to abortion services, then you support this bill. I happen to think that a woman should make that decision on her own. It should be her decision and not the decision of her boss.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts. I think he just put it correctly.

These are difficult choices. They are moral choices. They are choices from

the heart and choices from the gut. But I do think that a woman who is in need of an abortion in her mind has the right to have those kinds of services and has the right to not have her boss veto them for her.

The Conscience Protection Act is the latest in a long line of attempts to interfere with women's autonomy and medical care. I have come to the floor a number of times to defend a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions, a concept that, frankly, shouldn't need a defense at all. I respect decisions, one way or another.

This bill is marketed as one that would protect conscience rights, but let's be clear. Current law already allows health professionals to object to providing abortions for moral or religious reasons. The Conscience Protection Act would take this concept to a new extreme, expanding opportunities for employers to discriminate against women based on their reproductive health choices.

We have said this before and we will say it again: women's personal healthcare decisions are not their boss' business. An employer should not have the right to veto a medical decision by a woman. It is just not right.

Every patient should be able to make fully informed decisions about her health care without interference of her employer, and certainly without interference from Congress. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Again, whatever your moral choices are, I respect them; on both sides, I respect them. But it is not right for a woman who is seeking an abortion to have that abortion vetoed because her boss doesn't like abortions. I think that is a decision that should be left to the woman alone, not put more pressure on her, not force her to go against her will. This is something dealing with her body, her rights, not her boss' rights, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the charge that this would allow a woman's boss to prevent her from obtaining an abortion is a true outrage. It is a disgusting red herring.

This bill would allow employers to continue to have the freedom to decline to pay for abortions. No American should be forced to pay for the killing of an unborn child, whether they are a taxpayer or a private citizen. The other side should not stoop to such tactics.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, Mrs. Foxx for yielding and thank her for her extraordinary Pro-life leadership.

Madam Speaker, in an unconscionable abuse of power, for almost 2 years, the State of California has forced all insurance plans under its purview and the people in institutions that pay the premiums—to subsidize abortion on demand. Numerous faith-based entities

filed complaints pursuant to law with the HHS Office for Civil Rights seeking, and fully expecting, relief.

Effective June 21, however, the Obama administration flatly refused to enforce U.S. law—current law—protecting the civil right of conscience. Cardinal Timothy Dolan said, "It is shocking that HHS has allowed the State of California to force all employers—even churches—to fund and facilitate elective abortions in their health insurance plans."

I would note parenthetically to my colleagues, this isn't about ObamaCare and the massive taxpayer funding for abortion embedded—according to GAO's analysis—in over 1,000 insurance plans on the exchanges, which was contrary to what the President had promised right here in this Chamber, 30 feet away from me, in a joint session of Congress in 2009. No. This is about private health insurance plans of Catholic dioceses, religious schools, and others who have been ordered to violate their deeply held convictions and pay for the killing of unborn children by hideous dismemberment procedures, toxic compounds, or chemical poisoning.

The Weldon Federal conscience clause, authored by Congressman Dave Weldon of Florida and continuously in effect for well over a decade, is explicit and comprehensive, but it is not being enforced by the Obama Administration.

The Weldon amendment says, in pertinent part, that it is illegal for any "discrimination" against a healthcare entity "on the basis that the healthcare entity does not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions." The law's definition of healthcare entity explicitly includes "a health insurance plan."

Despite the absolute clarity of the Weldon language, injured parties, including the Catholic church, have been denied relief.

The Obama Administration's refusal to enforce the civil right of conscience is not only unfair and unjustified, it violates the rule of law, makes a mockery of the President's 2009 Notre Dame speech, mentioned by my colleague from Missouri, when Obama said: "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." Mr. Obama's words don't match his deeds and he is not honoring the civil rights of conscience.

The Conscience Protection Act of 2016, authored by Congresswoman DIANE BLACK, seeks to end discrimination against people, plans, and providers for refusing to be involved in the killing of unborn children. The bill says that the Federal Government or any State or local government that receives Federal assistance may not penalize, retaliate against, or otherwise discriminate against those who refuse to perform, refer for, pay for, or otherwise participate in abortion.

□ 1315

The linchpin of this legislation, of the Conscience Protection Act, pro-

tections people, insurance plans, and other entities from being forced to participate by providing a private right of action.

The HHS Office for Civil Rights has failed miserably. In this country, we need a remedy that is durable and that will provide the protection that people are demanding, especially today in California, but really the entire country.

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

Let's be honest with one another. What this is all about here is that some of my friends on the other side believe that abortion should be illegal all across the country, that no woman should have the right to abortion services. They are upset with the Supreme Court decision of *Roe v. Wade*, and they are frustrated that they can't find a way around it. This is what this is about: trying to deny women access to these kinds of services through maneuvers that are in this bill.

It is absolutely true that what this legislation does is to leave in the hands of her boss the decision about whether or not a woman can have an abortion or not. That is what this does. I want to be clear about one thing so my colleagues understand this. No taxpayer money—that is the law—can be used to subsidize abortion. That is the law of the land: no taxpayer money.

What this does is allow an employer who doesn't agree that abortion should be legal the ability to provide health insurance that doesn't cover it. So, if you are a low-income woman, you are out of luck. You could try to pay for the services out-of-pocket that are affiliated with having an abortion, which is almost impossible, and there could be complications.

It is crazy that we are here, debating a bill like this that would basically remove a woman out of this equation. We have better things to do on this House floor than this bill.

Let's also be clear in that the reason we are doing it now is that the Republican National Convention is next week, and my colleagues are desperate to appeal to the hard-liners in their base. That is what this is all about. This will never become law, and we shouldn't be doing this on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it is not true. Conservatives don't ask for bosses to purchase weapons that are protected under the Second Amendment. Why must my Progressive colleagues ask private citizens to pay for the death of a child?

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), the sponsor of the underlying legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule to allow for the consideration of my bill, S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act.

The Members of this body represent a broad array of views on matters of life

and abortion. But, surely, we can all at least agree on this: that nobody should ever be forced to participate in the act of abortion against one's will. That is what my legislation is about.

As it stands today, the conscience rights of pro-life Americans are not being consistently upheld. As a matter of fact, nurses have been required to assist in abortions despite their moral objections, and States like California and New York are now requiring every insurance plan, including those by churches and Christian universities, to include elective abortion coverage. This is wrong.

Madam Speaker, I am a nurse. I have been so for more than 45 years, and I still keep my license today. I love my job, but I would never sacrifice my view on the sanctity of life in order to keep it, and I shouldn't have to. Being an American has always meant experiencing the freedom to live according to one's deeply held beliefs at home, at work, and in the public square. My bill simply ensures that that will remain the case.

Think about it this way: a search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD returns over 1,300 results for the phrase "right to choose." My colleagues across the aisle use that term often. Of course, their argument leaves no choice for the unborn child in the womb, but it stands to reason that if politicians will protect that right to choose, then they must protect the other right to choose as well, the right not to be a forced partner in the practice of abortion. That is simply what my bill would do.

The government recognizes the importance of protecting conscience rights in other arenas: ObamaCare prohibits government discrimination against entities that do not participate in assisted suicide, and Federal employees are not required to participate in Federal death penalty executions. Why should abortion be any different?

Madam Speaker, if Americans can't abide by their own consciences, particularly on a matter of a deeply held belief such as this, then we have lost one of our most basic freedoms there is.

Just to reiterate that which has already been said, this bill does not change the law of today on abortion. It does not. I challenge my colleagues to show me in the language of the bill where it does. It will remain exactly the way it is. This bill does not affect women's access to abortion. As a matter of fact, even in the bill, we make sure that that access is still there in the bill's language, and this bill does not affect employers in the services that they give to their employees.

Today, we can change this. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

It is frustrating to listen to this debate because, apparently, facts don't matter. The fact of the matter is that this bill is not needed to protect

healthcare providers from being forced to provide or to participate in the provisions of abortion. Healthcare providers already have those protections under current law. What this bill does is to seek to empower a woman's boss to decide whether or not she can have access to abortion services—a woman's boss.

By the way, the health insurance that is being provided is not taxpayer-funded health care; it is health insurance that the woman herself pays into. She pays into health insurance, but her boss decides—if circumstances arose in which she thought, in order to protect her life or in extenuating circumstances, that she wanted to have an abortion—whether or not she could have that, whether or not it would be covered. That is what this is. This is about trying to deny women—in this case, mostly low-income women—the ability to have access to abortion services.

It is really kind of an underhanded attempt by my colleagues to get at *Roe v. Wade*, which I know they don't like. But that is the law of the land. They are trying to make it so that women cannot have access to safe abortion services if circumstances so call for that.

I just find this whole debate to be so out of touch with what the facts are. Again, existing policies already permit certain entities, like hospitals, to refuse to perform abortions, and most of these policies explicitly permit the refusal on the basis of religious or moral objection. What this does is to go a step further. It seeks to make it almost impossible for poor women in particular to be able to have access to the rights that they are guaranteed under the Constitution. I really think that this is a bad thing for us to be considering on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, my colleague is correct. This debate is far from the facts, but it is not on our side of the aisle. When you say something wrong, repeating it doesn't make it correct. This bill has nothing to do with abortion access. That is a fact. It has to do with conscience rights, period.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a physician, I took an oath to save lives, to protect lives, and as a heart surgeon, I worked day and night to save lives, to protect life at every step of the way. I believe that the oath I took way back when I finished medical school meant protecting all stages of life.

Healthcare providers who share this belief should not be forced to act against their consciences by participating in or by facilitating an abortion. Current law prevents discrimination against healthcare providers who do not wish to participate in abortions. Unfortunately, the Department of Health and Human Services' Office for

Civil Rights refuses to enforce this policy in its taking years, oftentimes, to consider complaints of conscience rights violations. That is just wrong. It is wrong.

The Conscience Protection Act will provide the healthcare community—doctors, nurses, hospitals, and insurers alike—with the right to seek their day in court when the administration fails to enforce existing law. Americans should never be forced to violate their conscience rights in order to do their jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Today, we are dealing with two pieces of legislation on this rule: one that would deny women's rights and another that would deny consumers' rights in terms of this inadequate GMO labeling bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Consumers Union, which is opposed to the GMO labeling bill. I include in the RECORD a letter that opposes this legislation and that is signed by countless consumer and healthcare organizations. I also include in the RECORD a New York Times editorial entitled "A Flawed Approach to Labeling Genetically Modified Food."

CONSUMERS UNION, POLICY & ACTION

FROM CONSUMER REPORTS,

Yonkers, NY, July 12, 2016.

*House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SLAUGHTER: Consumers Union, the policy and mobilization arm of Consumer Reports, urges you to vote no on S. 764, which includes a bill by Senator Roberts and Senator Stabenow related to the disclosure of genetically engineered (GE) food. This bill will not provide consumers with the clear information about GE food that nine out of ten consumers have repeatedly said they want. The legislation would preempt state laws requiring clear, on-package labeling of GE food, replacing them two or more years from now with an ineffective federal disclosure program to be established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Significant questions have been raised about this program's scope.

We have several specific concerns with S. 764. First, this bill, which allows USDA to take two years to develop implementing rules, undermines GE labeling occurring in the marketplace. Labels indicating that a food is produced with genetic engineering are already appearing on store shelves across the country, in compliance with duly enacted state labeling requirements. S. 764 would invalidate laws in states including Vermont, Alaska, Connecticut, and Maine, and produce a legal vacuum for at least two years while USDA writes federal rules.

Second, the definition of "bioengineering" is unclear, and will be subject to interpretation by the Secretary of Agriculture. As a result, there is an active and unresolved dispute about to what extent S. 764 includes or excludes many GE food products from the bill's requirements. This lack of clarity deeply concerns Consumers Union, as we believe that the regulations, should this bill become law, should be very broad in scope.

There are other significant problems with the bill's coverage. For example, while the bill does cover some products containing both GE ingredients and meat, it specifically

exempts any food where meat is the main ingredient, even if the food product contains other ingredients that are genetically engineered.

Third, S. 764 allows companies to employ methods of disclosure that are difficult to use, are not available to all consumers, and put rural, older and low income consumers at a disadvantage. The bill allows for disclosure via QR codes, designed to be scanned by a smartphone. Scanning a QR code may not be feasible for numerous consumers who are unfamiliar with the technology or who lack a smartphone, as three out of four older Americans and about half of rural residents do. As QR codes are already used for many purposes on packages, their presence is not a flag—it does not constitute a *de facto* or easily recognizable indication that a product contains GE ingredients.

Consumers express a clear preference for labels visible to the naked eye. Nearly nine out of ten in a recent survey favored printed, on-package information over scannable bar codes for labels indicating whether food at the grocery store contains GE ingredients, and only 8% preferred the scannable code. Other methods in the legislation that do not involve scannable codes would be significantly more difficult for consumers to use. Navigating a corporate website or dialing a customer call center would each require consumers to go through a multi-step process simply to determine if a food contains GE ingredients.

While Consumers Union agrees with the goal of establishing a uniform national standard for disclosure of GE food ingredients, this bill does not accomplish that goal. In fact, it does the opposite—prohibiting states from exercising their ability to protect consumers through labels while failing to create a credible, clear, unambiguous federal labeling requirement. Furthermore, this bill creates hurdles for consumers to determine quickly and easily while shopping if a product contains GE ingredients.

Consumers have said overwhelmingly that they want GE food to be labeled as such, and states have responded to their requests. The House should not disregard these views by eliminating state laws relating to GE food labeling and replacing them with a vague program that gives USDA excessive latitude in implementation. We therefore urge you to vote no on S. 764, and instead encourage you to continue working toward a uniform solution that serves the interests of both food producers and consumers.

Sincerely,

JEAN HALLORAN,  
*Director, Food Policy Initiatives.*

JULY 11, 2016.

*House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.*

Re GMO Labeling Bill—OPPOSE

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned food safety, farm, environmental, and consumer advocacy organizations and food corporations, and the millions of members we represent across the United States, we strongly oppose the new Roberts/Stabenow legislation on GMO food labeling. The bill was passed by the Senate last week and is expected to come to the House floor this week.

The process that created this legislation has been profoundly undemocratic and a violation of basic legislative practice. The bill addresses a critical issue for the American public, yet it was neither subject to a single hearing nor any testimony whatsoever. Rather, the bill's preemption of the democratically decided-upon labeling laws of several states, and seed laws of numerous states and municipalities, is the result of non-transparent "bargaining" between two senators and industry interest groups.

As explained in more detail below, we oppose the bill because it is actually a non-la-

beling bill under the guise of a mandatory labeling bill. It exempts major portions of current and future GMO foods from labeling; it is on its face discriminatory against low income, rural and elderly populations; it is a gross violation of the sovereignty of numerous states around the nation; and it provides no enforcement against those who violate the law.

(1) No mandatory standards—The Senate bill itself prescribes no mandatory standards for GMO labeling. Rather, it preempts the labeling laws of several states including Vermont, Connecticut, Maine and Alaska based exclusively on a multi-year discretionary process determined solely by an as of yet unknown, future USDA Secretary.

(2) A vast number of current and future GE foods will be exempt from any labeling—Either intentionally, or through poor drafting and lack of scientific expertise, the novel definition of "bioengineering" under the bill would exclude from labeling a vast number of current foods produced with genetic engineering, including those where the "modification" is "found in nature," those in which technology cannot as yet detect the novel genetic material, and foods made with non in vitro recombinant DNA techniques, such as new generations of food made with RNAi and so-called "gene-editing" techniques. In fact, 99% of all GMO food COULD be exempt from labeling as the bill leaves it entirely up to a future USDA Secretary to determine what "amount" of GMO ingredients in a food qualifies it for labeling. If that Secretary were to decide on a high percentage of GMO content, it would exempt virtually all processed GMO foods which comprise more than 99% of all GMO foods on the market.

(3) Discrimination against rural, low income and elderly populations—The bill anticipates that GMO labeling will be done primarily through QR codes ("digital" labeling). Because of their lack of access to smart phones, more than 50% of rural and low income populations, and more than 65% of the elderly, will have no access to these labels. This impact will fall disproportionately on minority communities. Millions more that do have smart phones may not be able to access these QR codes because they cannot afford to maintain their data service or their neighborhoods do not have adequate network coverage. The study of the efficacy of QR codes outlined in the bill is to take place significantly AFTER any labeling is established and in the marketplace. The results of such a study, if any, may take many years to clarify and codify. Such a "study" provision is clearly not sufficient to absolve the bill of an unconstitutional discriminatory impact.

(4) Violation of State sovereignty by specifically preempting GMO seed laws and potentially numerous other laws and regulations—The bill not only preempts state food labeling laws, but also specifically preempts GMO seed labeling laws, such as those in Vermont and Virginia that are designed to help farmers determine what seeds to buy and plant. Additionally, either intentionally or through poor drafting, the bill could be interpreted to be a preemption of more than 100 different state and municipal laws and regulations throughout the nation.

(5) No enforcement against those who violate mandatory GMO labeling—The bill provides no civil or criminal penalties whatsoever against those not in compliance with GMO labeling requirements. The bill specifically excludes the capacity of the USDA to order any recall of misbranded food, even in cases where a product has been produced with genetic engineering but the corporation involved purposely decides to violate the law and not label.

For this and other reasons, including the bill's definitions being in direct conflict with regulations under the National Organic Food

Production Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the international Codex Alimentarius, the undersigned organizations and companies urge you to VOTE NO on this misguided, inherently discriminatory bill. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Center for Food Safety, Food and Water Watch, Abundance Cooperative Market, Beyond Pesticides, Biosafety Alliance, Cedar Circle Farm and Education Center, Central Park West CSA, Citizens for GMO Labeling, Council for Responsible Genetics, Crop CSA, Crush Wine and Spirits, Dr. Bronner's, East New York Farms, Empire State Consumer Project, Family Farm Defenders, Farm Aid, Food Democracy Now.

Foundation Earth, Friends of the Earth, Genesis Farm, Greenpeace, GMO Action Alliance, GMO Free NY, GMO Free USA, GMO Inside, Good Earth Natural Foods, iEat Green, LLC, Institute for Responsible Technology, International Center for Technology Assessment, Katchkie Farm, Keep the Soil in Organic Coalition, Kezialain Farm.

Label GMOs, LIC Brewery, Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association, Midwest Organic & Sustainable Education Service, Miskell's Premium Organics, Moms Across America, National Family Farm Coalition, National Organic Coalition, Nature's Path, Nine Mile Market, Non-GMO Project, Nutiva, Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance, Northeast Organic Farming Association, Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York, Northeast Organic Farming Association of New Hampshire, Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont, NYC H20.

Oregon Right to Know, Organic Consumers Association, Organic Farmers' Agency for Relationship Marketing, Inc., Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association, Our Family Farms, PCC Natural Markets, Pesticide Action Network North America, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Presence Marketing, Regeneration Vermont, Riverside-Salem United Church of Christ/Disciples of Christ, Rodale Institute, Rumiano Cheese Company.

Rural Advancement Foundation International, Rural Advancement Foundation International USA, Rural Vermont, Sierra Club, Slow Food California, Slow Food Hudson Valley, Slow Food North Shore, Slow Food USA, Soil Not Oil Coalition, Sunnyside CSA, The Cornucopia Institute, The Organic & Non-GMO Report, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Vermont Public Interest Research Group, Vermont Right to Know GMOs Coalition, Wood Prairie Family Farm.

[The New York Times, July 6, 2016]

A FLAWED APPROACH TO LABELING  
GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD

(By the Editorial Board)

The Senate is expected to vote as early as Thursday on a bill that would require businesses to label genetically modified foods. Unfortunately, it would allow companies to use confusing electronic codes for scanning instead of simple, clear labels.

This bill, a bipartisan compromise negotiated by Senator Pat Roberts, Republican of Kansas, and Senator Debbie Stabenow, Democrat of Michigan, is being pushed through Congress because some lawmakers from farm states want to pre-empt a Vermont law that requires labeling for some genetically modified foods that went into effect on July 1 (Vermont is giving companies six months to comply) and to prevent other states from enacting similar laws. The Senate bill follows an failed effort in March to block state labeling laws. The House passed a bill last year

that would pre-empt states from enforcing such laws.

While most scientists say that genetically modified foods do not pose a risk to human health, consumers should have a right to more information about what they are eating. Polls have found that a vast majority of Americans favor mandatory labels. Dozens of countries, including all 28 members of the European Union and Australia, already require similar disclosures.

Researchers have found that labels do not dissuade people from consuming genetically engineered food, which has been a big worry of farm groups and businesses. It is no surprise then that some companies, like Campbell Soup, have voluntarily agreed to label their products.

The biggest problem with the Senate bill is that—instead of requiring a simple label, as the Vermont law does—it would allow food companies to put the information in electronic codes that consumers would have to scan with smartphones or at scanners installed by grocery stores. The only reason to do this would be to make the information less accessible to the public.

Another problem is that the bill might not cover some kinds of genetic engineering. The Food and Drug Administration warned that the bill “would result in a somewhat narrow scope of coverage”—for example, food that includes oil made from genetically engineered soybeans might not need to be labeled.

The bill’s sponsors, however, contend that under the Department of Agriculture’s analysis, the bill would require labeling of products that contain genetically engineered soybeans and refined oils. This lack of clarity is troubling, and certainly needs to be resolved. Exempting large categories of genetically modified foods would make the labels useless.

In addition to Vermont, labeling laws have been passed in Connecticut and Maine, but those measures will go into effect only if neighboring states adopt similar legislation. Clearly, a strong federal standard would be preferable to a patchwork of state rules. But the Senate bill needs more work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, Vermont’s GMO labeling law, Act 120, was signed into law in 2014 after years of hearings, testimony, and debate. It was the first-in-the-Nation GMO labeling law, but Americans should understand that 64 nations around the world have GMO labeling. That law was passed by a vote of 28-2 in the Vermont Senate and by 114-30 in the House. It garnered support from Republicans and Democrats. The reason it did is that labeling is simply giving consumers information that they can use in deciding whether they want to buy a particular product or not. GMO labeling tells consumers whether the product contains GMOs.

Some of its opponents oppose this largely because they think consumers aren’t entitled to that information even though they believe that GMOs are tremendous. But if they want to brag about GMOs, why don’t they want to label GMO products so consumers can make their own decisions? Now what we have is a situation in which the legislation we are going to be considering says that we will put a label on but not one that you can read.

The label that would be ascribed would allow manufacturers to decide to put on “GMO contained herein”—and that is in English—just like a calorie label or how much salt is in there.

It would also give them the option of using, in effect, a barcode whereby, when you are shopping and you have got to get home to make dinner and you have got to take a son or a daughter out to a play practice or to a sports game, you have to take your iPhone, scan the barcode, go to a Web site, and then investigate the Web site as to whether or not that can of black beans contains GMOs. Who has time to do that? How is that a practical option?

The other option for the company is to put on a 1-800 number, where you are probably getting a call center overseas, and you are talking to somebody about the beans that you are buying at the co-op in Burlington. Folks who are busy mountain women don’t have time to do that, so let’s get real.

This bill that the Senate has sent over is dumb. If you want to label something, use English. That is all you have to do, and we should accept the fact for our consumers, the people we represent. If they want to know something, why not tell them?

I applaud Campbell Soup for deciding it is just going to put GMO labels on the products and will let the consumers decide. Let’s kill this bill. Let’s get a national standard that uses English.

□ 1330

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

I appreciate so much my colleague from Vermont being concerned about the time that mountain women have for looking at their beans.

I want to tell you, we have been eating genetically modified food since the beginning of time, Mr. Speaker, all of us have. Anybody who raises a garden knows that you collect your good seeds, and you try to use them over and over and over again because you have a good product.

People have been modifying food genetically, again, from the beginning of time. We try to breed good cattle with good cattle. We have been doing that since we have had any sense about what was good and what was bad in terms of our food. It has been going on a long time.

Guess what?

I just love my heirloom tomatoes, and I am looking forward to a whole bunch of them this summer.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to talk about S. 764, the GMO labeling requirements. The labeling requirement provides flexibility to food manufacturers by giving them a variety of options to meet disclosure requirements.

My colleague talked about the Vermont Legislature being bipartisan. The Senate bill was very bipartisan. For instance, a product may have a label with text explaining its contents or it may have a QR code or an electronic link to identify bioengineered

products. The food manufacturer chooses their preferred method of disclosure.

To ensure ease of use, S. 764 requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct a study to identify potential roadblocks consumers may encounter when trying to access the disclosure information. The measure allows food manufacturers of all sizes adequate time to comply with the law’s requirements and provides additional protections for small businesses.

This bill represents a bipartisan compromise on this issue, and I commend this rule and the underlying bill to my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just point out to the gentlewoman that 88 percent of consumers said they would prefer on-package labeling for genetically engineered food rather than some QR code.

Again, what this bill is about is trying to appease industry. I would say to my friends, if you want to know why we are appealing to certain industry, just follow the money because that is how so many pieces of legislation in this Republican-controlled House are crafted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation, which would allow the Attorney General 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 my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question so that our ranking member can bring up his amendment to prevent suspected terrorists, people who are on the FBI’s no-fly list, people who can’t fly on an airplane because the FBI has determined it is too dangerous to the American public to allow these people to fly. But under existing law, they can legally buy a gun of their choice at a gun store. That is wrong. We all know it is wrong. Eighty-five percent of the American people believe that is wrong and support this measure.

We believe that terrorists, that criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill should not be able to have easy access to guns. Background checks and the no fly, no buy legislation are the two ways to make it tougher for them to get guns.

We are getting ready, under the Republican leadership, to run out of here and take weeks' worth of vacation without addressing this issue. I think it is shameful.

We have had 34,000 deaths by someone using a gun since the Sandy Hook tragedy 3½ years ago. We have had 1,196 mass shootings since the Sandy Hook tragedy. We have held 31 moments of silence on this floor for people who have been killed in mass shootings, but we have had zero votes on any gun violence prevention legislation. That is wrong.

The background check bill that we have before us is a bipartisan bill. As a matter of fact, there are 197 Members of Congress who are the coauthors of that bill, Democrats and Republicans. Ninety percent of the American people support it.

Why won't the Republican leadership allow that bill to be voted on here on the floor?

Every day there is another gun violence tragedy. We just had yesterday the memorial for the tragic situation in Dallas, Texas, where five police officers were murdered by someone using a gun.

It is not a partisan issue. When somebody takes a gun and goes to kill someone, they don't ask if they are Democrats or if they are Republicans. We need to put the partisan strife aside and deal with this. We need to come to this floor and work on solutions that will help keep the people who sent us to Washington, D.C., safe. It is long past time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, right outside of my district, two individuals with AK-47s held up an armored car. They shot one of the guards, and they took off and ended up in my district where police stopped them. One of them shot at the local police officer. He was able to hit him with his car. They arrested him. The other one with his AK-47 took off on the run. Two SWAT teams, the FBI, and the local police were out there trying to hunt this guy down with an AK-47.

This is personal. This could happen in any of our districts. It is real personal for me because one of those cops looking for this guy was my son. I don't want my son or any of your sons having to go up against some criminal with any kind of gun, the least of which would be a long gun that would pierce most of the protection they have.

Let's bring this bill to the floor. Let's get this thing done.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The Republicans are about to leave town, and I don't know whether to be happy or sad. Sad because there are so many important issues that we need to consider here that we are not doing, whether it is gun violence or dealing with the Zika virus, but happy in the sense that we won't have to deal with terrible pieces of legislation like the two bills that are being brought before us under this rule.

The so-called Conscience Protection Act is not about protecting anybody's conscience. We already have a law that does that. This is about denying a woman access to abortion services. This is about empowering a woman's boss to make the decision as to whether or not she could have access to abortion services.

When the gentlewoman says, "no, it is not; no, it is not," I would remind her that when you deny someone insurance coverage for a healthcare procedure, in most cases, that means that you deny them access because a woman, especially a low-income woman, couldn't afford those services.

So if you think that a woman's boss ought to be in control of her healthcare, then vote for this terrible bill. But I hope a majority of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, will see through this and reject it.

The second bill is this terrible GMO labeling bill. As my colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) said: If you want a labeling bill, then have a labeling bill. Label it. Make it clear to people. Give consumers the access to the information that they overwhelmingly want.

It is beyond the ability of the people that run this Congress to give the people of this country what they want. The vast majority want transparency, and, instead, we get this GMO bill that is confusing, that will make it impossible for some consumers to have access to information about whether or not a product contains GMOs or not.

This is not about the safety or the science of GMOs. This is about consumers' right to know. I mean, give people the information so they can make their own decisions.

Who are we in this Congress to deny people the information that they want?

It is about time we do what the American people want.

Vote "no" on the rule. Vote "no" on both of these pieces of legislation. Vote "no" on the previous question so we can finally have a debate on gun safety.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to remind my colleague—perhaps he has forgotten—that the House dealt with the Zika crisis and the Zika virus. We sent a bill over to the Senate, and it was the Democrat Members of the Senate that prevented that bill from being debated and voted on in the Senate. We have done our job

in the House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis. We are doing our job in the House of Representatives. I believe we passed 24 bills in this House on Monday alone. So we are doing our job, Mr. Speaker. We have problems with our colleagues' counterparts on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say again, the S. 304 does not stop a woman's choice. It is important, though, for us to understand what is at stake if we don't pass S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act. Not only will the State of California be allowed to continue to violate Federal law, but it is likely that other States will follow suit with similarly drafted rules and regulations, forcing more and more churches, religious charities, and employers to decide between honoring the tenets of their faith and helping their employees by providing health insurance.

Further, S. 304 allows healthcare providers to file a civil right of action when they face discrimination by government or subsidiary agencies. Currently, the only recourse a healthcare provider has available is to appeal to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Civil Rights. Recall that this was the same office that conveniently reinterpreted the Weldon Amendment, allowing the California Department of Managed Health Care to force churches to pay for elective abortions.

Additionally, the Office of Civil Rights has been notoriously slow to adjudicate complaints. The groups who filed the appeal in the California case waited more than 2 years for a decision. And a nurse who was forced to participate in an abortion and then required to reassemble the parts of a dismembered baby waited 3 years for her complaint to be resolved. That is unconscionable.

It has become clear that healthcare providers cannot rely on HHS and the Office of Civil Rights to defend healthcare providers from discrimination. S. 304 provides this protection and gives these entities recourse when they choose not to participate in or facilitate abortion.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also provides for consideration of a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 764, GMO labeling requirements. This bill leverages Congress' authority to regulate interstate commerce and will establish a uniform standard for labeling bioengineered foods that is easy for consumers to access and understand.

This standard provides food manufacturers with regulatory certainty and a single, national standard with which they must comply, rather than a patchwork of dozens of State and local regulations that vary from a complex list of details to no labeling at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing, though not surprising, to hear my colleagues criticize the Conscience Protection Act. Congress has a long history of providing freedom of conscience protections, and this bill ensures that healthcare providers are protected and can continue serving their patients, customers, and communities as they have been, without threat of government coercion or retaliation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 822 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 4. 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. 5. 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.

Ms. FOXX. 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.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5538.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1344

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. PITTINGER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 13, 2016, amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) had been disposed of.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendments En Bloc by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 43 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 249, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

#### AYES—177

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Aguilar	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Butterfield	Clay
Beatty	Capps	Cleaver
Becerra	Capuano	Clyburn
Bera	Cárdenas	Cohen
Beyer	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Courtney
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
F.	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy	Davis (CA)
Brown (FL)	Cioccine	Davis, Danny

DeFazio Kirkpatrick  
DeGette Kuster  
Delaney Langevin  
DeLauro Larsen (WA)  
DelBene Larson (CT)  
DeSaulnier Lawrence  
Deutch Lee  
Diaz-Balart Levin  
Dingell Lewis  
Doggett Lieu, Ted  
Doyle, Michael Lipinski  
F. Loeb sack  
Duckworth Lofgren  
Edwards Sarbanes  
Ellison Lowey  
Engel Lujan Grisham  
Eshoo (NM)  
Esty Luján, Ben Ray  
Farr (NM)  
Foster Lynch  
Frankel (FL) Maloney,  
Fudge Carolyn  
Gabbard Maloney, Sean  
Gallego Matsui  
Graham McCollum  
Grayson McDermott  
Green, Al McGovern  
Green, Gene McNerney  
Grijalva Meeks  
Gutiérrez Meng  
Hahn Moore  
Heck (WA) Moulton  
Higgins Murphy (FL)  
Himes Nadler  
Hinojosa Napolitano  
Honda Neal  
Hoyer Nolan  
Huffman Norcross  
Israel O'Rourke  
Jackson Lee Pallone  
Jeffries Pascrell  
Johnson (GA) Payne  
Johnson, E. B. Pelosi  
Kaptur Perlmutter  
Keating Peters  
Kennedy Pingree  
Kildee Pocan  
Kilmer Polis  
Kind Price (NC)

## NOES—249

Abraham Crenshaw  
Aderholt Culberson  
Allen Curbelo (FL)  
Amash Davidson  
Amodei Davis, Rodney  
Ashford Denham  
Babin Dent  
Barletta DeSantis  
Barr DesJarlais  
Barton Dold  
Benishek Donovan  
Bilirakis Duffy  
Bishop (GA) Duncan (TN)  
Bishop (MI) Ellmers (NC)  
Bishop (UT) Emmer (MN)  
Black Farenthold  
Blackburn Fincher  
Blum Fitzpatrick  
Bost Fleischmann  
Boustany Fleming  
Brady (TX) Flores  
Brat Forbes  
Bridenstine Fortenberry  
Brooks (AL) Foxx  
Brooks (IN) Franks (AZ)  
Buchanan Frelinghuysen  
Buck Garamendi  
Bucshon Garrett  
Burgess Gibbs  
Byrne Gibson  
Calvert Gohmert  
Carter (GA) Goodlatte  
Carter (TX) Gosar  
Chabot Gowdy  
Chaffetz Granger  
Clawson (FL) Graves (GA)  
Coffman Graves (LA)  
Cole Graves (MO)  
Collins (GA) Griffith  
Collins (NY) Grothman  
Comstock Guinta  
Conaway Guthrie  
Cook Hanna  
Cooper Hardy  
Costa Harper  
Costello (PA) Harris  
Cramer Hartzler  
Crawford Heck (NV)

Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Pitts  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mullaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Crowley  
Duncan (SC)  
Hastings

## NOT VOTING—7

Pearce  
Poe (TX)  
Rooney (FL)

□ 1407

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, BISHOP of Michigan, DUFFY, TROTT, and GARAMENDI changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: Rollcall No. 433, “yea.”

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

## AYES—187

Adams  
Agullar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Capps  
Capuano  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)

Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Cicilline  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Walker  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walz  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Takai

Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Esty  
Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa

## NOES—240

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy

Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Neal  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline

Knight	Olson	Smith (MO)	Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Love	Peterson	Smith (TX)
Labrador	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan	Lucas	Pittenger	Stefanik
LaHood	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Cohen	Jones	Polis	Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Stewart
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (TX)	Connolly	Kaptur	Price (NC)	Lujan Grisham	Pollquin	Stivers
Lamborn	Perry	Stewart	Conyers	Keating	Quigley	(NM)	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lance	Peterson	Stivers	Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rangel	Lummis	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Pittenger	Stutzman	Costa	Kennedy	Reed	MacArthur	Price, Tom	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	Courtney	Kildee	Rice (NY)	Marchant	Ratchliffe	Tiberi
Long	Pollquin	Tierney	Crowley	Kilmer	Richmond	Marino	Reichert	Tipton
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Tiberi	Cummings	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Massie	Renacci	Trott
Love	Posey	Tipton	Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz	McCarthy	Ribble	Turner
Lucas	Price, Tom	Trott	Davis, Danny	Kuster	Ruppersberger	McCaul	Rice (SC)	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Ratchliffe	Turner	DeFazio	Langevin	Rush	McClintock	Rigell	Valadao
Lummis	Reed	Upton	DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)	McHenry	Roby	Vela
MacArthur	Reichert	Valadao	Delaney	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	McKinley	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Marchant	Renacci	Veasey	DeLauro	Lawrence	T.	McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Marino	Ribble	Wagner	DelBene	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta	Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Massie	Rice (SC)	Walberg	DeSaulnier	Levin	Sanford	McSally	Rohrabacher	Walker
McCarthy	Rigell	Walden	Deutch	Lewis	Sarbanes	Meadows	Rokita	Walorski
McCaul	Roby	Walker	Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Meehan	Rooney (FL)	Walters, Mimi
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walorski	Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff	Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi	Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schrader	Mica	Roskam	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)	F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)	Miller (FL)	Ross	Wenstrup
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)	Duckworth	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Miller (MI)	Rothfus	Westerman
Rodgers	Rokita	Wenstrup	Edwards	Lowe	Serrano	Moolenaar	Rouzer	Westmoreland
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Westerman	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)	Mooney (WV)	Royce	Whitfield
Meadows	Roskam	Westmoreland	Engel	(NM)	Sherman	Mullin	Russell	Williams
Meehan	Ross	Whitfield	Eshoo	Lynch	Sinema	Mulvaney	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Rothfus	Williams	Esty	Maloney,	Sires	Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Wittman
Mica	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)	Farr	Carolyn	Slaughter	Neugebauer	Schweikert	Womack
Miller (FL)	Royce	Wittman	Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)	Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Russell	Womack	Foster	Matsui	Speier	Noem	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Moolenaar	Salmon	Woodall	Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)	Nugent	Sessions	Yoho
Mooney (WV)	Sanford	Yoder	Fudge	McDermott	Takano	Nunes	Shinkus	Young (AK)
Mullin	Scalise	Yoho	Gabbard	McGovern	Thompson (CA)	Olson	Shuster	Young (IA)
Mulvaney	Schweikert	Young (AK)	Gallego	McNerney	Thompson (MS)	Palazzo	Simpson	Young (IN)
Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Young (IA)	Garamendi	Meeks	Titus	Palmer	Smith (MO)	Zeldin
Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)	Graham	Meng	Tonko	Paulsen	Smith (NE)	Zinke
Newhouse	Sessions	Zinke	Grayson	Moore	Torres	Perry	Smith (NJ)	
Noem	Shinkus		Grijalva	Moulton	Tsongas			
Nugent	Shuster		Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)	Van Hollen			
Nunes	Simpson		Hahn	Nadler	Vargas			
			Hanna	Napolitano	Veasey			
			Heck (WA)	Neal	Velázquez			
			Herrera Beutler	Nolan	Visclosky			
			Higgins	Norcoss	Walz			
			Himes	O'Rourke	Wasserman			
			Hinojosa	Pallone	Schultz			
			Honda	Pascarella	Waters, Maxine			
			Hoyer	Payne	Watson Coleman			
			Huffman	Pelosi	Welch			
			Israel	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)			
			Jeffries	Peters	Yarmuth			

## NOT VOTING—6

Brady (TX)	Hastings	Poe (TX)
Eshoo	Pearce	Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1411

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR.  
LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from California (Mr.  
LOWENTHAL) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 183, noes 246,  
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—183

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

Abraham	Crawford	Guinta
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Allen	Cuellar	Hardy
Amash	Culberson	Harper
Amodei	Curbelo (FL)	Harris
Babin	Davidson	Hartzler
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Barr	Denham	Hensarling
Barton	Dent	Hice, Jody B.
Benishek	DeSantis	Hill
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Holding
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bishop (MI)	Dold	Huelskamp
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Huizenga (MI)
Black	Duffy	Hultgren
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Blum	Duncan (TN)	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Ellmers (NC)	Hurt (VA)
Boustany	Emmer (MN)	Issa
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Jackson Lee
Brat	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Forbes	Jolly
Buck	Fortenberry	Jordan
Bucshon	Foxo	Joyce
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Katko
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	King (IA)
Carter (TX)	Gibson	King (NY)
Chabot	Gohmert	Kinzing (IL)
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Gosar	Knight
Coffman	Gowdy	Labrador
Cole	Granger	LaHood
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lamborn
Comstock	Graves (MO)	Lance
Conaway	Green, Al	Latta
Cook	Green, Gene	LoBiondo
Costello (PA)	Griffith	Long
Cramer	Grothman	Loudermilk

## NOES—246

Guinta	Wasserman
Guthrie	Schultz
Hardy	Waters, Maxine
Harper	Watson Coleman
Harris	Welch
Hartzler	Wilson (FL)
Heck (NV)	Yarmuth
Hensarling	
Hice, Jody B.	
Hill	
Holding	
Hudson	
Dold	
Huelskamp	
Huizenga (MI)	
Hultgren	
Hunter	
Hurd (TX)	
Hurt (VA)	
Issa	
Jackson Lee	
Jenkins (KS)	
Jenkins (WV)	
Johnson (OH)	
Johnson, Sam	
Jolly	
Jordan	
Joyce	
Katko	
Kelly (MS)	
Kelly (PA)	
King (IA)	
King (NY)	
Kinzing (IL)	
Kline	
Knight	
Labrador	
LaHood	
LaMalfa	
Lamborn	
Lance	
Latta	
LoBiondo	
Long	
Loudermilk	

## NOT VOTING—4

Hastings	Poe (TX)
Pearce	Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1416

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR.  
MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendments en bloc of-  
fered by the gentleman from California  
(Mr. MCNERNEY) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 181, noes 248,  
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—181

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

Cummings	Kildee	Polis	McCarthy	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Delaney	Kilmer	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Price (NC)	McCaul	Reed	Stewart	DeLauro	Kind	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny	Kind	Quigley	McClintock	Reichert	Stivers	DelBene	King (NY)	Quigley
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Rangel	McHenry	Renacci	Stutzman	Dent	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
DeGette	Kuster	Rice (NY)	McKinley	Ribble	Thompson (PA)	DeSaulnier	Kuster	Reichert
Delaney	Langevin	Richmond	McMorris	Rice (SC)	Thornberry	Deutch	Lance	Rice (NY)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	Rodgers	Rigell	Tiberi	Dingell	Langevin	Richmond
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Ruiz	McSally	Roby	Tipton	Doggett	Roybal-Allard	Ruiz
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rush	Meadows	Roe (TN)	Trott	Dold	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Deutch	Lee	Ryan (OH)	Meahan	Rogers (AL)	Turner	Doyle, Michael	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Levin	Sánchez, Linda	Messer	Rogers (KY)	Upton	F.	Lee	Rush
Doggett	Lewis	T.	Mica	Rohrabacher	Valadao	Duckworth	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez, Loretta	Miller (FL)	Rokita	Wagner	Edwards	Lewis	Sánchez, Linda
F.	Lipinski	T.	Miller (MI)	Rooney (FL)	Walberg	Ellison	Lieu, Ted	T.
Duckworth	Lipinski	Sarbanes	Moolenaar	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden	Engel	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Edwards	Loebach	Schakowsky	Mooney (WV)	Roskam	Walker	Eshoo	LoBiondo	Sarbanes
Ellison	Lofgren	Schiff	Mullin	Ross	Walorski	Esty	Loebach	Schakowsky
Engel	Lowey	Schrader	Mulvaney	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi	Farr	Lofgren	Schiff
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)	Rouzer	Weber (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Esty	(NM)	Scott, David	Neugebauer	Royce	Webster (FL)	Fortenberry	Lowey	Scott, David
Farr	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano	Newhouse	Ruppersberger	Wenstrup	Foster	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Foster	(NM)	Sewell (AL)	Noem	Russell	Westerman	Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Sherman	Nugent	Salmon	Westmoreland	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Fudge	Maloney,	Sinema	Nunes	Sanford	Whitfield	Gabbard	(NM)	Sinema
Gabbard	Carolyn	Sires	Olson	Scalise	Williams	Gallego	Lynch	Sires
Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter	Palazzo	Schweikert	Williams (SC)	Garamendi	Maloney,	Slaughter
Garamendi	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Palmer	Scott, Austin	Wittman	Gibson	Carolyn	Smith (NJ)
Graham	McCollum	Speier	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Womack	Graham	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Grayson	McDermott	Swailwell (CA)	Perry	Sessions	Woodall	Grayson	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Green, Al	McGovern	Takano	Peterson	Shimkus	Yoder	Green, Al	McCollum	Speier
Green, Gene	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Pittenger	Shuster	Yoho	Green, Gene	McDermott	Stefanik
Grijalva	Meeks	Thompson (MS)	Pitts	Simpson	Young (AK)	Grijalva	McGovern	Swailwell (CA)
Gutiérrez	Meng	Titus	Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)	Guinta	McNerney	Takano
Hahn	Moore	Tonko	Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)	Gutiérrez	Meehan	Thompson (CA)
Heck (WA)	Moulton	Torres	Posey	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin	Hahn	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas	Price, Tom	Smith (TX)	Zinke	Hanna	Meng	Titus
Himes	Nadler	Van Hollen				Heck (WA)	Moore	Tonko
Hinojosa	Napolitano	Vargas				Higgins	Moulton	Torres
Honda	Neal	Veasey	Hastings	Poe (TX)		Himes	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas
Hoyer	Nolan	Vela	Pearce	Takai		Hinojosa	Nadler	Upton
Huffman	Norcross	Velázquez				Honda	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Israel	O'Rourke	Visclosky				Hoyer	Neal	Vargas
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Walz				Huffman	Nolan	Veasey
Jeffries	Pascrell	Wasserman				Israel	Norcross	Vela
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Schultz				Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Velázquez
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine				Jeffries	Pallone	Visclosky
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman				Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Walz
Keating	Peters	Welch				Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen	Wasserman
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Wilson (FL)				Kaptur	Payne	Schultz
Kennedy	Pocan	Yarmuth				Katko	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine
						Keating	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman
						Kelly (IL)	Peters	Welch
						Kennedy	Pingree	Wilson (FL)
						Kildee	Pocan	Yarmuth

## NOES—248

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

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

□ 1420

So the en bloc amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 225, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

AYES—202

Adams	Bustos	Clyburn
Aguiar	Butterfield	Cohen
Ashford	Capps	Connolly
Bass	Capuano	Conyers
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cooper
Becerra	Carney	Costa
Bera	Carson (IN)	Costello (PA)
Beyer	Cartwright	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Crowley
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Cummings
Boyle, Brendan	Ciциline	Curbelo (FL)
F.	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny
Brown (FL)	Clay	DeFazio
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeGette

## NOES—225

Abraham	Crenshaw	Hill
Aderholt	Culberson	Holding
Allen	Davidson	Hudson
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)
Amodei	Denham	Hultgren
Babin	DeSantis	Hunter
Barletta	DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hurd (VA)
Barton	Donovan	Issa
Benishkek	Duffy	Jenkins (KS)
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson, Sam
Black	Emmer (MN)	Jolly
Blackburn	Farenthold	Jones
Blum	Fincher	Jordan
Bost	Fleischmann	Joyce
Boustany	Fleming	Kelly (MS)
Brady (TX)	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Brat	Forbes	King (IA)
Bridenstine	Foxx	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Buchanan	Garrett	Labrador
Buck	Gibbs	LaHood
Bucshon	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Burgess	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Byrne	Gosar	Latta
Calvert	Gowdy	Long
Carter (GA)	Granger	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Love
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Chaffetz	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Clawson (FL)	Grothman	Lummis
Coffman	Guthrie	MacArthur
Cole	Hardy	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Harper	Marino
Collins (NY)	Harris	Massie
Comstock	Hartzler	McCarthy
Conaway	Heck (NV)	McCaul
Cook	Hensarling	McClintock
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	McHenry
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley

McMorris	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)	Grothman	Massie	Rush	Newhouse	Roskam	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rigell	Thornberry	Guinta	McCarthy	Russell	Noem	Ross	Tiberi
McSally	Roby	Tiberi	Guthrie	McCaul	Salmon	Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Tipton
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Tipton	Hardy	McClintock	Sanford	Norcross	Ruiz	Titus
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Trott	Harris	McHenry	Scalise	Nugent	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Turner	Hartzler	McMorris	Schweikert	Nunes	Ryan (OH)	Torres
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Valadao	Hensarling	Rodgers	Scott, Austin	O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Wagner	Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Sensenbrenner	Pallone	T.	Turner
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Walberg	Hill	Meadows	Sessions	Pascrell	Sanchez, Loretta	Valadao
Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden	Holding	Messer	Shimkus	Payne	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Mullin	Roskam	Walker	Hudson	Mica	Shuster	Pelosi	Schakowsky	Vargas
Mulvaney	Ross	Walorski	Huelskamp	Miller (FL)	Smith (MO)	Perlmutter	Schiff	Veasey
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Peters	Schrader	Vela
Neugebauer	Rouzer	Weber (TX)	Hultgren	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)	Peterson	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Newhouse	Royce	Webster (FL)	Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)	Pingree	Scott, David	Visclosky
Noem	Russell	Wenstrup	Hurd (TX)	Mullin	Stewart	Pocan	Serrano	Walden
Nugent	Salmon	Westerman	Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Polis	Sewell (AL)	Walz
Nunes	Sanford	Westmoreland	Issa	Murphy (PA)	Trott	Price (NC)	Sherman	Wasserman
Olson	Scalise	Whitfield	Jenkins (KS)	Neugebauer	Olson	Quigley	Simpson	Schultz
Palazzo	Schrader	Williams	Johnson (OH)	Olson	Palazzo	Rangel	Sinema	Waters, Maxine
Palmer	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Palmer	Ratcliffe	Sires	Watson Coleman
Perry	Scott, Austin	Wittman	Jones	Paulsen	Perry	Reed	Slaughter	Welch
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Womack	Jordan	Kelly (MS)	Pittenger	Reichert	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Pittenger	Sessions	Woodall	Kelly (MS)	King (IA)	Pitts	Renacci	Speier	Whitfield
Pitts	Shimkus	Yoder	Kline	Knight	Poliquin	Rice (NY)	Stefanik	Wilson (FL)
Poliquin	Shuster	Yoho	Labrador	Poliquin	Pompeo	Richmond	Stivers	Womack
Pompeo	Simpson	Young (AK)	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Posey	Rigell	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Posey	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)	Lamborn	Price, Tom	Rice (SC)	Roby	Takano	Young (AK)
Price, Tom	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)	Lance	Ribble	Roe (TN)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (CA)	Zinke
Ratcliffe	Smith (TX)	Zeldin	LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Rogers (AL)	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (MS)	
Reed	Stewart		Long	Roe (TN)	Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)	
Renacci	Stivers		Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Rokita			
Ribble	Stutzman		Love	Rohrabacher	Rothfus			
			Lucas	Rouzer	Young (IA)			
			Luetkemeyer	Royce	Young (IN)			
			Lummis		Zeldin			
			Marchant					

## NOT VOTING—6

Graves (LA)	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Hastings	Pearce	Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1423

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

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MRS.  
BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs.  
BLACKBURN) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 171, noes 258,  
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

## AYES—171

Abraham	Bucshon	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Byrne	Farenthold
Babin	Carter (GA)	Fincher
Barr	Chabot	Fleming
Barton	Chaffetz	Flores
Bilirakis	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	Fox
Black	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Comstock	Garrett
Blum	Conaway	Gibbs
Boustany	Cook	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Cooper	Goodlatte
Brat	Crawford	Gosar
Bridenstine	Culberson	Goody
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buck	Duffy	Griffith

## NOES—258

Adams	DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)
Aderholt	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Aguilar	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Amodei	DeLauro	Jolly
Ashford	DelBene	Joyce
Barletta	Denham	Kaptur
Bass	Dent	Katko
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Keating
Becerra	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Bera	Dingell	Kennedy
Beyer	Doggett	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Kilmer
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	King (NY)
Bonamici	F.	Kinzing (IL)
Bost	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Kuster
F.	Ellison	LaHood
Brady (PA)	Ellmers (NC)	Langevin
Brown (FL)	Emmer (MN)	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Bustos	Eshoo	Latta
Butterfield	Esty	Lawrence
Calvert	Farr	Lee
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Levin
Capuano	Fleischmann	Lewis
Cárdenas	Fortenberry	Lieu, Ted
Carney	Foster	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Loeb
Carter (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Loftgren
Cartwright	Fudge	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lowey
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Lujan Grisham
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	(NM)
Cicilline	Gibson	Luján, Ben Ray
Clark (MA)	Graham	(NM)
Clarke (NY)	Granger	Lynch
Clay	Grayson	MacArthur
Cleaver	Green, Al	Maloney,
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Carolyn
Cohen	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cole	Gutiérrez	Marino
Collins (NY)	Hahn	Matsui
Connolly	Hanna	McCollum
Conyers	Harper	McDermott
Costa	Heck (NV)	McGovern
Costello (PA)	Heck (WA)	McKinley
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	McNerney
Cramer	Higgins	Meehan
Crenshaw	Himes	Meeks
Crowley	Hinojosa	Meng
Cuellar	Honda	Moore
Cummings	Hoyer	Moulton
Curbelo (FL)	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Davis (CA)	Israel	Nadler
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Neal

## NOT VOTING—4

Hastings	Poe (TX)
Pearce	Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1427

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I  
move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;  
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs.  
WAGNER) having assumed the chair,  
Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Com-  
mittee of the Whole House on the state  
of the Union, reported that that Com-  
mittee, having had under consideration  
the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropri-  
ations for the Department of the Inter-  
ior, environment, and related agencies  
for the fiscal year ending September 30,  
2017, and for other purposes, had come  
to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-  
ant 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 822; and adoption of  
House Resolution 822, if ordered.

All electronic votes will be conducted  
as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 764, NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 304, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WHISTLEBLOWER ACT; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 822) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 183, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—245

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

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

NAYS—183

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

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Poe (TX)	Vela
Pearce	Takai	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1435

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ELECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 826

*Resolved*, That Philip George Kiko of the State of Ohio, be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, effective August 1, 2016.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Will the Chief Administrative Officer-designate please take the well.

The Chair will now administer the oath of office to the Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Kiko appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, Mr. Kiko.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker 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. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—242

Abraham	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Aderholt	Buck	Culberson
Allen	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Amodei	Burgess	Davidson
Babin	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barletta	Calvert	Denham
Barr	Carter (GA)	Dent
Barton	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Benishek	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Donovan
Black	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Boustany	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Brady (TX)	Cook	Farenthold
Brat	Costello (PA)	Fincher
Bridenstine	Cramer	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Crawford	Fleischmann

Fleming	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Flores	Lance	Rohrabacher
Forbes	Latta	Rokita
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rooney (FL)
Fox	Long	Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ)	Loudermilk	Roskam
Frelinghuysen	Love	Ross
Garrett	Lucas	Rothfus
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer
Gibson	Lummis	Royce
Gohmert	Lynch	Russell
Goodlatte	MacArthur	Salmon
Gosar	Marchant	Sanford
Gowdy	Marino	Scalise
Granger	Massie	Schweikert
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Scott, Austin
Graves (LA)	McCauley	Sensenbrenner
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Sessions
Griffith	McHenry	Shinkus
Grothman	McKinley	Shuster
Guinta	McMorris	Simpson
Guthrie	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Hanna	McSally	Smith (NJ)
Hardy	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Harper	Meehan	Stefanik
Harris	Messer	Stewart
Hartzler	Mica	Stivers
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Herrera Beutler	Moore (NV)	Thornberry
Hice, Jody B.	Mullin	Tiberi
Hill	Mulvaney	Tipton
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Trott
Hudson	Neugebauer	Turner
Huelskamp	Newhouse	Upton
Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Valadao
Hultgren	Nugent	Wagner
Hunter	Nunes	Walberg
Hurd (TX)	Olson	Walden
Hurt (VA)	Palazzo	Walker
Issa	Palmer	Walorski
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Walters, Mimi
Jenkins (WV)	Perry	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Pittenger	Webster (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Wenstrup
Jolly	Poliquin	Westerman
Jones	Pompeo	Westmoreland
Jordan	Posey	Whitfield
Joyce	Price, Tom	Williams
Katko	Ratchcliffe	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (MS)	Reed	Wittman
Kelly (PA)	Reichert	Womack
King (IA)	Renacci	Woodall
King (NY)	Ribble	Yoder
Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)	Yoho
Kline	Rigell	Young (AK)
Knight	Roby	Young (IA)
Labrador	Roe (TN)	Young (IN)
LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin
LaMalfa		Zinke

## NOES—185

Adams	Conyers	Grijalva
Aguilar	Cooper	Gutiérrez
Amash	Costa	Hahn
Ashford	Courtney	Heck (WA)
Bass	Crowley	Higgins
Beatty	Cuellar	Himes
Becerra	Cummings	Hinojosa
Bera	Davis (CA)	Honda
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Huffman
Blumenauer	DeGette	Israel
Bonamici	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Boyle, Brendan	DeLauro	Jeffries
F.	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks (AL)	Deutch	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Kennedy
Bustos	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Butterfield	F.	Kilmer
Capps	Duckworth	Kind
Capuano	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kuster
Carney	Engel	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Esty	Larsen (CT)
Castor (FL)	Farr	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Foster	Lee
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Ciçilline	Fudge	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Gabbard	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Gallego	Lipinski
Clay	Garamendi	Loeb
Cleaver	Graham	Loeb
Clyburn	Grayson	Lowen
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Connolly	Green, Gene	Lowey

Lujan Grisham	Peters	Sires
(NM)	Peterson	Slaughter
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pingree	Smith (WA)
(NM)	Pocan	Speier
Maloney,	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
Carolyn	Price (NC)	Takano
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Rice (NY)	Titus
McDermott	Richmond	Tonko
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McNerney	Ruiz	Tsongas
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Meng	Rush	Vargas
Moore	Ryan (OH)	Veasey
Moulton	Sánchez, Linda	Vela
Murphy (FL)	T.	Velázquez
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Walz
Neal	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Nolan	Schiff	Schultz
Norcross	Schrader	Waters, Maxine
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Pallone	Scott, David	Welch
Pascarella	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Pelosi	Sherman	
Perlmutter	Sinema	

## NOT VOTING—6

Hastings	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Kelly (IL)	Poe (TX)	Takai

□ 1443

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.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 440, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1445

## CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 822, I call up the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 822, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-61 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 304

*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 "Conscience Protection Act of 2016".*

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*Congress finds as follows:*

(1) Thomas Jefferson stated a conviction common to our Nation's founders when he declared in 1809 that "[n]o provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of the civil authority".

(2) In 1973, the Supreme Court concluded that the government must leave the abortion decision "to the medical judgment of the pregnant woman's attending physician", recognizing that a physician may choose not to participate in abor-

tion. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 164 (1973). The Court cited with approval a policy that "neither physician, hospital, nor hospital personnel shall be required to perform any act violative of personally-held moral principles", 410 U.S. at 143 n. 38, and cited State laws upholding this principle. *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179, 197-8 (1973).

(3) Congress's enactments to protect this right of conscience in health care include the Church amendment of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 300a-7), the Coats/Snowe amendment of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 238n), and the Weldon amendment approved by Congresses and Presidents of both parties every year since 2004.

(4) None of these laws explicitly provides a "private right of action" so victims of discrimination can defend their conscience rights in court, and administrative enforcement by the Department of Health and Human Services Office for Civil Rights has been lax, at times allowing cases to languish for years without resolution.

(5) Defying the Federal Weldon amendment, California's Department of Managed Health Care has mandated coverage for all elective abortions in all health plans under its jurisdiction. Other States such as New York and Washington have taken or considered similar action, and some States may go farther to require all physicians and hospitals to provide or facilitate abortions. On June 21, 2016, the Administration concluded a nearly two-year investigation of this matter by determining that California's decision to require insurance plans under the California Department for Managed Health Care authority to cover all legal abortion services did not violate the Weldon amendment. This interpretation means that individuals will have to choose between ignoring their conscience or forgoing health care coverage.

(6) The vast majority of medical professionals do not perform abortions, with 86 percent of ob/gyns unwilling to provide them in a recent study (*Obstetrics & Gynecology*, Sept. 2011) and the great majority of hospitals choosing to do so in rare cases or not at all.

(7) A health care provider's decision not to participate in an abortion, like Congress's decision not to fund most abortions, erects no new barrier to those seeking to perform or undergo abortions but leaves each party free to act as he or she wishes.

(8) Such protection poses no conflict with other Federal laws, such as the law requiring emergency stabilizing treatment for a pregnant woman and her unborn child when either is in distress (*Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act*). As the Obama administration has said, these areas of law have operated side by side for many years and both should be fully enforced (76 *Federal Register* 9968-77 (2011) at 9973).

(9) Reaffirming longstanding Federal policy on conscience rights and providing a right of action in cases where it is violated allows longstanding and widely supported Federal laws to work as intended.

## SEC. 3. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PROVIDERS OF HEALTH SERVICES THAT ARE NOT INVOLVED IN ABORTION.

Title II of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 245 the following:

## "SEC. 245A. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PROVIDERS OF HEALTH SERVICES THAT ARE NOT INVOLVED IN ABORTION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Federal Government, and any State or local government that receives Federal financial assistance, may not penalize, retaliate against, or otherwise discriminate against a health care provider on the basis that the provider does not—

"(1) perform, refer for, pay for, or otherwise participate in abortion;

"(2) provide or sponsor abortion coverage; or

“(3) facilitate or make arrangements for any of the activities specified in this subsection.

“(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to prevent any health care provider from voluntarily electing to participate in abortions or abortion referrals;

“(2) to prevent any health care provider from voluntarily electing to provide or sponsor abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion;

“(3) to prevent an accrediting agency, the Federal government, or a State or local government from establishing standards of medical competency applicable only to those who have knowingly, voluntarily, and specifically elected to perform abortions, or from enforcing contractual obligations applicable only to those who, as part of such contract, knowingly, voluntarily, and specifically elect to provide abortions;

“(4) to affect, or be affected by, section 1867 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd, commonly referred to as the ‘Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act’); or

“(5) to supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating insurance, except as specified in subsection (a).

“(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall designate the Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services—

“(1) to receive complaints alleging a violation of this section, section 245 of this Act, or any of subsections (b) through (e) of section 401 of the Health Programs Extension Act of 1973; and

“(2) to pursue the investigation of such complaints in coordination with the Attorney General.

“(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

“(1) **FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—The term ‘Federal financial assistance’ means Federal payments to cover the cost of health care services or benefits, or other Federal payments, grants, or loans to promote or otherwise facilitate health-related activities.

“(2) **HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.**—The term ‘health care provider’ means—

“(A) an individual physician, nurse, or other health care professional;

“(B) a hospital, health system, or other health care facility or organization (including a party to a proposed merger or other collaborative arrangement relating to health services, and an entity resulting therefrom);

“(C) a provider-sponsored organization, an accountable care organization, or a health maintenance organization;

“(D) a social services provider that provides or authorizes referrals for health care services;

“(E) a program of training in the health professions or an applicant to or participant in such a program;

“(F) an issuer of health insurance coverage; or

“(G) a group health plan or student health plan, or a sponsor or administrator thereof.

“(3) **STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT RECEIVES FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—The term ‘State or local government that receives Federal financial assistance’ includes every agency and other governmental unit and subdivision of a State or local government, if such State or local government, or any agency or governmental unit or subdivision thereof, receives Federal financial assistance.

**“SEC. 245B. CIVIL ACTION FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A qualified party may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate relief with regard to a designated violation.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

“(1) **QUALIFIED PARTY.**—The term ‘qualified party’ means—

“(A) the Attorney General of the United States; or

“(B) any person or entity adversely affected by the designated violation.

“(2) **DESIGNATED VIOLATION.**—The term ‘designated violation’ means an actual or threatened violation of—

“(A) section 245 or 245A of this Act; or

“(B) any of subsections (b) through (e) of section 401 of the Health Programs Extension Act of 1973 regarding an objection to abortion.

“(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES NOT REQUIRED.**—An action under this section may be commenced, and relief may be granted, without regard to whether the party commencing the action has sought or exhausted available administrative remedies.

“(d) **DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS UNDER THIS SECTION MAY INCLUDE GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AS WELL AS OTHERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An action under this section may be maintained against, among others, a party that is a Federal or State governmental entity. Relief in an action under this section may include money damages even if the defendant is such a governmental entity.

“(2) **DEFINITION.**—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State governmental entity’ means a State, a local government within a State, and any agency or other governmental unit or subdivision of a State or of such a local government.

“(e) **NATURE OF RELIEF.**—In an action under this section, the court shall grant—

“(1) all necessary equitable and legal relief, including, where appropriate, declaratory relief and compensatory damages, to prevent the occurrence, continuance, or repetition of the designated violation and to compensate for losses resulting from the designated violation; and

“(2) to a prevailing plaintiff, reasonable attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses as part of the costs.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on S. 304 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam 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 S. 304.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Congress has a long history of providing strong, bipartisan conscience and freedom protections consistent with our founding principles and the Constitution. It is about fairness. It is a cornerstone of our Constitution, which is built upon individual rights and liberties.

Look no further than the Clinton administration to find evidence of unity when it comes to conscience exemptions. President Clinton built conscience protections into managed care plans for Medicaid and Medicare regarding referrals. In 1977, as part of the Balanced Budget Act, almost identical conscience protections were applied to Medicare Choice Plans. The conference report that included these exemptions was widely supported by Democratic lawmakers like now-Vice President BIDEN, now-Secretary of State Kerry, and Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI, to name a few.

In 1998 and again in 1999, the Clinton administration took the initiative to add two separate conscience protections to the Federal employees health benefit program. Many of these protections have been renewed annually by Presidents Clinton and Bush and, yes, by President Obama.

One of these protections is the Weldon amendment, a longstanding conscience safeguard in appropriations law. This protection provides that States and localities receiving Federal funds may not discriminate against a healthcare entity on the basis that they do not “provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.”

Troublingly, those encountering discrimination cannot even look to the Office for Civil Rights for help. The Office for Civil Rights within HHS recently reinterpreted existing law to find a California mandate directing all health insurers to remove coverage exclusions and limitations for elective abortions to be consistent with the Weldon amendment.

Americans should not have to rely on the whim of attorneys at HHS to be protected from discrimination. This is why we are here today—to discuss fairness, to protect Americans’ rights.

Here is what the Conscience Protection Act does:

First, the bill reaffirms the protections that are found in the Weldon amendment;

Second, the bill gives discriminated individuals and entities their day in court through a private right of action; and

Third, the bill clarifies that nothing—nothing—in the legislation prevents providers from voluntarily electing to participate in abortion or makes changes to the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act.

The simple intent of this bill is to stop the government from unfairly coercing individuals and entities to provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.

Consider the examples of churches in California—like Skyline Church in La Mesa and Faith Baptist Church in Santa Barbara—that are currently being forced by the State to cover all legal abortion in their healthcare plans.

Or the case of a New York nurse, Cathy DeCarlo, who was forced to take part in a dismemberment of 22-week-

old unborn child. Cathy literally had to count the pieces of the unborn child, against her objection to abortion. Her lawsuit was dismissed because the conscience law lacks a private right of action.

Madam Speaker, this is why we need the Conscience Protection Act: for Foothill Church in Glendora; for Alpine Christian Fellowship in El Cajon; for the 12 New Jersey nurses who stood up to their employer for requiring them to train for and participate in abortion; and for Cathy DeCarlo, who deserves her day in court. This is why we need this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this bill, which is really nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is being touted as just simply a conscience clause, but, in fact, it strips away patient protections; it gives employers and healthcare companies the right to override a woman's reproductive healthcare decision; it vastly expands already damaging existing laws that restrict women's abilities to get full insurance coverage; and, just to add, it would clog the courts because it would create private rights of action for healthcare entities to enforce the law.

Now, existing so-called conscience provisions are bad enough, but what they apply to is existing healthcare entities. What this bill would do is something that has never been done before. It would allow employers and others to exercise this right; it would require OCR and DOJ to investigate claims of discrimination; and it would expand the definition of healthcare entities. All of this would just simply interfere with a woman's ability to get accurate information about treatment options and could lead to her being deprived of timely emergency care.

There is already plenty of evidence that current conscience provisions jeopardize women's health and safety. They create confusion about whether healthcare providers are required to offer critical care in emergency situations.

I have heard some heart-wrenching stories about what happened to the women. Let me just tell you one of them. Tamesha Means of Muskegon, Michigan, was only 18 weeks pregnant when her water broke. The nearest hospital, Mercy Health Partners, didn't pursue the normal course of treatment, inducing labor for a pregnancy that wasn't viable, in order to avoid risky complications. Instead, what they did is they gave her painkillers and they sent her home. Over the next 2 days, Tamesha returned to the hospital twice, bleeding and in severe pain, running a high fever, only to get more or less the same response. They were completing the papers to send her home a third time—a third time—when she started to deliver a very premature infant, dead within hours.

Madam Speaker, we would likely see much more needless suffering and endangerment if the bill before us were to pass. It would let employers who sponsor health plans deny their female employees access to medical services to which the employer objects. It would reinforce existing provisions that let health providers opt out of providing such services or even informing people about them.

With all of this in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bad legislation. Every patient should be able to make meaningful, informed decisions about their health care. Congress needs to stop interfering in women's health decisions once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I think we can all agree that in this country no one should be forced to perform an abortion.

Look, I know we disagree about when life begins; I know we disagree about what government should do about it; and, however strongly I hold my beliefs, I also know my friends on the other side of the issue feel just as strongly. I respect those disagreements. But whoever you are, whatever you believe, I think this is one thing that we all should agree on: no one should be forced to violate their conscience, least of all by the Federal Government. That is all this bill says.

The Federal Government, or anyone who receives taxpayer dollars, cannot discriminate against healthcare providers who do not perform abortions; and if they do discriminate, this bill says that the victims will have two avenues of relief: either file a complaint with the Department of Health and Human Services, or file a civil suit in court. That is it. That is what this bill does.

Now, opponents say that this kind of thing just doesn't ever happen, nobody in their right mind would force someone against their will to help with an abortion. Well, tell that to Cathy DeCarlo. She was a nurse at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. A few years ago, she was forced to help with an abortion.

Madam Speaker, this is not an isolated incident. There have been cases of nurses being suspended or threatened with firing solely for the offense of following their conscience.

And now the State of California requires all health insurance plans to cover abortion. So if you are a church or if you are a religious school, it doesn't matter, you must cover this procedure; and if it violates your conscience, too bad. This is a disturbing trend.

What is more disturbing is that the Federal Government has not been pro-

tecting people's rights. There are already laws on the books to protect people's conscience rights. But after Cathy DeCarlo filed a complaint to HHS, she waited 3 years for a resolution; and when she filed a lawsuit, an appeals court said she didn't even have standing and threw out her case.

That is why this bill makes it perfectly clear. People of faith have standing, and they deserve relief.

This bill does not ban or restrict abortion in any way. This bill does not change any medical standards or contracts. It does not change any laws regarding emergency treatment. All it does is protect a person's conscience.

Allowing this trend to continue, if we keep going down this path in this country, we will only erode our First Amendment rights further. It will continue to push people of faith into the sidelines of society. That is not the kind of country we want to live in, not any of us.

There is nothing more fulfilling than living out your faith, and we want all people of all faiths to live freely in our country. But we can live out our faith only if our government respects our faith. That is why we need to pass this bill.

I want to thank Congressman JOHN FLEMING and I want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for their outstanding work on this. JOHN and DIANE have done the Lord's work on defending people's conscience rights. It is the First Amendment of the Constitution, and it is under assault. This is something that keeps us free. This is something that makes us uniquely American. This is something that says men and women of conscience have rights that must be protected. And when our own government tramples upon and throws under the bus those rights, we have to act. That is why we are here today. They have been out front on this issue constantly leading this charge, and I am thankful for these warriors.

I have got to say to my colleagues, this is something that everyone should be in favor of, because if you believe in free speech, if you believe in freedom of religion, then you believe in freedom of conscience, then you believe in all of the First Amendment. That is why I ask each and every one of my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1500

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let's talk about conscience and whose conscience should prevail in a decision about what a woman does with her body and who makes that decision.

Is it the conscience of an insurance company?

That is already in the law.

Is it the conscience of her boss who makes the decision?

Clearly, it is not the consciences of American women in this piece of legislation. The bottom line is it sounds to

me like it is the conscience of Republican politicians who want to tell the women of America what they can do with their bodies.

Let's be very clear. Right now, current law says that hospitals, insurers, and doctors may refuse to perform an abortion or to provide coverage for abortion, which already greatly limits women's access to legal procedures. This bill would further extend the dangerous law by allowing health plan sponsors—that means employers—to deny female employees access to legal medical services because the boss has a moral objection to it, not the woman who is making the most personal of decisions here.

Women and their doctors, not their bosses, should be making medical decisions, and no outsider should be able to decide something as important as the size or the timing of having a family; and a woman's access to reproductive health should not be dependent on where she works or on where she goes to school.

Even more importantly, when a woman's health is in danger, providers would not be required to act to protect the health of that mother. This bill would allow them—and this is in the new language—to refuse to facilitate or to make arrangements for an abortion if they have a moral objection to it. For example, a Catholic hospital could force a doctor to withhold information about a patient's medical condition or options if that information might facilitate a woman's obtaining an abortion. It could also refuse to provide transportation to another hospital for a woman who is in distress if that hospital provides abortions.

This takes away a woman's right of conscience, and we should be voting "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Congressman JOHN FLEMING, and I want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK.

Before we come here as Members of Congress, we have occupations. JOHN FLEMING happens to be a doctor. DIANE BLACK started out as a nurse and is still a nurse. Her decades of experience, especially on this issue, are what have driven her in her work to make it here today.

Madam Speaker, I want to be explicitly clear so as to remove any confusion about what this legislation is and why we are voting on it today. This bill is not about abortion. Now, I am profoundly pro-life, and I don't hide it, but this bill isn't about that. It is about respecting people with different opinions and letting them live their lives without having the fear of punishment.

I am not asking people to change their closely held beliefs today. After all, every law on the books that has

governed abortion before this bill will remain exactly the same after this bill is passed. The message is more fundamental: don't force those who are deeply and morally opposed to something to fund it, support it, or perform it.

We all know America is unlike any other place. In America, we have Amish farmers, modern artists, stock market analysts, teachers, oil rig workers. We have the left and the right—Republican and Democrat—and every single one is just as American as the other. It is not easy to make this crazy experiment called "America" work, but we do because we respect that people may live in ways by which we don't approve and have opinions that we can't stand, and they are still our neighbors. This mutual respect is the lifeblood of a free society.

There are millions of people in this country—a majority, in fact—who are pro-life. That belief is intimately tied to our love of others and to our respect for human dignity; but many pro-life Americans face a choice no person should face.

Do they violate their consciences or violate the law? Do they do something they think is wrong, or do they lose their jobs?

A nurse in New York was told she had to participate in an abortion even though she objected. Her supervisor told her, if she didn't, she could be fired and could even lose her nursing license.

In my home State of California, a mandate forces pro-life individuals and churches to pay for insurance plans that cover the procedure even if doing so violates their deeply held beliefs. That mandate flies directly in the face of the Weldon amendment, which protects conscience rights—something of which this Congress has approved time and again for decades.

This mandate was challenged at the Department of Health and Human Services. It rejected the complaint. So I met with Secretary Burwell and with many of our colleagues to ask how this could happen.

How could a State force people to violate their beliefs?

I will tell you that I and the Members who were there still don't have an answer to our question.

But, Madam Speaker, why is this even a debate? Why would this administration want to force someone to violate his conscience?

As President Obama, himself, said early on in his Presidency, "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

Voting for this bill isn't voting against abortion. It is voting against compulsion. It is voting to reaffirm that mutual respect is necessary for a free society, and only with that respect can America live in the liberty we have so long enjoyed.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the

distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, when will the Republicans' war on women end?

First, Republicans passed a bill to allow a woman's boss to decide whether she has access to contraceptives. Next, Republicans passed legislation to prevent a woman from choosing the medical provider that best meets her needs. Today, Republicans are bringing another bill to the House floor to limit a woman's right to make the best decision for herself and her family.

This bill is not about protecting the conscience rights of healthcare entities to not provide or to participate in abortions. Providers already have those protections under current law. Instead, this bill expands and makes permanent policies that attempt to limit a woman's access to her constitutionally protected right to safe and legal abortions. This bill allows the moral beliefs of an employer's to limit a woman's access to healthcare services. A woman, not her employer, should make decisions about her health. Her healthcare choices are none of her boss's business.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for women's health by opposing this harmful legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), one of the authors of this legislation and the primary sponsor. I thank her for the excellent job that she does on all of the pro-life issues that affect not only our State, but our country.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee, my colleague and my friend.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

This legislation would prevent governments from penalizing or in any way discriminating against a healthcare provider for its refusing to participate in an abortion. In doing so, it would codify an act, known as the Weldon amendment, which has been attached to the annual spending bill since 2004 with bipartisan support. Importantly, the bill would also take the law a step further in allowing for a civil right of action so that the victims of abortion discrimination would have their day in court.

Today, if you believe you have been discriminated against on the basis of refusing to be involved in an abortion, you appeal to the Obama administration's Department of Health and Human Services.

In the case of Cathy DeCarlo, a pro-life nurse from New York who was forced by her employer to assist in the abortion of a 22-week pre-born baby, it took HHS 3 years to close its investigation into her case.

In California, where the Department of Managed Health Care required all insurance plans in the State to offer the coverage of elective abortion, the HHS

took 2 years to determine that no violation of the law had occurred; this despite the fact that the churches and the Christian universities are now required to subsidize abortion through their insurance plans.

Congress must step in to clarify and to strengthen our laws so that the conscience rights of every American are protected, because, Madam Speaker, if we lose the right to live according to our own convictions, particularly on the matter as deeply affecting as abortion, we don't have much left, do we?

After all, it was Thomas Jefferson who reminded us: "No provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of civil authority."

President Obama, himself, echoed this statement in 2009, saying, "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion."

If my colleagues won't listen to the pleas of the pro-life Americans who are asking for the protection of these most basic rights, maybe they will listen to the words of their own President.

With this bill, I am not seeking to change anyone's mind on abortion; though I hope that one day I can. I am not asking my colleagues to rule anyone's abortion to be illegal; though every act of abortion absolutely breaks my heart. I am not asking my colleagues to withhold a dime from a single abortion provider; although I will continue to fight to stop the spending of my constituents' dollars to the industries that take human life.

Today I simply ask the Members of this body to allow the millions of Americans who believe as I do—in the sanctity of every human life—to abide by those beliefs without having them trampled upon by their own government. I urge a "yes" vote on this very compassionate, reasonable, and modest bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Conscience Protection Act.

Despite its name, this bill actually does the opposite. It would infringe upon the beliefs and values of women across this country, putting their bosses' wishes over their own. This is wrong. It is yet another attempt to play politics with women's health. A woman's ability to control when, how, or whether to have children is central to her conscience, to her health, to her well-being, to her economic stability; but this bill would consider a woman's wish to be secondary to that of her employer's.

Let me be personal for just a moment. I am the daughter of a minister. I grew up in a parsonage, and my father was a member of the clergy. I understand the importance of religion to

the lives of so many, including to me. My faith was always a large part of what motivated me as a nurse, as a public health person, and what motivates me now as a Member of Congress. Perhaps it is because of this that I cannot stand on the sidelines when some are trying to use religion as a justification for discrimination or to take away the decisionmaking powers and responsibilities of another.

□ 1515

Health care and the personal decisions a woman makes are not her boss' business. It is far past time to get employers out of the exam room.

We need to trust and value women and let them make their own personal health decisions with their healthcare providers, with their family, with their faith, not politicians.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING), the author of this legislation and the primary cosponsor.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the testimony from Honorable Dr. Dave Weldon, author of the Weldon amendment, on this very bill and a few letters I received from obstetricians and gynecologists from across the country.

STATEMENT BY THE HON. DAVE WELDON, MD,  
RETIRED FL-15

CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS,  
JULY 8, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. The stories shared today by the people around this table underscore the very reason I authored the Weldon amendment.

You can imagine my outrage to learn that this administration has gutted my amendment and is allowing ongoing discrimination in California.

Over a decade ago, I became aware of the Maryland NARAL Hospital Provider Project. This disturbing initiative was designed to force abortion into every hospital in Maryland.

In response to this and similar threats, I drafted my appropriations amendment. It is intended to bring a stop to the abortion industry crusade to force this gruesome procedure into every aspect of society.

Recognizing that the abortion lobby's relentless campaign knows no limits, we drafted the amendment to cover a wide universe of entities. Nurses, doctors, hospitals, even health plans themselves are covered entities under my amendment.

Covering individual health plans ensures that insurance companies that are ambivalent about abortion can still offer plans that exclude abortion to meet the needs of purchasers.

We never limited the protection to those with religious, moral or conscience objections. In fact, in my experience as a physician the majority of health professionals who claim to support Roe v Wade always say to me that they would never want to be affiliated with doing an abortion. They too would be protected if the administration would do their duty to enforce the law.

I authored this amendment to protect FREEDOM for people to provide health care free from abortion and FREEDOM for people to access health care and coverage free from the scourge of abortion.

FREEDOM for people like the pastors here today to purchase insurance plans that ex-

clude abortion—a freedom that existed just two years ago before California took the draconian step of mandating abortion in ALL plans under the authority of the California Department of Managed Health Care.

The origins of the directive are as insidious as the directive itself. When the abortion lobby found out that Catholic Universities in California did not cover abortion in their insurance plans, they sprang to action, initiating a meeting with the Department of Managed Health Care.

Less than a year later, the Department did the bidding of Planned Parenthood and the ACLU. They unilaterally inserted abortion into each and every insurance plan under their authority—even plans purchased by CHURCHES and Catholic Universities.

My amendment anticipated this very scenario by defining a health insurance plan as a protected health care entity. This allows an insurance company to offer multiple insurance plans—some with abortion coverage and some without to meet the conscience needs of their clients.

After the Department of Managed Health Care issued their directive, the plans excluding abortion were changed to include abortion. This is clear discrimination against the plan that excluded abortion, since such plan was no longer permitted to exist.

As I explained in my floor statement in 2004, "This is a continuation of the Hyde policy of conscience protection . . . The right of conscience is fundamental to our American freedoms. We should guarantee this freedom by protecting all health care providers from being forced to perform, refer or pay for elective abortions." Unfortunately, the current administration has even twisted this statement to suit their political agenda.

They take this reference to conscience protection and argue that it must mean that I meant to include a religious or moral test in my amendment. This is far from the truth.

There is no reasonable way to read my statement as an excuse to airdrop a religious or moral test into my amendment. The Hyde amendment stops ALL federal funding for elective abortion. Similarly, my amendment stops ALL discrimination against entities that do not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortion.

Both amendments protect conscience broadly by protecting the freedom of Americans to offer and access health care that does not include abortion. Neither limits its protections to cases where someone raises a religious or moral objection.

In the June 21, 2016 letter announcing their gutting of the Weldon amendment, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) also feebly attempted to twist several more of my comments in their effort to ignore the plain reading of the text.

One begins to wonder, what's next. How far will the abortion lobby and their allies in the administration go to force abortion into our health care system?

I am deeply concerned that this administration added words to my amendment where they do not exist and ignored other words clearly articulated in the text.

We simply can no longer rely on the administration to enforce the law and must offer a private right of action that allows the Weldon protections to be enforced by the Courts.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER,  
Charleston, WV, 12 July 16.

Representative JOHN FLEMING and Representative VICKY HARTZLER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I am writing in support of the

Conscience Protection Act, HR. 4828, that provides federal legal protection of conscience regarding abortion for those who care for pregnant women. My clinical experience spans 25 plus years of clinical care, research, publication, and instruction as a Board certified Obstetrician & Gynecologist and Maternal-Fetal Medicine specialist. I daily provide care for women and babies who have medically complicated, life-threatening, and uncommon/rare pregnancy complications. Further, as the originator of "perinatal hospice", I have cared for (and still do) dozens of women with babies who have terminal prenatal diagnoses who will die at, or shortly after, birth.

No one in my entire 25 plus years of clinical experience has ever been denied appropriate care because of the exercise of the rights of conscience in the provision of abortion. Women and babies may die in spite of our best medical efforts, but this unrelated to abortion availability or provision.

In my understanding of this new federal statute, conscience will now be formally and legally protected. There is no need for additional exceptions, or amendments, to this law as it is presently written.

I am more than happy to discuss this issue with either of you or with one of your colleagues.

Sincerely,

BYRON C. CALHOUN, MD,  
FACOG, FACS, FASAM,  
MBA,  
*Professor & Vice-Chair, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, West Virginia University-Charleston, Charleston, WV.*

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, TWIN CITIES CAMPUS, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH,

July 6, 2016.

Representatives JOHN FLEMING, MD and VICKY HARTZLER,  
*House of Representatives, Washington DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics/Gynecology and Maternal/Fetal Medicine with 36 years of experience in practice, teaching and research. During that time I have cared for hundreds of women and babies with life-threatening, complicated, and rare pregnancy conditions. In some of those situations mothers and babies have lost their lives despite undergoing the best available treatment including induced delivery at the margins of viability. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on the care of mothers and babies.

During my years of practice I have worked under informal and formal conscience rights protections that permit me to provide the best pregnancy care without being forced to perform abortions. I have read the Conscience Protection Act, H.R. 4828, and I agree with the federal formalization of these protections. In my years of practice I have never seen a woman denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in this regard. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am happy to discuss this with you or with your colleagues.

Sincerely,

STEVE CALVIN, MD  
*Clinical Associate Professor of Obstetrics/ Gynecology and Women's Health, Co-chair Program in*

*Human Rights and Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.*

ANTHONY P. LEVATINO, MD, JD,  
*Las Cruces, NM, July 7, 2016.*

DEAR REPS. FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I understand you are seeking congressional approval of the Conscience Protection Act (H.R. 4828), to prevent government discrimination against health care providers who do not practice abortion. I am writing in support of your efforts. I am a board-certified obstetrician gynecologist. I received my medical degree from Albany Medical College in 1976 and completed my OB-GYN residency training at Albany Medical Center in 1980. In my 36-year career, I have been privileged to practice obstetrics and gynecology in both private and university settings, serving as associate professor of OB-GYN at Albany Medical College, medical student director, and residency program director. I currently serve as Clinical Professor and Chair of Obstetrics & Gynecology at the Burrell College of Osteopathic Medicine. I have also dedicated many years to private practice and currently operate a solo gynecology practice in Las Cruces, NM. I would like to comment on the claim that government must require involvement in abortion in order to save women's lives, because of life threatening conditions that can and do arise in pregnancy. I can speak to this issue from experience. I no longer perform abortions, but during my first five years of private practice I performed approximately 1,200 abortions including over 100 second trimester Suction D&E procedures up to 24 weeks gestation.

At Albany Medical Center in the 1990s, I personally treated hundreds of women with life threatening conditions that can arise or worsen during the second and third trimester of pregnancy. In all of those cases, "terminating" the pregnancy—that is, delivering the child—can be life saving. In all such cases I treated, abortion was never a viable treatment option. By their nature, late-term abortion procedures require days of preparation of the cervix in order to be successful. Any attempt to perform an abortion in such cases—that is, to take the extra steps needed to ensure that the unborn child does not survive—entails undue and dangerous delay in providing appropriate, truly life-saving care for women.

As an illustration, a patient arrived at Albany Medical Center one night at 28 weeks gestation with severe pre-eclampsia or toxemia. Her blood pressure on admission was 220/160 and was so dangerously high that she was likely minutes or hours away from a major stroke. This case was managed successfully by rapidly stabilizing the patient's blood pressure, then "terminating" her pregnancy by Cesarean section. She and her baby did well. This is a typical case in the world of high-risk obstetrics. During my time at Albany Medical Center I managed hundreds of such cases by "terminating" pregnancies to save mother's lives. In all those hundreds of cases, the number of unborn children that I had to deliberately kill was zero.

Attempting to treat women with truly life-threatening conditions in the late 2nd and 3rd trimester with an abortion entails serious delay of care that is not appropriate in the vast majority of cases. I welcome your efforts to ensure that health professionals can provide optimal medical care for preg-

nant women, without having to fear outside legal pressure to perform abortions instead.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY LEVATINO, MD, JD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

*Chapel Hill, NC, July 13, 2016.*

Rep. JOHN FLEMING,  
Rep. VICKY HARTZLER,  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics and Gynecology with a subspecialty certification in Maternal-Fetal Medicine. I have over thirty-two years of experience in practice, teaching and research at a major academic health center. During my career I have cared for numerous women and babies with complications that increase the risk of maternal death. In some of these situations, both a mother and her baby have lost their lives. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on both those of us who provide perinatal care and on our patients.

My personal conscience directs me to provide the best of care to pregnant women and their unborn children and I am able to do so without performing abortions, as are several of my colleagues and a proportion of the residents we train each year. I have not seen a situation where an emergent or even urgent abortion was needed to prevent a maternal death. I am aware of, and have read, the Conscience Protection Act, and I am writing to provide my opinion that I support the formalization of these protections. No woman at UNC hospitals has ever been denied care due to her conscience or beliefs; nor does any physician ever feel obliged to direct or change the standard of care for any woman due to race, ethnicity, religion, or conscience. I see no need for any exceptions or amendments to the law as written.

I am available for question or comment or for further discussion on this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN THORP, MD,  
*Hugh McAllister Distinguished Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Professor, Maternal & Child Health, School of Public Health, Director, Women's Primary Healthcare.*

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, those words are inscribed in the Declaration of Independence among our inalienable rights, but the most important is life itself.

As a physician who has delivered hundreds of babies, a father of four and a grandfather of three, I think I know something about preborn life and about the beginning of life itself.

This is much more important than just our day-to-day work that we do here. So a decision in order for a healthcare worker or nonhealthcare worker to participate with an abortion, whether paying for it or actually performing it, is an immensely important debate that we should have here.

It is not just religious grounds, as what is suggested on the other side, but also moral grounds. You see, even an atheist can find it against his or her conscience to participate in any way with an abortion.

Now, the Conscience Protection Act, what is it, and why do we need it? Well, I would say, first of all, that it gives a private right of action to any American who disagrees with being required to pay insurance that would cover elective abortions. Certainly, a healthcare provider that may have to participate in any way—a physician, a nurse, anyone—should not be required to do that against his or her will. And it protects for that. It gives a private right of action.

Now, why do we need a private right of action? Because in the recent example, in California, Secretary Burwell has failed, has deliberately avoided enforcing the very law itself, the Weldon amendment, that has been in law for 12 years. She has failed to enforce that law. And, therefore, the people of California, millions of people, do not have an access to court. They can't complain. They can't do anything and get relief.

What this bill does is allow them to open that courtroom door and to get that relief and not be required any longer to participate with abortions, spending or otherwise.

Now, the other side might say: What is the need for this? Is anyone being harmed?

Of course, they are. You have heard of the DeCarlo case, where the nurse had to participate with putting dismembered body parts back together of a 22-week-old fetus. We have the nurses of Nassau University Medical Center. In 2010, nine of them were suspended for refusing to assist in abortions. And we have many, many other cases.

I would just say to you, in conclusion today, this is the land of the free. This is, again, life and the pursuit of happiness. Certainly, it is important that what we do here today, in passing this bill, that we protect the conscience rights—not just the religious rights but the moral rights—of our fellow citizens of America. We do the right thing, and we go on, and we work from there.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 304 because this Republican bill discriminates against women. In fact, it promotes discrimination by sanctioning interference with a woman's ability to make her own personal health decisions.

This bill, which was brought to the floor without any hearing in the Congress, is being done as the Republicans rush for the exits for summer recess tomorrow. It highlights the unfortunate inability of the Republican majority to focus on the issues that are affecting American families, like things to keep us safe, like keeping military-style weapons out of the hands of terrorists or dangerous people. They won't allow a debate or vote on that. Addressing the Flint, Michigan, water crisis, we haven't had a vote, a debate, or help for those families.

The emerging public health crisis of Zika. In my home State of Florida, we now are approaching 300 cases of Zika, including 43 pregnant women. What we know is birth defects and microcephaly are directly tied to the Zika virus. I hope that will weigh on everyone's conscience as the Republicans move toward adjournment without taking any action on the Zika virus.

There was a report yesterday:

Infectious-disease experts are shocked that Congress is about to leave town for the summer without doing anything to combat the Zika virus.

"In the almost 40 years I've been in this business, I've never seen anything like what's happening with Zika," said an adviser to four administrations.

Some infectious-disease experts said they're stunned by what's happened with Zika—months of waiting while the virus' reach, and its potential to cause widespread birth defects, in the U.S. has grown.

So, colleagues, I urge you to defeat this discriminatory bill and get back to the business of the American people, keeping them safe, like addressing the Zika virus, not attacking the constitutional rights of women and their ability to make their own healthcare decisions.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER). I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on life issues in this body.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in firm support of the Conscience Protection Act. The validity and timeliness of this legislation could not be more important in light of recent events in California in which religious employers are being forced to violate their beliefs by purchasing health coverage for their employees that includes elective abortion. And as stories surface, such as those you have heard about today of nurses being forced to participate in abortion procedures or else risk losing their job, the time to correct this injustice is now.

It is unthinkable that the government could and would force a person to act against their personally held beliefs, yet that is what is happening. In a speech in Notre Dame, in 2009, President Obama said: "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." But those words have rung hollow as his administration has sided with those who violate the First Amendment. It doesn't have to be like this.

The Conscience Protection Act addresses this discrimination. It gives legal protection to those who choose not to participate in abortions and upholds our most fundamental rights. There is no more noble goal.

The government should not be picking and choosing our beliefs. Those who have had this happen to them deserve their day in court. This bill will give them that day.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Conscience Protection Act and against coerced complicity in abortion.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for being such a strong voice on women's rights in this country.

Colleagues, yesterday, this body considered a bill that would codify discrimination against our Nation's LGBT community under the guise of religious freedom. Today, we are debating legislation that would similarly distort this country's sacred promise of religious liberty and use it as a vehicle to deny women access to health care.

Make no mistake, the ability to freely and fully practice your faith is a fundamental bedrock American liberty. But to ensure that liberty for all of us, our Constitution establishes a simple boundary. One person's sincerely held beliefs cannot trump another's. My freedoms and rights cannot be used to limit yours.

And in this country, access to abortion is a right, as our Justices have ruled time and again.

So let's be clear. This bill is not about protecting religious freedom of an employer or insurer. It is about imposing the religious views of a few on the healthcare choices of the many.

And this bill is not about protecting women's health. Instead, it will create dangerous, discriminatory barriers to access to care for women and their families.

Those who oppose abortion are free to exercise that belief fully in their personal lives. That is the promise that our country makes to each of us. But nowhere does this country promise that your government will be the vehicle through which your beliefs are imposed on someone else—your neighbor, your coworker, your employer, or your friend. Nowhere do we say that my faith is more legitimate than yours or that your religious principles outweigh my access to basic civil rights.

In fact, the Constitution expressly prohibits that sort of system in the very first words of the very First Amendment. Since those words were written, the ever-changing, often elusive balance between religious freedom and civil rights in this country has been fought for every single day throughout our history.

Passing this bill is an affront to those honest efforts and to the vast majority of Americans who value both their faith and their freedoms.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, we have all used this expression: "I can't do that in good conscience." But we really don't think deeply about what it means. So let me take a moment from the debate here and explore that question deeper.

Conscience is the sacred space of human dignity. Conscience is the place where, one, a person using the faculty of reason exercises their deeply held sincere beliefs to make a judgment in a

particular circumstance about what is right or wrong, what they ought to do or not to do.

When the government comes along and robs us of our right to exercise our conscience, the government contradicts the very principle of its existence, of its purpose. The government imposes a dictate and violates that sacred space, the good of the human person, and the good of community. That is unjust. That is not America. That is an exercise in power. That is an imposition of the few with power on the many who deserve protection from their government.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the so-called Conscience Protection Act. I proudly represent the 11th District of Illinois. And as someone who supports a woman's right to choose, I find it deeply disturbing that so many lawmakers today want to make healthcare access more difficult for women.

This legislation will be detrimental to women's health because it gives individuals and corporations a license to discriminate against women's reproductive choices.

I am also the only Ph.D. scientist in Congress. And as a scientist, I find it outrageous that this bill will give healthcare companies the right to deny accurate medical information to patients. This kind of legislation deliberately undercuts a woman's relationship to her doctor and has no place in the laws of our country.

It is designed to confuse and to muddy the responsibilities of the medical community, who have been trained to make the best possible decisions for the patients in their trust. It, therefore, prioritizes ideology above science and reason to the detriment of women throughout the country.

Every woman has the legal and constitutional right to make the healthcare decisions that are right for her and to receive scientifically correct advice from her healthcare providers.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary and dangerous legislation.

□ 1530

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding and for her leadership not only on this bill, but especially for her work as chair of the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives.

When we talk about this legislation, the Conscience Protection Act, I do want to also thank the author of the bill, DIANE BLACK, as well as Dr. JOHN FLEMING, who helped lead this effort to draft it, Chairman JOE PITTS, and CHRIS SMITH as well.

Madam Speaker, it is so important that we pass the Conscience Protection Act. If you look at our Bill of Rights, our Constitution, and the framework that gives people all across this country true religious freedom, we recognize now that religious freedom is under attack. You don't need to look any further than the State of California which passed a law that really was the genesis for bringing this bill forward, because under the California law, it literally started forcing people to perform abortions against their own faith.

We have heard about the story of Cathy DeCarlo, a nurse who was forced to participate in an abortion of a baby who was 22 weeks old at delivery. This should not happen in the United States of America. People should not be forced to violate their religious freedom, yet it is going on because this administration has not been enforcing the law. The Weldon amendment, which has been on the books since 2004, gives that very religious freedom protection that is now in jeopardy.

Madam Speaker, what we are doing with this bill is restoring the law, but we are doing two specific things:

First, we are making it very clear that this annual appropriations language becomes permanent. We shouldn't have to rely every year on re-establishing the law. Let's make this law permanent giving that religious freedom protection.

Second, we are no longer depending on HHS alone, which is not doing its job to enforce the law. We actually give people the ability to enforce the law themselves and let government work for them in protecting their religious freedoms.

It is critically important that we pass the Conscience Protection Act. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this bill and in so many other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Conscience Protection Act. It is, in fact, a bill that offends the conscience and threatens the health and security of women. This vindictive bill is yet another tactic to throw roadblocks between women and their constitutional right to choose their own form of reproductive health care.

Neither an employer nor an insurance company has the right to dictate a woman's healthcare choices. That is right. This bill permits insurance companies to deny certain coverage based on religious or moral grounds. This is merely another deliberate attempt to cut women off from safe, legal, comprehensive healthcare services. It could even restrict medical communication between a patient and her doctor or prevent women from getting critical emergency care.

There are already sufficient laws in place so that religious institutions and providers cannot be compelled to perform abortions if they are morally opposed. So who are we protecting?

This bill is not about conscience. It is an attack. It is an attack on women. It is an attack on their health care. It is a vehicle of discrimination against women, and women only. I urge my colleagues to vote against this unnecessary and destructive bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). He is the chairman of our Health Subcommittee and one of the life leaders, chairman of the Values Action Team here in Congress. He is retiring this year, and we are going to miss his leadership on all the life issues.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill before us today. It is an urgent and necessary legislative fix. The Conscience Protection Act would simply make the protections of the Weldon conscience amendment more effective and permanent. The Weldon amendment has been the law of the land and approved by Congress as part of the appropriations process every year since 2004.

Sadly, just 3 weeks ago, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Civil Rights ruled that the California Department of Managed Health Care did not violate the Weldon amendment when it unilaterally required abortion in all health insurance plans. Due to this governmental discrimination against plans that previously excluded abortion, conscientious objectors are being forced to cover abortion through their health plans against the dictates of their conscience.

This bill protects those who do not wish to participate in, provide for, or pay for abortions by opting out. It is this right to decline involvement in abortion that requires these protections, and the protections simply allow an aggrieved party to seek judicial review through a civil right of action.

I urge support of the bill.

ENERGY AND COMMERCE PROTECTION ACT FORUM TESTIMONIES PART II, STATEMENT BY THE HON. DAVE WELDON MD RETIRED FL-15, CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS JULY 8, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. The stories shared today by the people around this table underscore the very reason I authored the Weldon amendment.

You can imagine my outrage to learn that this administration has gutted my amendment and is allowing ongoing discrimination in California.

Over a decade ago, I became aware of the Maryland NARAL Hospital Provider Project. This disturbing initiative was designed to force abortion into every hospital in Maryland.

In response to this and similar threats, I drafted my appropriations amendment. It is intended to bring a stop to the abortion industry crusade to force this gruesome procedure into every aspect of society.

Recognizing that the abortion lobby's relentless campaign knows no limits, we drafted the amendment to cover a wide universe

of entities. Nurses, doctors, hospitals, even health plans themselves are covered entities under my amendment. Covering individual health plans ensures that insurance companies that are ambivalent about abortion can still offer plans that exclude abortion to meet the needs of purchasers.

We never limited the protection to those with religious, moral or conscience objections. In fact, in my experience as a physician the majority of health professionals who claim to support *Roe v. Wade* always say to me that they would never want to be affiliated with doing an abortion. They too would be protected if the administration would do their duty to enforce the law.

I authored this amendment to protect FREEDOM for people to provide health care free from abortion and FREEDOM for people to access health care and coverage free from the scourge of abortion.

FREEDOM for people like the pastors here today to purchase insurance plans that exclude abortion—a freedom the existed just two years ago before California took the draconian step of mandating abortion in ALL plans under the authority of the California Department of Managed Health Care.

The origins of the directive are as insidious as the directive itself. When the abortion lobby found out that Catholic Universities in California did not cover abortion in their insurance plans, they sprang to action, initiating a meeting with the Department of Managed Health Care.

Less than a year later, the Department did the bidding of Planned Parenthood and the ACLU. They unilaterally inserted abortion into each and every insurance plan under their authority—even plans purchased by CHURCHES and Catholic Universities.

My amendment anticipated this very scenario by defining a health insurance plan as a protected health care entity. This allows an insurance company to offer multiple insurance plans—some with abortion coverage and some without to meet the conscience needs of their clients.

After the Department of Managed Health Care issued their directive, the plans excluding abortion were changed to include abortion. This is clear discrimination against the plan that excluded abortion, since such plan was no longer permitted to exist.

As I explained in my floor statement in 2004, “This is a continuation of the Hyde policy of conscience protection. . . . The right of conscience is fundamental to our American freedoms. We should guarantee this freedom by protecting all health care providers from being forced to perform, refer or pay for elective abortions.” Unfortunately, the current administration has even twisted this statement to suit their political agenda.

They take this reference to conscience protection and argue that it must mean that I meant to include a religious or moral test in my amendment. This is far from the truth.

There is no reasonable way to read my statement as an excuse to airdrop a religious or moral test into my amendment. The Hyde amendment stops ALL federal funding for elective abortion. Similarly, my amendment stops ALL discrimination against entities that do not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortion.

Both amendments protect conscience broadly by protecting the freedom of Americans to offer and access health care that does not include abortion. Neither limits it's protections to cases where someone raises a religious or moral objection.

In the June 21, 2016 letter announcing their gutting of the Weldon amendment, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) also feebly attempted to twist several more of my comments in their effort to ignore the plain reading of the text.

One begins to wonder, what's next. How far will the abortion lobby and their allies in the administration go to force abortion into our health care system?

I am deeply concerned that this administration added words to my amendment where they do not exist and ignored other words clearly articulated in the text.

We simply can no longer rely on the administration to enforce the law and must offer a private right of action that allows the Weldon protections to be enforced by the Courts.

TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL CASEY MATTOX, SENIOR COUNSEL, ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM, CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS—JULY 8, 2016

My name is Casey Mattox, Senior Counsel for Alliance Defending Freedom. As you have heard from those who preceded me, all of whom ADF has been privileged to represent now or in the recent past, rights of conscience in the medical professions are under attack. Regrettably, some would make conscience a partisan issue. But historically it has not been so.

In *Roe* itself the Supreme Court acknowledged the importance of protecting conscience even as it created an abortion right, noting that the AMA recognized that medical professionals should never be “required to perform any act violative of personally held moral principles.” Few disagreed.

When the House considered the Church Amendments just weeks after *Roe*, which were intended in part to stop the ACLU's lawsuits to force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions or stop serving Medicaid patients, the bill passed 372-1 in the House and 92-1 in the Senate. I challenge any of you to imagine such a vote on anything today. Senator Ted Kennedy defended the bill's “full protection to the religious freedom of physicians and others.”

As other issues arose, this bipartisan agreement to protect conscience remained, resulting in additional laws like the Coats-Snowe Amendment and later, the Weldon Amendment. As recently as 1992, when testifying in support of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, ACLU President Nadine Strossen explained the law would safeguard “such familiar practices as . . . permitting religiously sponsored hospitals to decline to provide abortion or contraception services.”

Sadly, conscience is no longer a consensus. When virtually everyone agreed that we were all better off with doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and religious hospitals serving the public while maintaining their moral principles, existing healthcare conscience laws may have been sufficient.

But today . . .

The ACLU has relaunched its decades-old assault on Catholic hospitals and aid agencies with a new campaign to force them to perform abortions or withdraw from serving the poor.

Individual medical professionals face increasing pressures and orders to perform abortions or lose their jobs.

Washington state enacted a law at Planned Parenthood's request designed to punish pharmacists who refused to violate their consciences.

After years of failed attempts to enact abortion mandates through favorable legislatures, the abortion lobby has now found unelected allies to impose these mandates bureaucratically—with even churches forced to cover abortions from the offering plate.

And as the Administration refuses to enforce the existing conscience laws, medical students must decide whether to pursue careers in women's health knowing that they may no longer be able to depend on these bi-

partisan laws to protect them when they need it.

Whatever one's abortion views, Americans should be able to agree—as even the most ardent abortion supporters in Congress and culture historically have—that the “choice” should not involve government compulsion.

In light of the Administration's failure to act, it is clear that we need a right of action to make these protections meaningful again. We need the Conscience Protection Act.

RICHARD M. DOERFLINGER, REMARKS AT A FORUM ON THE CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT (HR 4828), HOUSE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE JULY 8, 2016

It is clear why conscience rights on abortion should be important to Congress. Our Declaration of Independence, which we celebrate this week, cites the unalienable rights that governments must respect because they are bestowed by our Creator. Those rights begin with life and liberty. If government can take away our liberty to respect life, there is no right it cannot take away. Congress and the states have passed laws to protect conscience rights since the Supreme Court legalized abortion in 1973. And until very recently, in this Administration, support for such laws has been strong and thoroughly bipartisan.

The first such federal law is the Church amendment of 1973—named for its prime sponsor, Democratic Senator Frank Church of Idaho. It was needed for two reasons. First, after *Roe v. Wade*, abortion supporters claimed that medical students, health professionals and hospitals legally must perform abortions; second, a federal court had ruled that even a Catholic hospital must do sterilizations if it receives federal funds. The Church amendment protected moral and religious objections to these procedures, and in some circumstances to any procedure. In 1996 Congress acted again, because a national accrediting body was trying to force all ob/gyn residency programs to provide abortion training. The Coats/Snowe amendment said the government would not discriminate against residents and residency programs that do not perform abortions as regards accreditation and federal aid. It passed the Senate 63-37, supported by Democrats such as Patrick Leahy and Joseph Biden, and remains law today (42 USC 238n). It is not limited to objections based on morality or religion, for reasons I would be happy to discuss. In 2002 the Abortion Non-Discrimination Act sought to ensure that this policy would apply in non-training contexts. It passed the House 229-189, supported by 37 Democrats, but was not taken up by the Senate. Its policy was finally written into law in 2004 through the Labor/HHS appropriations rider known as the Weldon amendment.

We now know these laws have a serious deficiency: None of them includes a private right of action, allowing victims of discrimination to go to court. All enforcement has been by the HHS Office for Civil Rights. This deficiency is now fatal, since this Administration refuses to enforce the law as written and is itself a perpetrator of discrimination, as in the domestic program for victims of human trafficking.

Pro-abortion forces are now exploiting what they claim are additional ambiguities in the Weldon amendment. They even think they can have it declared unconstitutional because of its enforcement mechanism, and the Obama administration now gives credence to that claim. To defend pro-life Americans' fundamental rights we need a clear definition of who is protected, and a method of enforcement that is legally secure and workable. This would be provided by the Conscience Protection Act, HR 4828.

## JIM GARLOW TESTIMONY

My name is Jim Garlow. I am the pastor of Skyline church in San Diego. I want to tell you a story.

Lynda grew up in the Midwest. As a 14 year old high school freshman, she was flattered that two high school seniors wanted to take her to a movie. However, instead of going to a movie, they drove the truck into a field in the darkness of night and there they raped her.

She became pregnant. Several months along, her pregnancy was confirmed by a doctor and the decision was made to place the baby for adoption.

Lynda's pregnancy was problematic. The closest hospital that could assist such a complicated pregnancy was 60 miles away. Her mother—holding down a job and raising other children, including two infants—could not come to see her. For several months, the 14 years old lay flat on her back. By herself. In a large city a long way from her small town.

Finally the baby was born—a girl. A couple adopted her. My (late) wife and I were that couple. We named that baby girl Janie.

Thirty six years later, my wife Carol died of cancer. Shortly thereafter my daughter Janie happened to make connection with her birthmother. It was then we found out that Janie was not merely the product of rape—but of a gang rape.

This birthmother—who is now in her 50's—is a hero to me. Why? Because we believe that while there might be unwanted pregnancies, the results of those pregnancies are always wanted babies.

I have not only adopted four babies, but I have worked to help couples adopt babies. And two of my daughters have adopted babies—including our daughter Janie.

The thought of a baby being killed in the womb is a detestable and despicable act.

In the last two years I have remarried. I married Rosemary Schindler, who by her first marriage is distantly related to Oskar Schindler of Schindler's List fame. My wife—following in the gifting of Oskar Schindler—has given her life to work with holocaust survivors—including 57 trips to Israel.

And . . . I have given people tours to Germany—including a stop by Buchenwald, the concentration camp. America's killing centers will someday be likened to these locations of death.

I find it appalling beyond words that my church . . . my church! . . . is being forced so pay for such despicable acts. I plead with you to do all you can to "let my people go" from this horrific Dept of Managed Healthcare "Pharaoh."

Thank you so much

JIM GARLOW

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The gentlewoman from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 11½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to another bill that is aimed to come between a woman and her doctor. I have heard a lot of people talk about laws in California and so forth and what we are doing.

This is my license to practice medicine in California as a doctor. Core to the oath I took as a doctor were three

things: to do good, to do no harm, and the third plank in the ethics that guide how we practice is patient autonomy. That is what I want to talk about today, because what is buried in our Constitution is individual rights, individual liberties, and there is no right more sacred than what we do with our own bodies.

Now, my job as a doctor is to sit in that exam room, answer the questions, and empower my patients to make the decisions that best impact their lives. That is why I find the Conscience Protection Act so objectionable, because it takes away a patient's right to make the decisions about their own health care. Let me give you an example that actually happened in our State.

In northern California earlier this year, a woman was going to have a baby. She wanted to have that baby. She was scheduled to have a C-section, but she already had prior kids, and she wanted to get a tubal ligation after the C-section. Her doctor thought that was the most prudent thing to do. That is totally acceptable. That is standard medical care. The problem was her hospital said she couldn't do it because they conscientiously objected to it.

Now, to me that isn't a healthcare provider making a decision. That isn't taking best medical practice and making a decision. There wasn't anything objectionable about that. That is why we need to get the government out of our healthcare system. We need to get politicians out of the exam room. We need to make these decisions about that sacred bond between a patient and their physician, because she needs to make the decision.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, this is about honoring that sacred oath between a patient and their physician.

Let's protect patients' rights, let's make our patients and women able to make the decisions that best impact their lives, and that is what this is about—individual liberties and individual rights.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conscience Protection Act. This legislation helps us protect our Nation's most vulnerable and protects healthcare providers' right of choice. The Conscience Protection Act will enable healthcare providers, charities, small businesses, and churches to have the power to make decisions regarding their practices.

Our government should not force these entities to participate in or perform abortions against their deeply moral, ethical, or religious beliefs. No American should be forced to act against their beliefs. I am proud this bill provides protection to those who do not wish to be a part of these practices.

I thank my colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce for their work on this very important bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Republicans have a hard time winning, especially on abortion. Already there are no Federal funds for abortion except rape, incest, or life of the mother. Already religious objections must be accommodated. But this bill allows the employer to veto his employee's reproductive health choices. How un-American.

Let's thank the Supreme Court of the United States that, in an unusual move, has just sent a case back to the Justice Department for an appropriate compromise after nuns did not want to fill out a form absolving them of making a decision on abortion for their employees. The Court said, you can find an answer without depriving these employees of their healthcare choices.

Some Republicans won't be satisfied until abortion is unavailable nationwide, as Congress has done, to its shame, for poor women in the District of Columbia, whose local tax funds cannot be used for abortion services. This choice belongs to women and to women alone.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD statements from the Protection Act Forum in addition to the statements previously included by Mr. PITTS.

ENERGY AND COMMERCE CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT FORUM TESTIMONIES PART I, JULY 8TH FORUM ON CAPITOL HILL

Good morning. My name is Dr. Marie-Alberte Boursiquot and I am the president-elect of the Catholic Medical Association. I am delighted and honored to be invited to address you ladies and gentlemen today on the Conscience Protection Act (CPA).

It's providential that we are gathered today to discuss a threat to our religious liberties following the July 4th holiday. I need not remind any of you that our First Amendment states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

I am here today to help you appreciate the importance of upholding conscience rights and religious liberty in all aspects of life and most especially in the delivery of health care.

As an organization, the CMA was accepted as a party to the case of the ACLU vs. Trinity Health Care where the ACLU would force hospitals to perform abortions and threaten the rights of medical professionals and the choices of pro-life patients. This case would furthermore violate federal conscience laws.

The Conscience Protection Act of 2016 is necessary in that it will protect health care professionals from being forced to pay for or participate in abortions and allow victims of discrimination a "right of action" to defend their rights in court.

We cannot allow our government to force hospitals, physicians, nurses, and other health care professionals to stop offering much needed health care because they cannot in good conscience participate in destroying developing life.

This intrusion of the government prohibits the free exercise of our faith as Catholics. Catholic Medical students are particularly vulnerable in that they may be forced to participate in abortions and learn how to perform them. This would not only violate their conscience, as Catholics, but force them to violate the Hippocratic Oath.

This oath, as you know, was developed in the 5th–3rd century, B.C and requires a new physician to swear to uphold specific ethical standards in the practice of medicine. A modernized version of the original Greek version is often used today. But originally one swore to the following:

Respect the authority of our teachers

To treat the sick according to one's ability and judgment but never with a view to injure and wrongdoing

Never to administer poison to anyone who'd ask for it nor to suggest such a course

Not to give to a woman a pessary to cause abortion

To keep pure and holy both our lives and our art

Help the sick and abstain from all intentional wrong doing and harm

Respect the confidentiality of our discussion with our patients

All human life is a gift from God. Pregnancy is not an ailment but a sign of health. Abortion terminates that gift of life and the woman ultimately suffers physically, spiritually, and emotionally. Physicians and Catholic hospitals should not be coerced to violate their consciences in performing this harmful act nor allow it to be performed in a Catholic setting.

Respectfully,

MARIE-ALBERTE  
BOURSIQUOT, M.D.,  
F.A.C.P., *President-  
elect, Catholic Medical  
Association.*

#### FOOTHILL CHURCH, TESTIMONY BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL FORUM

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Chris Lewis and I'm the Lead Pastor at Foothill Church in Glendora, California.

Foothill Church has approximately 1,000 people who attend each weekend. We are actively involved in serving our local community by helping low income public schools, raising money for victims of sex trafficking and serving in a local crisis pregnancy center. We've never waived in our Biblical conviction about the sanctity of all life and that life begins at the moment of conception and must be protected.

In May of 2014, Foothill Church, on its own initiative, asked its insurance broker to begin working with our insurance providers (Kaiser & Blue Shield) specifically to ensure that we were not covering abortions or abortifacient drugs. Our sole purpose for doing that was to ensure that we were not contradicting our deeply held beliefs about the sanctity of Life by offering insurance that, in practice, denied those beliefs. Our church's employees don't want abortion coverage and our church members don't wish their tithes and offerings contributing to abortion coverage.

In the Summer of 2014, we were pleased to find out that Kaiser Permanente had already been approved to offer such a plan by DMHC in 2012. Our insurers were willing and able to provide us with an insurance plan that met the needs of our employees and which was consistent with our religious convictions. This should have been the end of the story.

But on August 22nd, 2014, the DMHC issued an order requiring every medical plan in the state to "provide coverage of ALL terminations of pregnancies effective immediately." There is no religious exception.

Today, because of the decision by the DHMC and the refusal of HHS to require them to follow federal law and grant religious exemptions, Foothill Church is being coerced by the State, to violate one of our most cherished beliefs and deeply held religious convictions and offer abortions in our medical plan. Jesus taught us to render to Caesar that which is Caesar's, but neither human life, nor our consciences belong to Caesar, they belong to God. The tithes and offerings of the people of Foothill Church do not belong to Caesar, they belong to God. And when Caesar and God disagree we have no choice: we must render to God what is God's.

This illegal mandate places Foothill Church in an impossible situation. On the one hand, we have a Biblical (and now under Obamacare a legal) obligation to take care of our employees. And we want to do that. But on the other hand, California says that in fulfilling that obligation, we must cover abortions and violate one of our fundamental beliefs. If we don't, we will face penalties of thousands per employee. We have explored alternatives, but as a single church we simply can't take on the cost and risk of self-insuring our employees and their families.

So here we are, left in a precarious position first by the State and now by the Administration which has refused to enforce the law that should protect us.

I want to thank you for taking time to hear me today and I'm asking you to act.

#### TESTIMONY OF FE VINOYA, JULY 8, 2016

My name is Fe Esperanza Racpan Vinoya, a nurse of 26 years and I represent the 12 nurses who were ordered to assist in abortion 6 years ago in a Same Day Surgery Unit in New Jersey. I became a nurse to help people, not to do harm. Participating in the destruction of human life is not only a violation of my religious convictions, it conflicts with my calling as a medical professional to protect life, not to end it.

Despite our numerous pleas to our superiors due to our religious beliefs, we were required to be trained to participate in the preparation, delivery, and disposal of the baby. Our jobs were threatened if we were not to follow their directives.

Protecting our conscience serves our patients well. I will not participate in abortion. Period. So no amount of compulsion against me would have succeeded. But forcing me and my colleagues out of our jobs would have denied all of my patients access to the services we perform on a daily basis. And no one should want medical professionals, with the power of life and death in their hands, that are forced to set aside their moral convictions.

Both New Jersey and federal law prohibited discrimination against us because of our refusal to perform abortions. But in practice those laws are often only as effective as the willingness of government to respect them. In response to our lawsuit to defend our rights the hospital argued that those laws gave us no right to sue and enforce those laws. That I and my colleagues had to go through this ordeal shows the need for clearer protections that do not rely upon the good faith of government officials.

I am here in your presence right now as the voice for the health professionals who are and will be undergoing the same traumatic experience of being ordered to participate in the killing of the innocent babies. I was asked to choose between following my conscience or keeping my job to sustain my family. We were blessed to have the assistance of ADF and attorney Demetrios Stratis to protect our rights. Others will not be so fortunate, and should not have to rely sim-

ply upon the hope that whichever Administration is in power will enforce the law.

I encourage you to protect medical professionals like us and allow us to serve our patients without fear of discrimination. Please pass the Conscience Protection Act.

#### REMARKS BY ALLIANCE FOR CONSCIENCE RIGHTS DIRECTOR WILLIAM J. COX, ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE FORUM ON CON- SCIENCE RIGHTS, JULY 8, 2016

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bill Cox, and I am here in two capacities: as the director of the Alliance for Conscience Rights, a national coalition of Catholic health care systems formed to address growing governmental discrimination against faith-based health care providers; and as CEO of the Sacramento-based Alliance of Catholic Health Care, which represents California's 48 Catholic hospitals.

The nub of this morning's conversation is about whether federal civil rights statutes, such as the Weldon Amendment, should include a private right of action. This would give the victims of private and governmental discrimination standing to adjudicate their claims in federal court.

I'll briefly make four points: First, every federal civil rights law includes a private right of action, including the Administration's new health care non-discrimination rule. The Weldon civil rights statute should include one as well. As a matter of fairness, when protecting a civil right, every American deserves their day in court. Second, this Congress has a duty to add a private right of action to Weldon, given that the Office for Civil Rights just stated that the Department of Justice believes the current Weldon remedy—the rescission of a state's Labor-H funds—is unconstitutional under the Supreme Court's NFIB v. Sebelius ruling. Thus, the OCR and DoJ have basically admitted that the executive branch will never enforce Weldon. Third, a Weldon private right of action would provide an alternative to rescinding a state's federal health, education and other funds—billions of dollars that support programs for those who are struggling the most. We're not interested in financially penalizing states that violate Weldon—our only interest is in bringing them into compliance with federal law. All we're seeking is the legal status quo (Weldon) with an additional remedy (a private right of action). Fourth, the OCR's recent refusal to uphold Weldon revealed another possible enforcement defect: health care insurers that are covered by Weldon, but ignore their clients' conscience rights. California's health plans acceded to the state's abortion mandate and, therefore, do not believe they can honor their clients' sincerely held moral convictions. Weldon should be clarified to ensure that purchasers of health insurance, who object to covering elective abortions, are never required to do so. Without that clarity, states, such as California and New York, will continue to discriminate against employers and health care providers that choose not to cover, pay for or provide elective abortions; and other states will inevitably follow their lead.

In conclusion, those opposed to enforcing Weldon allege two things: First, the growth of Catholic health care in states, such as Washington—where Catholic hospitals provide 40% of the acute care—is reducing access to abortion; and second, Catholic hospitals' moral beliefs result in substandard emergency care to pregnant women. In respect to the first allegation, in 2013 the State of Washington's Healthcare Research Group released a study showing that there has been no diminishment in access to abortion pursuant to the growth of Catholic hospitals in

that state. In respect to the second allegation, numerous lawsuits claiming Catholic moral beliefs result in injury to patients have not withstood even preliminary challenges in the courts. And no state or federal regulatory authority has ever cited a Catholic hospital for providing substandard emergency care to a pregnant woman. If patients were actually injured in a hospital—any hospital—damages and malpractice claims would be filed immediately. In the instances alleged in these suits, none have been filed. The injury allegations made in them are not anchored in fact, but asserted solely for political reasons to tarnish Catholic hospitals' sterling brand. Finally, and notwithstanding claims to the contrary, Catholic moral principles do not preclude Catholic hospitals from providing emergency contraception when treating rape victims. For example, in California 11 Catholic-affiliated hospitals are state-designated rape trauma centers and/or Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) sites.

Mr. Chairman, our nation is strengthened by faith-based hospitals that have been delivering care, consistent with their core convictions, for well over 150 years. This Congress needs to clarify and strengthen Dr. Weldon's amendment to enable them to continue serving their patients and communities, free from governmental compulsion to violate their moral beliefs.

Thank you.

ORAL STATEMENT OF DONNA J. HARRISON M.D., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PRO-LIFE OBSTETRICIANS AND GYNECOLOGISTS AT THE CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING: CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT, JULY 8, 2016

As Executive Director of The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists, representing 4000 obgyns and other reproductive health care professionals, I routinely hear from medical students, residents and members of my organization who are being pressured to kill their unborn patients. I know students denied residency positions, fully tenured faculty fired for testifying in court cases, defending the lives of their fetal patients, or teaching about the scientific fact of human existence from fertilization. Physicians who practice according to the Hippocratic Oath are expelled from the medical system or prevented from entering it for refusing to cooperate in the killing of their patients. And the ACLU has recently launched a project to force hospitals to perform abortions. Through our attorneys at ADF, AAPLOG has intervened to help defend these Catholic hospitals and the pro-life medical professionals that work there. Who do you want to care for you and your family: a physician with moral integrity or a physician without moral integrity? Most patients want a physician who shares their moral values and most U.S. women think killing unborn children is wrong. Elective abortion is not medical care. Killing human beings to solve social problems is not medical care. As stated in the International Dublin Declaration on Maternal Health, and our AAPLOG mission statement, killing our unborn patients has no place in the practice of the healing arts. 85% of obstetricians do not perform elective abortions. It is not from lack of skill. We don't kill unborn patients because we went into medicine to care for both the pregnant mother and her unborn child. We don't want to be forced to use our professional skills to participate in killing one of our patients.

I speak to medical student groups across the country. Medical students tell me frequently that they are interested in obgyn, but they won't train in it because they don't want to be forced to kill unborn children. No wonder there is a shortage of obgyns and

costs are rising. On paper, federal and state conscience laws protect rights of conscience. But these students see the grim reality—those protections are worthless without a right of action when the Administration refuses to enforce the law.

Compelling medical professionals and students to perform abortions won't increase access for women's healthcare. It will force medical professionals with moral integrity out of the field. Women won't have more access to abortionists. They'll have reduced access to obgyns to meet their health needs and deliver their babies.

America used to recognize conscientious objections to killing and allow her citizens to live out their convictions in ways which do not involve taking human lives. That is what the First Amendment is about. But without an administration willing to uphold our First Amendment rights, a health care professional has little recourse. On behalf of pro-life medical professionals and the women and unborn children they serve, I urge you to pass the Conscience Protection Act.

Respectfully submitted,

DONNA J. HARRISON, M.D.,  
Executive Director,  
American Association  
of Pro-life Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS). She is our Conference chair and also a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conscience Protection Act because, in America, we think and believe differently than each other. We are granted the freedom to believe. It is a freedom that sets us apart, makes us unique. It is not a flaw; it is special. It is spectacular, even.

Preserving this freedom is not easy. It wasn't meant to be. Living in a country where everyone is promised the right to live free according to their own beliefs and dreams is difficult. But it is a challenge that we have risen to time and time again, and we must continue to do so.

All of this is exactly why the Conscience Protection Act is so important. It stops the government from coming in and taking away a person's freedom to choose a doctor who shares their beliefs or forcing churches to make decisions that violate their conscience, like purchasing health insurance plans that go against who they are.

Importantly, it allows doctors and other healthcare providers to focus on healing and caring for their communities without the fear of having someone from the government telling them they have to do something that violates who they are and what they believe.

It is no secret, the Federal Government isn't supposed to be discriminating against healthcare providers who refuse to participate in abortion. It is against the law. Here we have the Department of Health and Human Services ignoring the law and doing whatever they want to do. Along the

way, they are ignoring people, people who wish to leave abortions out of their coverage or their medical practice.

There are a number of reasons this kind of discrimination cannot stand, but the biggest reason: people are being told what to do and what to believe by the government. In this case, it is the Department of Health and Human Services joining the ranks of countless, faceless, nameless bureaucrats who are trying to dictate what beliefs are more worthy of the protection than others. They have to stop it.

Support the Conscience Protection Act today because people who believe differently than us are promised the freedom to still find unity as communities and companies, and no one should be denied that freedom based on their unwillingness to participate in abortion. Support the Conscience Protection Act on behalf of people who are just trying to live their lives and do what they believe is the right thing.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

□ 1545

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding and for all her work in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today would allow a woman's boss to decide what type of medical care she is allowed to access.

Republicans are telling us that it is not up to a woman to consult her doctor or her family or her own faith—that she needs to consult with her boss when it comes to her personal, private, and constitutionally protected medical decisions.

Here we are in the midst of unprecedented public health emergencies—nearly 50 American women diagnosed with Zika every single day, a dangerously underfunded opioid response program, no relief for the families of Flint, Michigan, and the worst gun massacre in our country's history—and this is the Republican majority's priority?

The response to these emergencies is wrapping themselves in religious liberty when religious objections are already protected under our current laws, as they should be, and, instead, insert themselves into a woman's most private medical decisions.

This is no way to govern. I know it, the majority knows it, and the American people are going to remember it.

This so-called Conscience Protection Act is ironically titled because I cannot imagine a more blatant admission of this Congress' crisis of conscience. With 91 people dying every day by guns, with the threat of Zika to unborn babies unanswered and unfunded, with 125 deaths from opioids every day in this country, this bill is an abject rejection of conscience. If anyone needs their conscience protected, it is the Republicans in Congress who think this is

what we should be dealing with right now.

My question to my colleagues is this: How does your conscience feel when you remain silent in the face of such tragedy and public health threats?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), who is a true fighter on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, in 2009, President Obama, told Notre Dame University graduates:

Let us honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion, and draft a sensible conscience clause, and make sure that all of our healthcare policies are grounded not only in sound science, but also in clear ethics.

Over the course of the ensuing 8 years, however, what the President has said and what he is doing now are completely opposite. Instead of protecting the conscience of those who disagree, the President and his administration have discriminated against Americans because of their views on abortion.

No American should be forced to participate in an abortion or be coerced to purchase a healthcare plan which includes abortion. Yet today, that is exactly what is happening. In California, churches are being forced to purchase healthcare plans and pay for abortion. Yes, churches.

In America, respecting the freedom of conscience is a long-held American tradition. Let's continue that tradition today and pass the Conscience Protection Act.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, a central principle in our Nation's history has been a clear rejection of government forcing someone to take an action that violates their religious or moral convictions.

Americans rejected being forced to return runaway slaves. We rejected forced conscription against conscientious objections. We reject being forced to support State-run churches. And now we must reject the forced participation in the killing of unborn life.

No one should be forced to have an abortion, no one should be forced to participate in an abortion, and no one should be discriminated against for refusing to collaborate in an abortion. When government endangers these protections and discriminates against healthcare providers who are holding fast to their moral convictions, it is time to provide safeguards. That is why I urge the House to pass S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

No one should be forced to purchase health plans that cover abortions. Certainly, no one—nurses, doctors, or other healthcare providers—should be forced to help carry out an abortion against their conscience. Certainly, no one should be punished or discrimi-

nated against for refusing to carry out this gruesome procedure.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conscience Protection Act, and I would like to thank my colleague from Tennessee for her work on this important issue.

Health care is about saving life, not taking life. Medical professionals should not be forced to violate their deeply held convictions and participate in abortion procedures based on a government mandate.

In this Nation, universities and even churches are being forced to cover abortion through their insurance plans. These mandates trample on religious freedom.

This bill, which I support here today, would stop the Federal Government and State and local governments from penalizing, retaliating, or discriminating against a healthcare provider if that provider chooses to not participate in abortion services.

I am the proud father of three boys with my wife Kristen, and I am also a practicing Catholic. I stand here today in defense of the unborn and religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, regardless of their faith or their views on abortion, to understand and realize that this form of government coercion is immoral. We must protect Americans' rights to follow their conscience, and I urge my colleagues to support this necessary legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Conscience Protection Act, which allows employers and others to block women's access to full health care.

Under the guise of conscience protection, this is a hypocritical bill that would make it even harder for women to obtain the reproductive health care they need. It is hypocritical because it does nothing to protect the doctors whose conscience guides them to provide women with safe, legal abortions. Because of hundreds of punitive bills filled in State legislatures and in this Congress, these providers face the threat of harsh penalties for following their conscience: onerous fines, years in prison, and loss of their medical license.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, let me respectfully suggest that the consciences we should be protecting today belong to the women of this Nation, who should be allowed to choose their own reproductive destiny.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania Mr. ROTHFUS.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, as seen in this debate, few issues divide this country the way abortion does. One

sides argues an autonomy that allows no questions. The other implores we recognize the inalienable, God-given right to life of all human beings, a right recognized in our Declaration of Independence. Notwithstanding these divisions, our citizens have long agreed that no one should be coerced into participating in abortion or paying for an abortion.

Pro-life Americans have deeply held convictions that abortion destroys a human life. They have watched sonograms of babies in utero, and they have seen the tragic aftermath. They do not want to be involved in this procedure in any way.

Yet, from a New York nurse, who was forced against her conscience to take part in aborting a 22-week-old baby, to Catholic institutions in California being forced to pay for insurance plans that cover abortion, people of conscience are threatened. This is wrong.

Martin Luther King, Jr., a faith leader—he was a Reverend—was a powerful advocate for conscience rights. Dr. King put it simply: "Conscience asks the question, is it right?"

The Conscience Protection Act is in the long tradition of our Nation's respect for religious freedom and the protection of people of conscience. I urge support for this legislation.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conscience Protection Act, which would prevent the Federal, State, and local government from discriminating against healthcare providers who choose not to participate in abortion.

I am a cosponsor of this bill, and I stand before you today as a surgeon who has practiced for over two and half decades. I want to say clearly that no healthcare provider should be forced to participate in abortion or any medical or surgical procedure, for that matter, against their will.

Doctors take an oath to do no harm. I took that oath myself. Health care is about protecting life, not taking life. Make no mistake about it, I am pro-life.

Forcing healthcare providers to violate their conscience is a rejection of the individual liberty on which our Nation is built.

And even more to make a point, what patient would want a doctor to perform a procedure—any procedure—that they don't feel comfortable with, for whatever reason they don't feel comfortable with it?

This defies human reason. Enforcing it defies human freedom in this, the land of the free, or so we say.

Healthcare providers are not owned by the government or any other entity. No American is owned by the government or any other entity. This protection is long overdue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this crucial bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I started this debate, I said that this bill is really a wolf in sheep's clothing. And I meant it.

We have heard throughout this last hour many calls for conscience, many assertions that people shouldn't be forced to perform abortions against their religious convictions. We even just now saw a quote from my hero, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., here on the floor, talking about civil rights.

Well, guess what?

As speaker after speaker on our side has pointed out, under current law, providers are not required to provide abortions. This has been the law since the 1970s, when the Church amendment was passed.

In the 1970s, when the Church amendment was passed—it has been law ever since then—I was in high school at that time. It says that providers do not have to provide abortions against their religious convictions, and they have legal recourse if they don't want to do it.

The Church amendment was expanded in 2005 by the so-called Weldon amendment, which has been an appropriations rider since that time. What the Weldon amendment says is that no Federal funding will be made available to government entities that subject a healthcare entity, physicians, hospitals, or HMOs to discrimination because it does not provide, pay for, cover or refer for abortions.

So, in fact, under current law, if somebody is being made to provide abortion services against their will, they have recourse.

And guess what?

In every single example that the majority gave today, they had recourse. And they won.

Let's talk about the Catherine DeCarlo case, the nurse in New York that so many of my colleagues have referred to, who, by her employer, was required, against her ethical convictions, to provide abortion services. She filed a complaint with the Office for Civil Rights, as she is allowed to under law. An investigation ensued.

And guess what?

The hospital was required to take remedial action and change their policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the decision from the Department of Health and Human Services entered under the Obama administration giving Ms. DeCarlo these rights.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH &  
HUMAN SERVICES,  
February 1, 2013.

Re Reference Number: 10-109676

MATTHEW S. BOWMAN, ESQ.,  
*Alliance Defending Freedom,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DAVID REICH, MD,  
*Interim President, The Mount Sinai Hospital,*  
*New York, NY.*

DEAR MR. BOWMAN AND DR. REICH: The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office for Civil Rights (OCR), has completed its investigation of the above-referenced complaint filed by the Alliance Defending Freedom, formerly known as the Alliance Defense Fund (the complainant), on behalf of Catherina Lorena Cenzon-DeCarlo (the affected party) against The Mount Sinai Hospital (the Hospital). The complaint alleges that, on May 24, 2009, the Hospital forced the affected party to assist in the performance of an abortion procedure despite her express religious objections. The complaint also alleges that, because of the affected party's initial refusal to participate in the May 24, 2009 procedure, the Hospital discriminated against her by: (i) reducing the number of on-call shifts she received for the month of August 2009; and (ii) asking her to sign a statement of her willingness to participate in abortion procedures in emergencies as a condition to being assigned more on-call shifts for September 2009 than she was assigned for August 2009.

OCR initiated an investigation of this complaint consistent with its authority under the Church Amendments, 42 U.S.C. §300a-7; Section 245 of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. §238n; and the Weldon Amendment, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008, Public Law 110-161, Div. G, §508(d), 121 Stat. 1844, 2209 (collectively referred to as the Federal health care provider conscience statutes) and their implementing regulation, 45 C.F.R. Part 88.

According to information available on its website, the Hospital is a 1,171-bed tertiary-care teaching facility that oversees approximately 58,000 patients receiving inpatient care, 530,000 outpatient visits, and 98,000 emergency room visits each year. The Hospital is part of The Mount Sinai Medical Center. The Hospital receives federal financial assistance from HHS under the Public Health Service Act and through its participation in Medicare and Medicaid.

During the course of the investigation, OCR reviewed information submitted by the complainant and the Hospital. OCR interviewed the complainant, the affected party, Hospital staff and administration, and physicians providing services at the Hospital. OCR also coordinated the handling of the complaint with the staff of the HHS program(s) from which the Hospital receives HHS funding.

The complainant indicated that the affected party has been employed in the Hospital's Perioperative Services Care Center since August 9, 2004, and has strongly-held religious beliefs and moral convictions that she should not participate in abortion procedures. During the course of its investigation, OCR learned that elective abortion procedures are scheduled on weekdays at the Hospital, staffed by individuals who have agreed in advance to participate in such procedures. Urgent/non-elective abortion procedures that occur over the weekend are staffed by Operating Room (O.R.) nurses and surgical technicians who have signed up and are assigned to be "on call" for that specific weekend. The complainant indicated that the affected party was on on-call and called to the O.R. for a procedure to take place during the morning of Sunday, May 24, 2009. The com-

plainant informed OCR that, shortly after the affected party learned that the case was an abortion procedure, she reminded her supervisor of her religious objection and asked to be excused from the case, but the Hospital insisted that she assist in the procedure.

During OCR's investigation of this matter, the Hospital stated that it did not force the affected party to assist in the performance of an abortion procedure, and that it did not discriminate or retaliate against her for her initial refusal to assist in the abortion procedure. Nonetheless, the Hospital also indicated that, since the events of May 24, 2009, it has implemented measures to address the administrative issues that prevented the Hospital from locating a replacement nurse for the affected party on the day of the procedure.

In particular, OCR learned that the Hospital adopted a revision to its O.R. scheduling policies and procedures, effective August 2009, which requires abortion procedures to be scheduled with the O.R. with as much notice as possible. The revised policy also establishes a process wherein the Hospital maintains: (i) contact information for the O.R. nurses and surgical technicians, and (ii) a list indicating which nurses and surgical technicians are willing to participate, and which are not willing to participate, in abortion procedures. Further, the revised policy instructs O.R. scheduling staff and on-duty nurse managers that, in the event on-call O.R. nurses or surgical technicians must be called in for an abortion procedure, the O.R. scheduling staff must inform the on-duty nurse manager. If the scheduled on-call O.R. nurse or surgical technician is listed as being unwilling to assist, the scheduling staff (and the nurse manager) will use the aforementioned lists to contact and secure an O.R. nurse or surgical technician, as appropriate, who is willing to assist in the performance of an abortion.

Subsequently as a result of OCR's investigation, the Hospital has agreed to take certain other actions to ensure and strengthen its commitment and ongoing compliance with the applicable Federal health care provider conscience statutes. OCR notes that the Hospital has taken significant affirmative steps to address the compliance concerns identified in the complaint, and the following listed actions provide additional safeguards for objecting health care personnel while ensuring patients have access to needed health care. Specifically, the Hospital has agreed in writing to:

1. Comply with the provisions of the Church Amendments, 42 U.S.C. §300a-7 et seq.
2. Continue to use its best efforts to ensure that non-objecting health care personnel are available to perform their job duties with respect to abortion procedures, including any abortion procedures that occur over the weekend;
3. Revise Human Resources Policy No. 15.3, titled "Exclusion from Patient Care—Employee Rights," to state that "The Mount Sinai Hospital does not discriminate in the employment, promotion, or termination of employment of any physician or other health care personnel, or in the extension of staff or other privileges to any physician or other health care personnel, because he or she performed or assisted in the performance of a lawful sterilization procedure or abortion, or because he or she refused to perform or assist in the performance of such a sterilization procedure or abortion on the grounds that his performance or assistance would be contrary to his religious beliefs or moral convictions."
4. Continue to post the Hospital's Human Resources Policy No. 15.3, titled "Exclusion from Patient Care—Employee Rights," electronically on the Hospital's intranet and

post in hard copy on the Operating Room notice board; and

5. Train O.R. managers, nurses and surgical technicians about the Hospital's obligations to comply with the Church Amendments and train Surgical Admitting Planning office administrative staff to ensure that O.R. nurses' and surgical technicians' objecting or non-objecting status is properly recorded.

In addition, OCR provided the Hospital with technical assistance regarding its grievance procedure and its list identifying whether O.R. nurses and surgical technicians are willing or not to participate in abortion procedures. The Hospital incorporated OCR's technical assistance, further ensuring the Hospital's compliance with the applicable Federal health care provider conscience statutes.

Based on the above-described commitments and actions, OCR finds that the Hospital took steps, subsequent to May 24, 2009, and during the course of OCR's investigation, which have sufficiently addressed and resolved the allegation regarding the May 24, 2009 procedure.

With respect to the allegation that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party by reducing the amount of weekend on-call shifts to which she was assigned for August 2009, the evidence gathered during OCR's investigation did not support such a finding. The affected party asserted that there were multiple sign-up sheets and she had signed up for approximately 7-8 on-call shifts for August 2009. The Hospital indicated that there was only one set of sign-up sheets, and the affected party signed up for a single shift, which the Hospital assigned to her. While the Hospital's documentation does not definitively establish that there was not a second set of sign-up sheets for August 2009, OCR's interviews of multiple O.R. nurses indicate that O.R. nurses and surgical technicians signed up at a single location on a single set of sign-in sheets. Accordingly, OCR has determined that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party when assigning on-call shifts for the month of August 2009.

The complainant also alleged that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party by asking her to sign a statement of her willingness to participate in abortion procedures in emergencies as a condition to being assigned more on-call shifts for September 2009 than she was assigned for August 2009. After interviewing the affected party and other staff involved in the alleged conversations, OCR found that at least one conversation occurred on or about July 16, 2009, involving a request for the affected party to sign a statement. However, there was substantial dispute as to the substantive content of any conversation, including the content of any requested statement. Based on our review of the facts and circumstances of this matter, including that the affected party did not agree to sign any statement and the Hospital subsequently assigned her on-call shifts for September 2009 after she signed up for them, OCR has determined that there is insufficient evidence to substantiate the claim that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party by asking her to sign such a statement.

Further, on February 4, 2011, the complainant contacted OCR to report an alleged act of retaliation by the Hospital against the affected party for the filing of this complaint. Following the May 24, 2009 procedure that is the subject of this matter, the affected party sought assistance from the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) at the Hospital. The complainant alleged that, on February 3, 2011, the Hospital informed the affected party that it would not provide her with a

copy of her EAP records unless she first obtained a court order, because the affected party had filed OCR and judicial complaints against the Hospital. A claim that the Hospital's actions with respect to the affected party's EAP records amounts to another act of discrimination under the Church Amendments is not supported by the evidence. During OCR's investigation of the complainants associated HIPAA Privacy Rule complaint, TN 11-123374, OCR learned that all employees of the Hospital who seek to obtain a copy of their EAP records must first obtain a court order or subpoena, regardless of whether: (i) the employee has or has not filed a complaint or lawsuit against the Hospital, or (ii) the employee has or has not refused to assist with an abortion procedure, and irrespective of what the employee's religious beliefs are about abortion.

This determination of compliance is not intended, nor should it be construed, to cover any issues, regarding the Hospital's compliance status with the Church Amendments, that are not specifically addressed in this letter. It neither covers issues or authorities not specifically addressed herein nor does it preclude future determinations of compliance that are based on subsequent investigations.

Please take all necessary steps to ensure that no adverse action is taken against the complainant, the affected party, or any other individual for the filing of this complaint, providing information to OCR, or otherwise participating in this investigation.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, it may be necessary for OCR to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. In the event OCR receives such a request, we will seek to protect, to the extent provided by law, personal information the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

If you have additional questions or concerns, please contact Frank J. Musumeci, M.S., Supervisory Equal Opportunity Specialist.

Sincerely,

LINDA C. COLÓN,  
Regional Manager.

Ms. DEGETTE. Now, let's talk about the nine Nassau County nurses apparently required by their employer to provide these services. All of those nurses were reinstated to their job after they made a complaint.

According to any example that we have gotten, these people have had recourse under current law.

So what does this bill do?

This bill doesn't give anybody any more conscientious ability to object.

□ 1600

What this bill does is it allows whole new classes of people to refuse to provide services to the women of America. It allows employers, it allows healthcare plans and health plan sponsors to refuse to provide women the services they need.

The only people who are going to be hurt by this are the patients. And I will tell you what, if you want to talk about civil rights, talk about the civil rights of those patients.

Talk about Mindy Swank, who is a woman from Illinois. She was denied care by a Catholic hospital when her water broke just 20 weeks into her pregnancy. Even though her life would have been endangered by continuing

the pregnancy and it could have threatened her ability to have more children in the future, the hospital she visited not only refused to treat her, but it refused to provide documentation that her abortion was medically necessary so somebody else could treat her.

She was forced to wait weeks, returning to the hospital four times with bleeding, until finally she was deemed sick enough to induce labor and give birth to a baby who died without ever regaining consciousness. Talk about her civil rights. That is what we are thinking about today.

So I have got to say—I am a deeply religious person myself—I believe that we should give people their rights to their religious expression, and we do that under current law. I don't think that taking women's rights to health care away does anything to help with that situation.

Here is one more thing. In case you didn't know, President Obama issued an order today saying that he is going to veto this bill if, in the unlikely event, it ever passes his desk.

So what are we doing here today? The majority has announced that they are going out of session for 7 weeks at the end of this week. They are not going to deal with the Zika funding. They are not going to deal with gun safety legislation, which would save many Americans' lives. They are not going to finish the appropriations bills, on and on and on.

We have spent a whole hour of our valuable time today debating about something that is not only unnecessary from a conscience point of view, but that could endanger women's lives, and we are doing nothing to help the lives of the millions and millions of Americans that need it.

It is not the right focus. It is not the right time. It is not the right legislation. I urge every single one of my colleagues to examine their conscience and to vote "no" on this poorly thought-out piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me talk for just a minute about what some of this does. We have spent a whole hour here, yes, defending the Constitution, standing up for an individual's right.

This bill does not do a few things. It doesn't clog the courts. It doesn't hamper due process; it increases it. It doesn't create confusion; it creates clarity. It doesn't stop you from getting care. It doesn't offend conscience. It isn't vindictive. It isn't hypocritical.

What it does do is state that someone has this right.

The bill doesn't ban abortion. It doesn't take away rights. The bill doesn't remove lifesaving protections for women. And third, the bill doesn't force pregnant women from foregoing chemotherapy, all claims that we have heard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, today we heard quite a few claims that were made, and I would like to set the RECORD straight.

First of all, the bill before us today simply protects the other right to choose, that is the right of healthcare providers to choose not to be involved in abortion. The bill does not change the legality of abortion in any way.

Some of my colleagues have raised concerns regarding how this bill may affect life-threatening cases. As a nurse who has worked in the emergency room, I can tell you that medical personnel always—always—act to save patients who come through their doors, including pregnant women and their babies. It is that compassion and that drive to protect life that brought them to the medical profession in the first place.

Furthermore, stabilizing a woman when her life is in danger is the law. It is already the law. There is a standard of care and there is a law. Under the Emergency Medical Treatment and the Active Labor Act, doctors and hospitals are required to stabilize emergency patients, including pregnant women.

So to be absolutely sure there is no confusion on this point, the Conscience Protection Act includes a rule of construction that clarifies those protections and EMTALA will continue to co-exist side by side, offering women the assurance that they will be cared for in these situations.

We protect insurance plans and employers purchasing such plans from participation in abortion in this bill because that is the very scenario that has prompted the consideration of the bill.

Abortion is a highly controversial issue on which Americans have a wide range of views. It is reasonable to allow anyone who does not want to be a party to abortion to be able to opt out.

Recognizing this point, even President Obama's healthcare law, ObamaCare, allows States and insurance companies to opt out of including abortion in the health plans offered on the exchanges.

My bill simply ensures that the healthcare providers, as defined in the bill, are not forced or coerced to participate in a brutal procedure that is often painful to an unborn child.

I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to S. 304, the so-called "Conscience Protection Act."

This bill would allow employers, insurance companies, and other health care entities to refuse to provide, pay for, cover, or refer for abortion services.

This is an overreaching and dangerous proposal under which employers, among others, could deny women comprehensive health insurance coverage and intrude on their personal health care decisions.

This legislation is unnecessary since existing federal law already protects individuals

who do not want to participate in abortion care and many states have refusal clauses for individual who wish to refuse to participate in abortion care.

A woman's medical decisions should be left up to her and her physician; they should not be vulnerable to the arbitrary discrimination of an employer or other outside party.

As responsible lawmakers, we have a duty to reject any and all provisions that seek to codify a health care system in which discrimination against women is legal and encouraged.

The Supreme Court has upheld the right of women to choose regarding this matter.

It is time that we move on from attempts to undermine this right and instead focus on improving health care quality and access for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing S. 304.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 822, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Wasserman Schultz moves to recommit the bill, S. 304, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### SEC. 4. NO IMPACT ON RESPONSE TO ZIKA VIRUS.

The provisions of section 3, including the amendment made by such section, shall not apply to the extent that such provisions would reduce access to health care services to prevent, prepare for, or respond to the Zika virus.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act, is yet another extreme attempt to block women's access to health care. This dangerous legislation, which the President has threatened to veto, would strip away patient protections and permit employers to override a

woman's personal medical decisions. It is the 113th House GOP vote in this Congress alone to attack women's health care.

This bill is an attempt to make permanent the so-called Weldon amendment, which pressures any Federal agency or program, or any State or local government, with the potential loss of all of its Labor and Health and Human Services funding if it doesn't allow a healthcare entity to provide, pay for, cover, or refer for abortions.

The majority purports that this legislation would protect religious liberty, but, in reality, it is a thinly veiled attempt to restrict women's access to safe and legal abortion.

To be clear, religious liberty is one of our Nation's most fundamental and cherished values, but it does not, and should never, mean the freedom to discriminate against or harm others. This bill would unduly limit women's healthcare choices by allowing a broad set of health providers, including many employers, to deny their female employees access to legal medical services based on any and all objections.

This legislation could not possibly have been written more broadly. Specifically, the Conscience Protection Act would allow employers and insurance companies, among other "healthcare entities," to refuse to "facilitate," "make arrangements for," or "otherwise participate in" abortions.

Women of color, low-income families, LGBTQ individuals, young people, and those living in rural areas already experience widespread and systemic barriers to health care. This vague and overly broad language will exacerbate the significant barriers to care that they already face.

Additionally, the bill would give virtually any individual or entity standing to sue for an actual or threatened violation. As civil rights organizations have noted:

This broad right of action would chill State, local, and Federal Government's ability to advance pro-women's health policies by exposing them to frivolous, resource-draining lawsuits by opponents of safe, legal abortion.

Undoubtedly, this bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. In the name of religious liberty, the majority is continuing its campaign to deny women access to safe and legal abortion and create a healthcare system that is legally permitted to discriminate against women.

Women and all Americans deserve access to the care and coverage that is right for them. The Conscience Protection Act threatens that access and is another attempt by the majority to insert themselves into a decision best left between a woman and her doctor.

This motion to recommit prevents the harmful provisions of the bill from applying to any area in the U.S. where it would reduce access to healthcare services to prevent, prepare for, or respond to the Zika virus.

More than 3,600 Americans, including more than 600 pregnant women in 45

States, D.C., and 3 U.S. territories, have already been diagnosed with the Zika virus, and more transmission is expected. In my home State of Florida, there are more than 250 people that have contracted Zika, including 43 pregnant women. During pregnancy, the Zika virus can cause a serious birth defect called microcephaly, as well other severe fetal brain defects.

The Zika virus is primarily transmitted through two types of mosquitos, and according to a recent article in the Journal of Medical Entomology, 40 States and D.C. have reported the presence of one or both of those mosquitos.

Public health experts have made clear that it is not if we will have local transmission of the Zika virus in the continental U.S., it is when. Despite that risk, our Republican colleagues are on the floor today playing politics with women and children's access to federally supported healthcare services like Medicaid.

Through Federal healthcare services, women can visit healthcare providers to better understand how to prevent contracting the Zika virus, and children born with severe fetal brain defects can receive the healthcare services that they need.

Threatening receipt of Federal healthcare services by women and children in need of care to advance the harmful Republican war on women is unconscionable. It is shocking that anyone would even consider taking any action that would cut off federally supported healthcare services when the threat of the Zika virus looms so large in this country, especially during the summer, the height of tourist and mosquito season.

This bill is dangerous and irresponsible. Pregnant women who contract the Zika virus and infants born with microcephaly or severe fetal birth defects as a result should have the federally guaranteed healthcare benefits and services that they need and not be punished because the Republicans wanted to score more political points.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I pose a simple question: When did this institution and the political discourse lose respect for freedom of conscience protections in health care?

It is not fair. It is not fair that individuals today may have legal recourse to protect their civil rights but not

their constitutionally safeguarded conscience rights.

This straightforward bill reaffirms the Weldon amendment protections, gives individuals and entities a private right of action, and makes sure that nothing prevents providers from voluntarily electing to take part in an abortion.

It is written to protect a person like Fe Vinoya, who is one of the nurses from New Jersey. During a Conscience Forum just last week, Fe said:

Participating in the destruction of human life is not only a violation of my religious convictions, it conflicts with my calling as a medical professional to protect life, not to end life.

We owe this to Fe and anyone else who objects to being forced to provide or to pay for abortion services. So I simply urge you, I implore Members to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and to vote "yes" on the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1615

#### NO 2H2O FROM IRAN ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 819, I call up the bill (H.R. 5119) to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 819, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5119

*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 "No <sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub>O from Iran Act".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE OR ISSUE A LICENSE FOR THE PURCHASE OF HEAVY WATER PRODUCED IN IRAN.

No funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended—

(1) to purchase heavy water produced in Iran; or

(2) to issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of this bill. What this would do is prohibit the United States from spending millions of dollars purchasing from Iran heavy water. Iran—I think we should remember—is the number one state sponsor of terrorism. Heavy water is essential to the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

While this relatively rare chemical is not radioactive, it has long been tightly controlled. Why? Because of its use as a coolant in heavy water nuclear reactors. These are the types of reactors which experts call a plutonium bomb factory.

The history of this goes back. If we think back during the Second World War, the fall of Norway and its heavy water plant to the Nazis created a very real risk that Hitler could win the race to build the bomb. In response, at the time, the Allies launched several daring commando raids—the most daring of the war—and hundreds of bombers in what was ultimately their successful effort to prevent the Nazis from using heavy water to develop weapons-grade plutonium. That is how important this process has been in history in the race to that weapon.

So fast forward several decades, and now the Obama administration's nuclear agreement does not limit Iran's ability to produce heavy water. This is one of the agreement's many flaws, in my opinion. But, instead, the deal allows Iran to possess a small amount of heavy water for its newly legitimized nuclear program and requires Iran to ship any excess heavy water that it produces out of the country.

So, while this deeply flawed deal allows Iran to sell its excess heavy water on the international market, it certainly doesn't require the United States to buy Iran's excess heavy water. If there are no buyers, then Iran would have to comply with the limits on its heavy water possession by suspending production, or it could also dilute any excess heavy water that it currently possesses. That makes sense to me.

Let me be clear. Despite false claims, enacting this legislation would not cause the United States or Iran to violate the nuclear deal. What we are talking about here is something that is not in the deal, whether or not we subsidize their production of heavy water.

So what it would prevent, clearly, is it would prevent the administration from going above and beyond the agreement to deliver Iran financial rewards that were never part of the agreement that passed this House.

That is one of the reasons why the Obama administration's purchase of 28

metric tons of heavy water from Iran is so concerning. Purchases like this only—as I indicated—subsidize and incentivize Iran's continued production of this sensitive material that plays an essential role in the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

I just want to go to the words of David Albright, which I think all of us should reflect on here. He is a respected nonproliferation expert, and he said these words: We should not be paying Iran for something they shouldn't be producing in the first place.

That is my point, Mr. Speaker. So this bill is simple. It prohibits U.S. purchases, prohibits us paying Iran for heavy water from their facility, and, thus, prevents U.S. taxpayer dollars from subsidizing this rogue regime.

I also want to thank the author, Mr. POMPEO, for his work. I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by now, everyone knows that I opposed the Iran nuclear deal. But as I have said again and again and again, now that the deal is done, we need to focus on holding Iran's leaders to their word and holding the regime accountable for its other bad behavior. I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member of this body who disagrees with that goal.

But there is a right way to do that and a wrong way to do it. The right way to do it is to collaborate across the aisle to draft legislation that will win bipartisan support, that will make it across the finish line, and that the President will sign into law.

The right way to do it is to let committees go through a regular process, a regular order, so that Members on both sides have a chance to debate and contribute.

The right way to do it is to bring it to the floor in a way that ensures we end up with the best possible legislation so that we can honestly advance American interests and protect American security.

The wrong way to do it is to ram it through the Rules Committee—that is what happens here—and bring it to the floor with no chance to offer new ideas to make the bill better. But that is exactly where we are today. That is why this bill is so deeply flawed. That is why it has no chance of becoming law, and that is a shame, in my opinion, because this bill might have been a good starting point.

Again, I think we do need to deal with Iran more forcefully. Generally speaking, I agree that we shouldn't be buying heavy water from Iran. But this bill is far too broad. It is a blanket prohibition—no waivers, no sunset, no exceptions. We have no idea what the unintended consequences of this bill could be in the years ahead. Those are the uncertainties we try to deal with on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

So pull it out of a committee's jurisdiction, give it to the Rules Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee really has no say in what is truly an important Foreign Affairs Committee bill.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally, the House Iran-related bills have been bipartisan. The way we have dealt with Iran has maybe been the best example of nonpartisan collaboration on foreign policy, or bipartisan collaboration on foreign policy, and politics stopping at the water's edge. But in this case, the Speaker has totally circumvented the Foreign Affairs Committee and our normal bipartisan approach. I think there are serious consequences to the process that led us here. We are sending a message to the rest of the world that foreign policy issues are now part of everyday politics. This is a dangerous path.

I don't blame my good friend Chairman ROYCE for this lousy process. This isn't the way he runs our committee, and I am grateful, as always, for his fair leadership. Tomorrow, we are marking up 13 bipartisan measures in our committee. That is the way it should be. We pride ourselves in bipartisanship. That is how you pass legislation in foreign policy, and that is exactly what we are not doing here this afternoon.

But I am left to wonder, what happened to the Speaker's commitment to regular order? When he became Speaker, that was the platform he rode on. What do our friends in the Freedom Caucus and the Liberty Caucus have to say about the Speaker's change of heart? It just isn't right.

It leads to bad policy. Foreign policy is rarely black and white. There are very few times when it is smart to say: "This is the right way to go, without exception, in perpetuity." That is what the bill does. Complexity isn't a vice in foreign policy, and sometimes bills that are only a page or two long are the most dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that we are spending time on a measure that we all know isn't going anywhere and that we all know is just political theater as my friends in the majority move into the convention next week. We could be using this time in an honest effort to make our country safer with this issue, which is an important issue. But a flawed process has led to a flawed bill, and I am forced to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 5119.

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 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of this legislation.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the chairman for the gentleman's good work on policing and performing oversight on the JCPOA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 5119, to prevent the United States purchase of heavy water from Iran.

I want to start by pointing out the recent statements from the Department of State and the Department of Energy confirming that the United States was under no commitment to purchase heavy water from Iran nor is it committed to do so in the future. The Obama administration only acknowledged this fact last month as a result of a congressional inquiry from my office.

This legislation is really very simple and as straightforward as you can get. H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act, would prohibit Federal funds from being used to purchase heavy water and also prohibit Federal funds from being used to issue licenses to purchase heavy water from Iran.

Tomorrow marks the 1-year anniversary of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This week, the House is taking a stand against Iran and the dangerous deal this Nation entered into—reflecting very much what I hear when I am back in Kansas.

Americans know President Obama's unsigned and unratified political commitment with the Islamic Republic of Iran does not make them safer. Americans see Iran continue to test sophisticated ballistic missiles. They see Iran capture and humiliate American sailors. They see Iran hold Americans and other foreigners hostage. They see Iran fire rockets dangerously close to American aircraft carriers.

While many constituents are back home watching us vote on this issue, the Iranian Ayatollah is watching this too. I know this because Iran is desperate. On Monday, it announced that it had received \$8.6 million in exchange for 32 tons of Iranian heavy water that the Obama administration wanted to purchase back in April.

Only then, only after the Iranians had chosen to reveal the status of this funding, shortly before this very vote, did the Obama administration come clean to the American public with some details of this sale.

Mr. Speaker, must we always find out what is happening between the United States and Iran from the Iranians?

Mr. Speaker, my bill will protect Americans and ensure the United States does not become an active partner in Iran's nuclear program and its terror regime. We cannot legitimize this nuclear proliferator. We have already done enough for the Islamic Republic of Iran. We need not act outside the requirements of the nuclear deal, no matter how much Iranian mullahs

complain and no matter how much they threaten.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one year ago, our country made the correct decision. We all agreed that Iran should not have a nuclear weapons program, but we decided the better way to achieve that was through diplomacy rather than war.

Today, we deal with yet another challenge to that agreement. The material involved is heavy water. For those who thought that war and military action was the only way to prevent nuclear weapons development in Iran, heavy water is the issue today, but it is just another way to sink a successful agreement.

□ 1630

When you look at the facts, how can it possibly be in our national interest to take away our own authority to take away from Iran a material that could be used in the development of nuclear weapons?

I don't think this is just about heavy water. When you consider the facts and all that is represented here, it is a heavy lift, or a heavy stretch, to believe that limiting ourselves somehow will protect our families.

There are a number of nonmilitary uses for heavy water. The water we are getting from Iran can be used by U.S. industry and research labs. Heavy water is a critical material for biomedical and diagnostic research, such as MRIs and pharmaceutical development, as well as a variety of chemical and environmental analysis.

By purchasing this material, we make our families and allies safer and boost American research and development. Exposed to light, objections to our procuring this heavy water really do evaporate.

In World War II, many lives were lost to keep heavy water developed by a Norwegian utility from being used by Nazi Germany for development of a nuclear weapon. Here, we are using dollars instead of the lives of young Americans and others to ensure there is no nuclear weapons development within Iran and that there is less of this dual-use material in Iran, and more of it in America.

I realize the strong desire here on the eve of the Republican National Convention to undermine any success this Administration has. But I believe this is a bipartisan success. That is one of the reasons that a large number of experts on security policy—and former Members of this body in the United States Senate, both Republicans and Democrats—have joined together in bipartisan support of an agreement that is working and that is making our families safer.

Don't vote to undermine the efforts of this international agreement. Don't drown diplomacy by adopting this heavy water bill.

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

Again, the reality today is that the agreement was not intended to be structured in a way that would give an inducement for Iran to go forward with a production of heavy water and the export of heavy water because, as we all know, in 15 years this agreement is going to be over. At that point in time, we do not want Iran to have a full-scale industrial weapons production capability.

If we create the market for heavy water—right now under the agreement they are not supposed to have it on hand—if we create the market by continuously purchasing this heavy water, yeah, they are going to continue to produce it and, as a consequence, will further develop their capability.

It is odd to me also, since the sale represents a government intrusion into the North American heavy water market, why we would prefer Iran continue the capability of developing this as opposed to an American ally, Canada.

Why would we open the door to future U.S. purchases of Iran's heavy water, which is what the administration is doing here, and choose Iran as the supplier rather than our ally, Canada?

For these reasons, I am very concerned with that line of argument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this week, the administration agreed to a catastrophic nuclear deal with Iran, a deal that was eventually rejected by Congress in a bipartisan vote.

Despite negotiating from what should have been a position of strength, the Obama administration has gone out of its way to appease Iran. And even more disturbing, the administration admitted that it used a false narrative to sell the nuclear deal to journalists and, ultimately, to the American public.

As if the deal wasn't bad enough, the administration has made it a point to make concession after concession in order to keep Iran happy. The President tells us that Iran is honoring the deal, but German intelligence tells us they are not. We were promised snap-back sanctions, but the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury have been flying around Europe promoting Iran while trying to find creative ways to give Iran access to the U.S. dollar. Lately, it seems that our cabinet secretaries are acting more like ambassadors-at-large for the Iranian Chamber of Commerce than Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of State.

We were told this deal wasn't about normalizing relations with Iran, but the administration reportedly is weighing whether to back Iran's bid to join the World Trade Organization. Rather

than just adhere to the deal, we are going above and beyond. We are using taxpayer dollars to buy heavy water from Iran and indirectly eating Iran's nefarious destabilizing activities in the region.

The administration claimed they understood the concerns of our ally, Israel; but Iran violated the U.S. resolution by firing a ballistic missile that said Israel must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, the administration assured us that they are going to push back on Iran's destabilizing activities and human rights concerns, but 12 months later it seems like we have only empowered them.

If the administration won't hold Iran accountable, then the responsibility falls on the people's House.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Iran-related measures on the floor this week.

The ranking member, a few minutes ago, made a point of suggesting that there is no chance that the President would sign this bill, and that we are wasting our time by debating it here today. It is incumbent on us to call out the shortcomings on this deal. It is incumbent on the House and the Members of the House to point out when Iran has violated the deal. As I said frequently during the debate, you cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

I am listening to the debate and, frankly, it is interesting to have the two diametrically opposed views. This agreement a year ago was supported by a range of former Secretaries of State in both parties. It was an opportunity to move forward with our principal allies and with China and with Russia to try and make Iran less likely to develop nuclear weapons.

Mercifully, the agreement is in force, and for this first year it is working. There is a reactor filled with concrete. This item here today is an example of progress that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to turn back. Under this agreement, they are required to reduce the supply of heavy water. We are purchasing heavy water from them, taking it out of their hands. At the same time, there are 14,000 fewer centrifuges that are operating in Iran and under international supervision.

Why wouldn't we want to take away this essential element for the production of nuclear weapons, especially since the United States has an opportunity to purchase heavy water?

As my good friend from Texas pointed out, there are many research applications for which we need heavy water.

My friend, the chairman of the committee, alluded to the question: Why don't we use the North American production of heavy water?

Well, the United States doesn't manufacture heavy water anymore, and Canada has stopped producing it and is selling it off.

Where are we going to get the heavy water from?

I think it is perfect to get it from Iran. We use it, it is beneficial to us, and it takes a potential dangerous item out of their hands.

I think the House should reject yet another effort to undermine the agreement. The world is safer today than it was a year ago when Iran was a month or 2 away from creating a nuclear weapon, and it created a frenzy on the part of some of the people who are justifiably concerned about Iran. Now that breakout date is a year away and we are strengthening the potential ties.

The United States has serially mismanaged its relations with Iran since we worked with the British to overthrow their popularly elected government in 1953 and install a dictator, the shah, in charge. The United States backed the murderous Saddam Hussein in the Iraq-Iranian war when Saddam Hussein used poisonous gas against Iran.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that Iran is one of the few countries in the Middle East where the majority of the people still like the United States, unlike some of our so-called allies over there.

Admittedly, there are people in the leadership in Iran who are bad people who do bad things. The President of Iran has worked with us to try and move the ball forward. This agreement is a foundation upon which we can build. I am pleased that maybe they would buy airplanes from us rather than the French or the European Union Airbus consortium.

I hope that we can get behind the reflexive opposition to this and look at the facts. I think the facts are, at a minimum, we should buy all of the heavy water from Iran we can at a market rate, get it out of their hands, and help us with our needs.

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

I think there is some confusion here. The point is that Iran is continuing to manufacture heavy water. The point is that we are making a market for their ability to export this instead of taking the legacy stock of heavy water that is in the possession of Canada.

The reason Canada quit producing it is because they have ample stock, and the presumption was they would sell that to the United States. Why? Because Canada is not in the business of trying to become more proficient in de-

veloping a market for something which can be used for nuclear weapons production.

We have ample opportunity to purchase this from our ally. It is still a requirement under the agreement that Iran cut back its reserve of heavy water. If we are going to enter an ongoing program to continue to purchase this from Iran, what we are doing is enabling them, enabling them as they prepare 15 years from now, as I said earlier, to have that turnkey operation where they can then have industrial-size capability for the weapons program.

The other point I would make is that the reason the Iranians have a favorable disposition towards the United States—and that is reflected in the polling that shows that two-thirds of Iranians want a western-style democracy without a theocracy—is because they don't happen to agree with the policies of the Ayatollah and what happened in 1979 with the revolutionary regime grabbing control of that government.

The consequences of that government nationalizing companies is that the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps actually controls the economy. When we put money into that regime, what we are actually doing is aiding and abetting the efforts of those that go to the streets and yell "Death to America" and "Death to Israel," and that is exactly what the Ayatollah does.

We should have had a tilt to Iran, yes; but that tilt to Iran should have been to the people of Iran who had that election stolen from them.

□ 1645

That is where our tilt should have been. Instead, we are walking on eggshells, and every time there is a new demand like this one, that we now purchase and aid and abet their ongoing development of capability on heavy water, it is beyond me. We have an annual report that was published last month by the German Intelligence Service, and this is what it reads:

The illegal proliferation-sensitive procurement activities by Iran in Germany, registered by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution, persisted at what is, even by international standards, a quantitatively high level last year. This holds true, in particular, with regard to items which can be used in the field of nuclear technology.

Iran is violating this agreement as we speak. It is not being enforced. The debate here should be how we enforce this agreement, not how we augment activities to further encourage the regime to avoid what it agreed to.

Iran remains a center of illicit procurement, anxious to find ways to circumvent U.S. export controls and sanctions. The nuclear deal acknowledged this in annex I, which states that Iran intends to apply nuclear export policies and practices in line with internationally established standards for the export of nuclear material, equipment, and technology.

Now, Iran has done absolutely nothing to implement this provision of the agreement, and the administration appears content to allow them to get out of doing so. That is what is concerning.

Finally, the components for the heavy water plant were illicitly procured. Essentially, the United States Government is buying pirated heavy water because the components for that heavy water plant were illicitly procured.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act.

It is now clear that a glaring side effect of the disastrous nuclear deal with Iran is that it incentivizes Iran to keep overproducing heavy water—a critical component in the production of weapons-grade plutonium. Because this administration sees no problem with creating a new U.S.-approved heavy water marketplace, it is, thereby, giving Iran a green light to continue overproducing. There should, instead, be serious consequences for Iran's overproduction of heavy water. Under the administration's logic, we are paying and rewarding Iran for being in violation of the nuclear agreement, and we are making it easier for them to have nuclear weapons in the future.

It is high time for this administration to admit to the American people and to itself that Iran has no intention of complying with the nuclear deal. We should not give them any more concessions that cost American taxpayers their hard-earned dollars while advancing Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend Mr. POMPEO and the chairman for their leadership on this issue, and I echo what the chairman said just a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act. This legislation would block the licensing and purchasing of heavy water—nuclear material that is needed for a nuclear weapon—from Iran.

The bill became necessary when the administration announced it intended to make an \$8.6 million purchase of 32 tons of this nuclear material despite the purchase not being required by the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Further, the administration never clarified how Iran would use such funds or if steps would be taken to ensure U.S. taxpayer dollars are not used by Iran to support terrorism, Iran's ballistic missile program, or to finance other nefarious activities or bad actors in the region.

The bill is necessary, unfortunately, because Iran is still producing heavy

water, and, now, to echo the chairman's sentiments, we are creating a market for it. That just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the chairman for his leadership. I think this is a very serious issue. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Pennsylvania. There is no requirement under the agreement that Iran cannot manufacture heavy water. There is a limit on the amount that they can possess. That is why the reserves are in storage elsewhere. The amount that we are talking about now is already being shipped to the United States as we speak.

Iran has a right, under the agreement, to continue producing heavy water, which it will.

Where is the heavy water going to go?

They can sell it on the global market. I would rather they sell it to the United States at market price than to North Korea or to Pakistan or to some other actor.

This bill is misguided and misses the point. They are not violating the agreement. We are better off in having the heavy water that we need, that we don't produce, and that Canada has stopped producing that we will be able to reinforce the possibility of having a successful agreement over time.

I appreciate the ranking member for giving me the opportunity to at least clarify what I think is reality.

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

A clarifying point is that they cannot sell it to North Korea. Iran would not be able to do that because North Korea is under sanctions on just that point.

I would also just make the argument that there is no scientific or medical breakthrough that is dependent upon purchases of heavy water from Iran; and, if there were, I have no doubt that we could work with our ally, Canada, to make it happen because Canada, in particular, has been creating a reliable, long-term heavy water supply that is able to meet the projected increased needs in North America and elsewhere. Canada stopped producing more because they have too much, and they anticipated that we would purchase this from them. The United States should support our ally, Canada, in this effort rather than in subsidizing a state sponsor of terrorism's production of sensitive material.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank Mr. POMPEO for his work on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 5119, and I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

Here, on the anniversary of Mr. Obama's deal with the theocracy of Iran, passing the No 2H2O from Iran Act is a commonsense thing to do.

There is nothing in the failed, ill-conceived, misdirected, poorly designed disaster of a nuclear deal which says the United States Government is required to help Iran fulfill its commitments to limit its stores of heavy water. I remain unconvinced today by the arguments of my friends in the loyal opposition of the idea that our government would obligate our taxpayers or even possess an option to buy Iranian heavy water in the future. It is ridiculous. There is a private market for heavy water in this world, and the Iranians are welcome to meet their deal obligations in that private market. It is Iran's responsibility to comply with the limits of its heavy water agreement.

As to the nuclear deal, it is not the United States' or any other country's responsibility to buy a commodity in an already limited global market from a government that has done nothing to indicate that it is a friend.

I am proud to support this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

I thank the chairman for his leadership consistently on analyzing the President's transaction with Iran and its shortcomings. Here, a year has passed, and we still see the failings of this transaction every time we turn.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the chairman. I really appreciate Chairman ROYCE for offering this legislation, and I thank MIKE POMPEO for all of his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, here is the deal. We were told by people like Ben Rhodes that the Iran agreement was going to capitalize on winds of change inside Iran and that this could be a way for Iran to cease its offending conduct and become part of the community of nations. Yet here we are, over a year out from this Iran deal, and Iran is increasing its illegal proliferation procurement activities. It is increasing its missile procurement activities. This is not the action of a country that is looking to make nice with the rest of the world. They are taking the concessions that were granted to them in this Iran deal, and they are taking advantage of them, and they are expanding their influence throughout the Middle East.

It is curious because the deal itself, I think, clearly, in looking back on it, has been a failure; but what the administration is doing is doubling down on that, and it is going even beyond what the deal says. It wants to give Iran indirect access to the American dollar. Then this purchasing of heavy water is not a requirement of the deal's. It, ef-

fectively, acts as a subsidy on Iran for Iran's nuclear program. We see other things like really lucrative aircraft deals that will help Iran transport weapons to its proxies in places like Syria and Lebanon.

Of course, there are reports about uranium being found in Parchin, one of the military sites. We are never going to be able to inspect Parchin. That is not even in the deal. That is totally off the table. Iran is not going to permit inspections there; so you could have some of this activity continuing apace there.

I think it is great that a majority of us in this House has been on the right side of this in voting against the Iran deal, in voting for a number of years to sustain very tough sanctions on Iran. And now this series of bills that we have, I think, is important, and particularly the heavy water issue, because it is an unnecessary illicit subsidy that we are sending over to Iran.

If you ask the American people whether they want their tax dollars going to subsidize Iran's nuclear program, you will have overwhelming opposition to such a policy; so I am happy to be here, speaking in favor of this and of the other measures.

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

In the summer of 2013, we passed a very tough sanctions bill against Iran. The chairman and I worked on it together very closely, and we passed it unanimously out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Think about that—unanimously. We have so many different ranges of ideologies on the committee; yet, when it came to slapping sanctions on a murderous regime, we found bipartisan consensus unanimously. That bill went to the House floor and passed by a margin of 400-20. We sent it over to the Senate, and, unfortunately, the Senate sat on it. It didn't pass it.

I raise this because it shows what can happen when we work in a bipartisan fashion on important foreign policy issues. This is important. My friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle who came up and who spoke disparagingly about Iran and the Iranian Government will get no quarrel from me. I am no fan of the regime's and I am no fan of a lot of things, but I do think that if we are going to pass legislation that is going to have meaning, then we ought to do it together in a bipartisan form.

□ 1700

For the past 3½ years, Chairman ROYCE and myself have worked really, really hard to put our heads together and come up with bipartisan legislation, and this could have been the same. This could have been the same.

This could have come to the Foreign Affairs Committee. We would have debated it, and we would have passed it probably. There would have been some changes with some difficulties that some of us find in the bill, and perhaps we would have had a very similar vote. But it wasn't done that way.

No regular order. Taking the bill out of the Foreign Affairs Committee, where no one on the committee had a chance to either vote or speak on it or give their opinion—absolutely nothing. It was taken to the Rules Committee, rammed down, and came to the floor of the House. There was no process, no transparency, no regular order, no bipartisanship.

My God, if we cannot be bipartisan when it comes to foreign policy, what can we be bipartisan on? Here is a perfect example.

So what happens is this bill is going to pass. I predict it will pass, mostly along political lines. The President won't sign it. It won't probably pass the other House.

But maybe if we had put our heads together and all worked together and sent the bills to the Foreign Affairs Committee and came up with legislation, maybe we could have had a bill that did 80 percent of what this bill did, or maybe 90 percent, or maybe 100 percent but had certain things in there—waivers and other things that are necessary—in the bill. That is why I know that this is not a serious attempt at doing it. It is an amendment attempt to score political brownie points, and that is not what we should be all about, and that is not what we should be doing.

My friends on the other side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle know, when I talk about foreign policy, I try to be principled. We may not always agree, but I try to be principled on it. I try to say what I feel. I try to find common ground.

So I hope this will be an anomaly. I hope that we can go back to the bipartisan ways of the committee. I know tomorrow morning when we mark up all those bills we will be doing it in a bipartisan way and, when we come to legislation, the final product, that it is bipartisan. It is not being bipartisan for the sake of it being bipartisan. It is not just a semantical debate. It is the fact that it is good legislation on foreign policy, and we always say that partisanship should stop at the water's edge.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have gone on trips all over the world. We have bipartisan delegations all the time. And what we always find is, as Americans, when we go around the world, there is very little that divides us. There is very little that divides us.

When we were in the majority and I was chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee for 4 years, we went around to all these countries. Everyone on my committee on my trip, Democrat or Republican, had the ability to say whatever was on their mind and not once was there ever a problem because, as Americans, we have so much more in common than we have differences. And that is why, again, bipartisanship should stop at the water's edge.

I worry because the world is watching as American foreign policy falls

victim to partisan politics. And, tomorrow, unfortunately, with another bill, we are going to get more of the same.

So I hope that, in the future, we can get back to business as usual because I know that Congress can work to push back on Iran's dangerous behavior. I know that we can hold Iran's feet to the fire and make sure that the nuclear deal, which passed—again, without my vote, but it passed—and I want to make sure that that nuclear deal is being implemented properly.

That is what we have to do: hold Iran's feet to the fire, do it in a bipartisan way, not try to score political brownie points.

We all love this country. We want the right thing for this country. Let's work together to make sure that foreign policy is as bipartisan as it can be.

For now, I have to vote "no" on this bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a concern with the administration's decision on this issue over Iran, not necessarily my colleagues here. My concern is that, regardless of how we perceive the Iran deal that we voted on on the floor, my concern is that the administration is now going beyond that deal. It is the administration's conduct here that gives me pause.

When I hear the Secretary of Energy for the President, Mr. Ernest Moniz, he made it clear that the U.S. purchase of this heavy water, in his words, "will be a statement to the world: 'You want to buy heavy water from Iran, you can buy heavy water from Iran. It's been done. Even the United States did it.'"

Why are we giving the seal of approval to Iran's heavy water production? Why is the administration doing that? This is beyond me. It is beyond many experts.

I previously quoted nonproliferation expert David Albright, who has said we shouldn't be paying Iran for something they shouldn't be producing in the first place.

With this policy of purchasing Iran's heavy water, the Obama administration is achieving two things. And neither of those two things, in my opinion, are good. It is legitimatizing Iran's nuclear program, and it is putting more money into Iran's pocket.

More buyers for Iran's heavy water means it will continue to produce this sensitive material. And in just 15 years, when the President's flawed nuclear deal expires, Iran can use this heavy water to produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The Obama administration's latest effort to go above and beyond to accommodate Iran should be rejected.

So I would urge all Members to support this bill.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 819, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on S. 304; and passage of S. 304, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 176, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—249

Abraham	Fincher	Lamborn
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Allen	Fleischmann	Latta
Amash	Fleming	Lieu, Ted
Amodei	Flores	Lipinski
Ashford	Forbes	LoBiondo
Babin	Fortenberry	Long
Barletta	Fox	Love
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Barton	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Benishek	Garrett	Lummis
Bilirakis	Gibbs	MacArthur
Bishop (MI)	Gibson	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Marino
Black	Goodlatte	Massie
Blackburn	Gosar	McCarthy
Blum	Gowdy	McCaul
Bost	Graham	McClintock
Boustany	Granger	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Brat	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Brooks (AL)	Green, Gene	McSally
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	Meadows
Buchanan	Grothman	Meehan
Buck	Guinta	Messer
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mica
Burgess	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Byrne	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Harper	Moolenaar
Cárdenas	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA)	Hartzler	Mullin
Carter (TX)	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Clawson (FL)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Coffman	Hill	Noem
Cole	Holding	Nugent
Collins (GA)	Hudson	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Huelskamp	Olson
Comstock	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Conaway	Hultgren	Palmer
Cook	Hunter	Paulsen
Costello (PA)	Hurd (TX)	Perry
Cramer	Hurt (VA)	Peterson
Crawford	Issa	Pittenger
Crenshaw	Jenkins (KS)	Pitts
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
Davidson	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Davis, Rodney	Jolly	Price, Tom
Denham	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Dent	Joyce	Reed
DeSantis	Katko	Reichert
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Renacci
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
Dold	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
Donovan	King (NY)	Rigell
Duffy	Kinzing (IL)	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Roe (TN)
Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher

Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker

Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

□ 1731

Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, VELA, and CÁRDENAS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 636) “An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.”.

#### CONGRESSIONAL GOLF TOURNAMENT

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the results of a competition that takes place every year.

Every year, the House Republicans play against the House Democrats in a golf match that is patterned after the Ryder Cup. This is called the Congressional Cup.

This takes place once each year, and I have been privileged to serve as the captain of the Republican team for 4 years. I am pleased to announce with all the humility I can muster that the Republicans have won again for the fourth straight year.

The good news is that it is a fundraising event that has raised nearly \$2 million for an organization called First Tee, which introduces young people to the game of golf.

The event this year raised a little less than \$100,000. As I said, over a 15-year period, we have raised over \$2 million.

This introduces young people to the game of golf; the principles of golf, like discipline, hard work, and commitment; and life skills to help those individuals.

So I want to congratulate the members of the team for another great win.

There was a lot of hard work, dedication, et cetera.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), my counterpart, the captain of the Democratic team.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

I am beginning to feel a little bit like “Groundhog Day.” Unfortunately, no matter what Bill Murray does, the result seems to be the same. We keep changing team members, strategies, and so forth, but it hasn’t mattered.

My congratulations to the Republican team. They played extremely well. We will keep trying.

The most important thing, as my colleague said, is the incredible sums of money we raise to help a phenomenal program like First Tee. Most everybody in this body has a First Tee chapter in their district. I know I don’t need to talk about the great benefit it provides to American youth.

So, once again, congratulations to the Republican team.

My final comment would be to say it has been an honor and a pleasure to co-captain this event with my good friend, ANDER CRENSHAW. This will be his last year as captain. I will miss him, but he has comforted himself in every instance with the class and grace you would expect of an avid golfer, as have the members of both teams.

Once again, congratulations to the Republicans. We will see you again next year.

#### CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 244, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

#### YEAS—182

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

#### NAYS—176

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

#### NOT VOTING—8

Davis, Danny	Loudermilk	Takai
Hastings	Pearce	Young (IN)
Knight	Poe (TX)	

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Crowley	Kennedy	Polis	McHenry	Reichert	Stivers	Duffy	Kline	Roby
Cuellar	Kildee	Price (NC)	McKinley	Renacci	Stutzman	Duncan (SC)	Knight	Roe (TN)
Cummings	Kilmer	Quigley	McMorris	Ribble	Thompson (PA)	Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Rangel	Rodgers	Rice (SC)	Thornberry	Ellmers (NC)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)	McSally	Rigell	Tiberi	Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
DeGette	Kuster	Richmond	Meadows	Roby	Tipton	Farenthold	Lamborn	Rokita
Delaney	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Meehan	Roe (TN)	Trott	Fincher	Lance	Rooney (FL)
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	Messer	Rogers (AL)	Turner	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Mica	Rogers (KY)	Upton	Fleischmann	Lipinski	Roskam
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rush	Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Valadao	Fleming	LoBiondo	Ross
Deutch	Lee	Ryan (OH)	Miller (MI)	Rokita	Wagner	Flores	Long	Rothfus
Dingell	Levin	Sánchez, Linda	Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Walberg	Forbes	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Doggett	Lewis	T.	Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden	Fortenberry	Love	Royce
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez, Loretta	Mullin	Roskam	Walker	Fox	Lucas	Salmon
F.	Loebach	Sarbanes	Mulvaney	Ross	Walorski	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Duckworth	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi	Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Scalise
Edwards	Lowenthal	Schiff	Neugebauer	Rouzer	Weber (TX)	Garrett	MacArthur	Schweikert
Ellison	Lowey	Schrader	Newhouse	Royce	Gibbs	Gibson	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)	Noem	Russell	Webster (FL)	Gohmert	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Eshoo	(NM)	Scott, David	Nugent	Salmon	Wenstrup	Goodlatte	Massie	Sessions
Esty	Luján, Ben Ray	Serrano	Nunes	Sanford	Westerman	Gosar	McCarthy	Shimkus
Farr	(NM)	Sewell (AL)	Olson	Scalise	Whitfield	Gowdy	McCaul	Shuster
Foster	Lynch	Sherman	Palazzo	Schweikert	Williams	Granger	McClintock	Simpson
Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Sinema	Palmer	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)	Graves (GA)	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Fudge	Carolyn	Sires	Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Wittman	Graves (LA)	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter	Perry	Sessions	Womack	Graves (MO)	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Gallagher	Matsui	Smith (WA)	Peterson	Shimkus	Woodall	Rodgers	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Garamendi	McCollum	Speier	Pittenger	Shuster	Yoder	Griffith	McSally	Stefanik
Graham	McDermott	Swalwell (CA)	Pitts	Simpson	Yoho	Grothman	Meadows	Stewart
Grayson	McGovern	Takano	Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)	Guinta	Meehan	Stivers
Green, Al	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Pompeo	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)	Guthrie	Messer	Stutzman
Green, Gene	Meeks	Thompson (MS)	Posey	Smith (NJ)	Young (IN)	Hardy	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Grijalva	Meng	Titus	Price, Tom	Smith (TX)	Zeldin	Harper	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Gutiérrez	Moore	Tonko	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Zinke	Harris	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Hahn	Moulton	Torres	Reed	Stewart		Hartzler	Moolenaar	Tipton
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas				Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Trott
Higgins	Nadler	Van Hollen				Hensarling	Mullin	Turner
Himes	Napolitano	Vargas	Davis, Danny	Hastings	Takai	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Upton
Hinojosa	Neal	Veasey	Davis, Rodney	Pearce		Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Honda	Nolan	Vela	Franks (AZ)	Poe (TX)		Hill	Neugebauer	Wagner
Hoyer	Norcross	Velázquez				Holding	Newhouse	Walberg
Huffman	O'Rourke	Visclosky				Hudson	Noem	Walden
Israel	Pallone	Walz				Huelskamp	Nugent	Walker
Jackson Lee	Pascrell	Wasserman				Huizenga (MI)	Nunes	Walorski
Jeffries	Payne	Schultz				Hultgren	Olson	Walters, Mimi
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine				Hunter	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman				Hurd (TX)	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Kaptur	Peters	Welch				Hurt (VA)	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Keating	Pingree	Wilson (FL)				Issa	Perry	Westerman
Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Yarmuth				Jenkins (KS)	Peterson	Westmoreland
						Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Whitfield
						Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Williams
						Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Wilson (SC)
						Jolly	Pompeo	Wittman
						Jones	Posey	Womack
						Jordan	Price, Tom	Woodall
						Joyce	Ratcliffe	Yoder
						Katko	Reed	Yoho
						Kelly (MS)	Reichert	Young (AK)
						Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Young (IA)
						King (IA)	Ribble	Young (IN)
						King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
						Kinzingler (IL)	Rigell	Zinke

## NOT VOTING—7

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1741

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 442, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 182, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—245

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

Davidson  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.

Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzingler (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishke  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)

Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)

Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan

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

Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallagher  
Garamendi  
Graham

NAYS—182

Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin

Lewis	O'Rourke	Serrano
Lieu, Ted	Pallone	Sewell (AL)
Loeb	Pascarella	Sherman
Lofgren	Payne	Sinema
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Sires
Lowey	Perlmuter	Slaughter
Lujan Grisham	Peters	Smith (WA)
(NM)	Pingree	Speier
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Swaiwell (CA)
(NM)	Polis	Takano
Lynch	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Maloney,	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Carolyn	Rangel	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Tonko
Matsui	Richmond	Torres
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
McDermott	Ruiz	Van Hollen
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Vargas
McNerney	Rush	Veasey
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Meng	Sanchez, Linda	Velázquez
Moore	T.	Visclosky
Moulton	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Nadler	Schakowsky	Schultz
Napolitano	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Neal	Schrader	Watson Coleman
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Welch
Norcross	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—6

Hastings	Poe (TX)	Takai
Pearce	Russell	Yarmuth

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1748

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 443, on the passage of S. 304, I am not recorded because I am representing constituents in business outside of Washington, DC. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5588. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3055. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5538.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1750

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by the gentleman woman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) had been disposed of.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 45 by Mr. BOUSTANY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Amendment No. 57 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 63 by Ms. GRAHAM of Florida.

Amendment No. 64 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 68 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 72 by Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

Amendment No. 73 by Mr. NEWHOUSE of Washington.

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 195, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—234

Abraham	Amodei	Barr
Aderholt	Ashford	Barton
Allen	Babin	Benishke
Amash	Barletta	Bilirakis

Amodei	Barr
Ashford	Barton
Babin	Benishke
Barletta	Bilirakis

Bishop (GA)	Bishop (MI)	Bishop (UT)
Black	Blackburn	Blum
Bost	Boustany	Brady (TX)
Brat	Bridenstine	Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Buck	Bucshon
Burgess	Byrne	Calvert
Carter (GA)	Carter (TX)	Chabot
Chaffetz	Coffman	Cole
Collins (GA)	Collins (NY)	Comstock
Conaway	Cook	Costa
Costello (PA)	Cramer	Crawford
Crenshaw	Cuellar	Culberson
Davidson	Davis, Rodney	Denham
Dent	DeSantis	DesJarlais
Donovan	Duffy	Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Ellmers (NC)	Emmer (MN)
Farenthold	Fincher	Fleischmann
Fleming	Flores	Forbes
Fortenberry	Fox	Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen	Garrett	Gibbs
Gohmert	Goodlatte	Gosar
Gowdy	Granger	Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)	Graves (MO)	Green, Gene
Griffith	Grothman	Guinta
Guthrie	Hardy	Harper

Harris	Hartzler	Heck (NV)
Hensarling	Herrera Beutler	Hice, Jody B.
Hill	Holding	Hudson
Huelskamp	Huizenga (MI)	Hultgren
Hunter	Hurd (TX)	Hurt (VA)
Issa	Jenkins (KS)	Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)	Johnson, Sam	Jordan
Joyce	Kelly (MS)	Kelly (PA)
Kildee	King (IA)	King (NY)
Kinzie	Kinzie	Kline
Knight	Labrador	LaHood
LaMalfa	Lamborn	Lance
Langevin	Latta	Long
Loudermilk	Love	Lucas
Luetkemeyer	Lummis	Marchant
Marino	Massie	McCarthy
McCaul	McClintock	McHenry
McKinley	McMorris	McRory
Meadows	Meehan	Messer
Mica	Miller (FL)	Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)	Mullin	Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)	Neugebauer	Newhouse
Noem	Nunes	Olson
Palazzo	Palmer	Paulsen
Perry	Peterson	Pittenger

## NOES—195

Adams	Cartwright	DeGette
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Beatty	Chu, Judy	DelBene
Becerra	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bera	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Diaz-Balart
Blumenauer	Clawson (FL)	Dingell
Bonamici	Clay	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	Dold
F.	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Brady (PA)	Cohen	F.
Brown (FL)	Connolly	Duckworth
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Edwards
Buchanan	Cooper	Ellison
Bustos	Courtney	Engel
Butterfield	Crowley	Eshoo
Capps	Cummings	Esty
Capuano	Curbelo (FL)	Farr
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Fitzpatrick
Carney	Davis, Danny	Foster
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Frankel (FL)

Fudge Lowenthal Ruiz Bucshon Huizenga (MI) Ratcliffe  
 Gabbard Lowey Ruppertsberger Burgess Hultgren  
 Gallego Lujan Grisham Rush Byrne Hultgren  
 Garamendi (NM) Ryan (OH) Calvert Hurd (TX)  
 Gibson Luján, Ben Ray Carter (GA) Hurl (VA)  
 Graham (NM) Sánchez, Linda T. Carter (TX)  
 Grayson Lynch Sanchez, Loretta Chabot  
 Green, Al MacArthur Chaffetz  
 Grijalva Maloney, Sanford  
 Gutiérrez Carolyn Sarbanes  
 Hahn Maloney, Sean Schakowsky  
 Hanna Matsui Schiff  
 Heck (WA) McCollum Schrader  
 Higgins McDermott Scott (VA)  
 Himes McGovern Scott, David  
 Hinojosa McNerney Serrano  
 Honda Meeks Sewell (AL)  
 Hoyer Meng Sherman  
 Huffman Miller (MI) Sinema  
 Israel Moore Sires  
 Jackson Lee Moulton Slaughter  
 Jeffries Murphy (FL) Smith (NJ)  
 Johnson (GA) Nadler Smith (WA)  
 Johnson, E. B. Napolitano Speier  
 Jolly Neal Stefanik  
 Jones Nolan Swailwell (CA)  
 Kaptur Norcross Takano  
 Katko Nugent Thompson (CA)  
 Keating O'Rourke Thompson (MS)  
 Kelly (IL) Pallone Titus  
 Kennedy Pascarell Tonko  
 Kilmer Payne Torres  
 Kind Pelosi Tsongas  
 Kirkpatrick Perlmutter Van Hollen  
 Kuster Peters Vargas  
 Larsen (WA) Pingree Velázquez  
 Larson (CT) Pocan Visclosky  
 Lawrence Polis Walz  
 Lee Price (NC)  
 Levin Quigley Wasserman  
 Lewis Rangel Schultz  
 Lieu, Ted Reichert Waters, Maxine  
 Lipinski Rice (NY) Welch  
 LoBiondo Richmond Wilson (FL)  
 Loeb sack Ros-Lehtinen Yarmuth  
 Lofgren Roybal-Allard

## NOT VOTING—4

Hastings Poe (TX)  
 Pearce Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1753

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 237, noes 189,  
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—237

Abraham Barton Boustany  
 Aderholt Benishek Brady (TX)  
 Allen Bilirakis Brat  
 Amash Bishop (MI) Bridenstine  
 Amodei Bishop (UT) Brooks (AL)  
 Babin Black Brooks (IN)  
 Barletta Blum Buchanan  
 Barr Bost Buck

Brady (PA) Brown (FL) Brownley (CA)  
 Brownley (CA) Bustos  
 Butterfield Capps  
 Capuano Cardenas  
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright Castor (FL)

Bucshon Burgess  
 Byrnes Calvert  
 Carter (GA) Carter (TX)  
 Chabot Chaffetz  
 Clawson (FL) Coffman  
 Cole Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY) Comstock  
 Conaway Cook  
 Costello (PA) Cramer  
 Crawford Crenshaw  
 Cuellar Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL) Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney Denham  
 Dent Desantis  
 DesJarlais Diaz-Balart  
 Donovan Duffy  
 Duncan (SC) Duncan (TN)  
 Lummis Ellmers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN) Farenthold  
 Fincher Fleischmann  
 Fleming Flores  
 Forbes Fox  
 Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen  
 Garretts Gibbs  
 Gibson Gohmert  
 Goodlatte Gosar  
 Gowdy Granger  
 Graves (GA) Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO) Griffith  
 Grothman Guinta  
 Guthrie Hardy  
 Harper Harris  
 Hartzler Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B. Hill  
 Holding Hudson  
 Huelskamp

## NOES—189

Adams Castro (TX)  
 Aguilar Chu, Judy  
 Ashford Cicilline  
 Bass Clark (MA)  
 Beatty Clarke (NY)  
 Becerra Clay  
 Bera Clyburn  
 Beyer Cohen  
 Bishop (GA) Connolly  
 Blumenauer Conyers  
 Bonamici Cooper  
 Boyle, Brendan Costa  
 F. Courtney  
 Brady (PA) Crowley  
 Brown (FL) Cummings  
 Brownley (CA) Davis (CA)  
 Bustos Davis, Danny  
 Butterfield DeFazio  
 Capps DeGette  
 Capuano Delaney  
 Cardenas DeLauro  
 Carney DeBene  
 Carson (IN) DeSaunier  
 Cartwright Deutch  
 Castor (FL) Dingell

Huizenga (MI) Hultgren  
 Hunter Hurd (TX)  
 Hurl (VA) Issa  
 Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH) Johnson, Sam  
 Jones Jordan  
 Joyce Katko  
 Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA) King (NY)  
 King (NY) Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline Knight  
 Labrador LaHood  
 LaMalfa Lamborn  
 Lance Latta  
 LoBiondo Long  
 Loudermilk Love  
 Lucas Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis MacArthur  
 Marchant Marino  
 Massie McCarthy  
 McCaul McCintock  
 McHenry McKinley  
 McMorris Rodgers  
 Meadows McSally  
 Meadows Meehan  
 Messer Mica  
 Miller (FL) Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA) Neugebauer  
 Newhouse Noem  
 Nugent Nunes  
 Olson Palazzo  
 Palmer Paulsen  
 Perry Pittenger  
 Pitts Pompeo  
 Posey Price, Tom

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

Blackburn  
 Cleaver  
 Hastings

Pearce  
 Poe (TX)  
 Russell

Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1756

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 231, noes 197,  
 not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—231

Abraham Bishop (MI) Buchanan  
 Aderholt Bishop (UT) Buck  
 Allen Black Bucshon  
 Amash Blackburn Burgess  
 Amodei Blum Byrne  
 Ashford Bost Calvert  
 Babin Boustany Carter (GA)  
 Barletta Brady (TX) Carter (TX)  
 Barr Brat Chabot  
 Barton Bridenstine Chaffetz  
 Benishek Brooks (AL) Clawson (FL)  
 Bilirakis Brooks (IN) Coffman

Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ribble	Joyce	Meeks	Sarbanes	Dingell	Lee	Quigley
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rice (SC)	Kaptur	Meng	Schakowsky	Doggett	Levin	Rangel
Collins (NY)	Jones	Roby	Keating	Miller (MI)	Schiff	Donovan	Lewis	Reichert
Conaway	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott (VA)	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)
Cook	Katko	Rogers (AL)	Kennedy	Moulton	Scott, David	F.	LoBiondo	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)	Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Duckworth	Loeb sack	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher	Kilmer	Nadler	Sewell (AL)	Edwards	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Crawford	King (IA)	Rokita	Kind	Napolitano	Sherman	Ellison	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Neal	Sinema	Engel	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kinzingler (IL)	Roskam	Kuster	Nolan	Sires	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	Kline	Ross	Langevin	Norcross	Slaughter	Esty	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Davidson	Knight	Rothfus	Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Smith (NJ)	Farr	Luján, Ben Ray	T.
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Rouzer	Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Foster	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Denham	LaHood	Royce	Lawrence	Pascrell	Speier	Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Sanford
Dent	LaMalfa	Russell	Lee	Paulsen	Swalwell (CA)	Fudge	Maloney,	Sarbanes
DeSantis	Lamborn	Salmon	Levin	Payne	Takano	Gabbard	Carolyn	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	Lance	Sanford	Lewis	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scalise	Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)	Garamendi	Matsui	Schrader
Donovan	Long	Schrad er	Lipinski	Peters	Titus	Garrett	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Schweikert	LoBiondo	Pingree	Tonko	McDermott	McDermott	Scott, David
Duncan (SC)	Love	Scott, Austin	Loeb sack	Pocan	Torres	McGovern	McGovern	Serrano
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Sensenbrenner	Lofgren	Polis	Tsongas	McNerney	McNerney	Sherman
Ellmers (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	Hahn	Meeks	Sires
Emmer (MN)	Lummis	Shimkus	Lowey	Rangel	Vargas	Heck (WA)	Meng	Slaughter
Farenthold	MacArthur	Shuster	Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)	Veasey	Higgins	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	Marchant	Simpson	(NM)	Richmond	Vela	Himes	Moore	Smith (WA)
Fleischmann	Marino	Smith (MO)	Luján, Ben Ray	Rigell	Velázquez	Honda	Moulton	Speier
Fleming	Massie	Smith (NE)	(NM)	Ros-Lehtinen	Viscosky	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Flores	McCarthy	Smith (TX)	Lynch	Ruiz	Walz	Huffman	Nadler	Takano
Fortenberry	McCaul	Stefanik	Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman	Israel	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Fox	McClintock	Stewart	Carolyn	Ruppersberger	Schultz	Jeffries	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Stivers	Maloney, Sean	Rush	Waters, Maxine	Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Titus
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Stutzman	Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman	Jolly	Norcross	Tonko
Garrett	McMorris	Thompson (PA)	McCollum	Sánchez, Linda	Welch	Jones	Nugent	Torres
Gibbs	Rodgers	Thornberry	McDermott	T.	Wilson (FL)	Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Gohmert	McSally	Tiberi	McGovern	Sanchez, Loretta	Wittman	Keating	Pascrell	Turner
Goodlatte	Meadows	Tipton	McNerney	Yarmuth	Yarmuth	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen	Van Hollen
Gosar	Meehan	Trott				Kennedy	Payne	Vargas
Gowdy	Messer	Turner				Kilmer	Pelosi	Velázquez
Granger	Mica	Upton				Kind	Perlmutter	Viscosky
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Waladao	Graves (LA)	Pearce	Takai	Kirkpatrick	Peters	Wasserman
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Wagner	Hastings	Poe (TX)		Kuster	Pingree	Schultz
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walberg	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR			Langevin	Pocan	Watson Coleman
Grothman	Mullin	Walden	The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).			Larsen (WA)	Poliquin	Welch
Guinta	Mulvaney	Walker	There is 1 minute remaining.			Larson (CT)	Polis	Wilson (FL)
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Walorski	□ 1800			Lawrence	Posey	Yarmuth
Hardy	Neugebauer	Weber (TX)	So the amendment was agreed to.				Price (NC)	Yoho
Harper	Newhouse	Webster (FL)	The result of the vote was announced					
Hartzer	Noem	Westenstrup	as above recorded.			Abraham	Denham	Hudson
Heck (NV)	Nugent	Westmoreland	AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MS. GRAHAM			Aderholt	Dent	Huelskamp
Hensarling	Nunes	Whitfield	The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished			Allen	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Herrera Beutler	Olson	Williams	business is the demand for a recorded			Amash	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)	vote on the amendment offered by the			Amodei	Dold	Hunter
Hill	Palmer	Womack	gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRA-			Ashford	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Holding	Perry	Woodall	HAM) on which further proceedings			Babin	Duncan (SC)	Hurt (VA)
Hudson	Peterson	Yoder	were postponed and on which the noes			Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Huelskamp	Pittenger	Yoho	prevailed by voice vote.			Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Jackson Lee
Huizenga (MI)	Pitts	Young (AK)	The Clerk will redesignate the			Barton	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (KS)
Hultgren	Poliquin	Young (IA)	amendment.			Bass	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Hunter	Pompeo	Young (IN)	The Clerk redesignated the amend-			Benishek	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Hurd (TX)	Posey	Zinke	ment.			Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, E. B.
Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom					Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Issa	Ratcliffe					Black	Fleming	Jordan
Jenkins (KS)	Reed					Blackburn	Flores	Joyce
Jenkins (WV)	Reichert					Blum	Forbes	Katko
Johnson (OH)	Renacci					Bost	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)

## NOES—197

Adams	Clyburn	Farr
Aguilar	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Bass	Comstock	Forbes
Beatty	Connolly	Foster
Becerra	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Bera	Cooper	Fudge
Beyer	Costa	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gallego
Blumenauer	Crowley	Garamendi
Bonamici	Cummings	Gibson
Boyle, Brendan	Curbelo (FL)	Graham
F.	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Grijalva
Bustos	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hahn
Capps	DelBene	Hanna
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Harris
Cárdenas	Deuth	Heck (WA)
Carney	Dingell	Higgins
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Himes
Cartwright	Dold	Hinojosa
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael	Honda
Castro (TX)	F.	Hoyer
Chu, Judy	Duckworth	Huffman
Cicilline	Edwards	Israel
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Engel	Jeffries
Clay	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Cleaver	Esty	Johnson, E. B.

## NOT VOTING—5

Graves (LA) Pearce  
Hastings Poe (TX)

## □ 1800

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

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MS. GRAHAM  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRA-  
HAM) on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the noes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 185, noes 243,  
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

## AYES—185

Adams	Butterfield	Connolly
Aguilar	Capps	Conyers
Bass	Capuano	Courtney
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crenshaw
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Bera	Cartwright	Cummings
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Curbelo (FL)
Bilirakis	Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Blumenauer	Davis, Danny
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	Delaney
F.	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clawson (FL)	DelBene
Brown (FL)	Clay	DeSantis
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Buchanan	Clyburn	Deuth
Bustos	Cohen	

## NOES—243

Abraham	Denham	Hudson
Aderholt	Dent	Huelskamp
Allen	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Amodei	Dold	Hunter
Ashford	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Babin	Duncan (SC)	Hurt (VA)
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Jackson Lee
Barton	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (KS)
Bass	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Benishek	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Black	Fleming	Jordan
Blackburn	Flores	Joyce
Blum	Forbes	Katko
Bost	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)
Boustany	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Brat	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Kinzingler (IL)
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	Kline
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Knight
Buck	Goodlatte	Labrador
Bucshon	Gosar	LaHood
Burgess	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Byrne	Granger	Lamborn
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Lance
Carney	Graves (LA)	Latta
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Carter (TX)	Green, Al	Long
Chabot	Green, Gene	Loudermilk
Chaffetz	Griffith	Love
Coffman	Grijalva	Lucas
Cole	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Guinta	Lummis
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	MacArthur
Comstock	Hanna	Marchant
Conaway	Hardy	Marino
Cook	Harper	Massie
Cooper	Harris	McCarthy
Costa	Hartzler	McCaul
Costello (PA)	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Cramer	Hensarling	McHenry
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Cuellar	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Culberson	Hill	Rodgers
Davidson	Hinojosa	McSally
Davis, Rodney	Holding	Meadows

Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	Gohmert	Marino	Rokita	Nadler	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Messer	Rohrabacher	Trott	Goodlatte	Massie	Rooney (FL)	Napolitano	Rush	Tiberi
Mica	Rokita	Upton	Gosar	McCarthy	Ross	Neal	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Miller (MI)	Rooney (FL)	Valadao	Gowdy	McCaull	Rothfus	Nolan	Sanchez, Linda	Tonko
Moolenaar	Roskam	Veasey	Granger	McClintock	Rouzer	Norcross	T.	Torres
Mooney (WV)	Ross	Vela	Graves (GA)	McHenry	Royce	O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Mullin	Rothfus	Wagner	Graves (LA)	McMorris	Russell	Pallone	Sarbanes	Turner
Mulvaney	Rouzer	Walberg	Griffith	Rodgers	Salmon	Pascrell	Schakowsky	Upton
Murphy (PA)	Royce	Walden	Grothman	McSally	Sanford	Payne	Schiff	Valadao
Neugebauer	Rush	Walker	Guinta	Meadows	Scalise	Pelosi	Schrader	Van Hollen
Newhouse	Russell	Walorski	Guthrie	Messer	Schweikert	Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Noem	Salmon	Walters, Mimi	Harper	Mica	Scott, Austin	Peters	Scott, David	Veasey
Nunes	Scalise	Walz	Harris	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Peterson	Serrano	Vela
O'Rourke	Schweikert	Waters, Maxine	Hartzler	Miller (MI)	Sessions	Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Olson	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)	Hensarling	Moolenaar	Simpson	Pocan	Sherman	Visclosky
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup	Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)	Polis	Shimkus	Walden
Palmer	Sessions	Westerman	Hill	Mullin	Smith (NE)	Price (NC)	Shuster	Walz
Perry	Sewell (AL)	Westmoreland	Holding	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)	Quigley	Sinema	Wasserman
Peterson	Shimkus	Whitfield	Hudson	Neugebauer	Stewart	Rangel	Sires	Schultz
Pittenger	Shuster	Williams	Huelskamp	Newhouse	Stutzman	Reed	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Thompson (PA)	Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Watson Coleman
Pompeo	Sinema	Wittman	Hurd (TX)	Nugent	Thornberry	Renacci	Smith (WA)	Welch
Price, Tom	Smith (MO)	Womack	Hurt (VA)	Nunes	Tipton	Rice (NY)	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Woodall	Issa	Olson	Trott	Richmond	Stefanik	Yarmuth
Reed	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Wagner	Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Young (AK)
Renacci	Stefanik	Young (AK)	Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walberg	Roskam	Swalwell (CA)	Zeldin
Ribble	Stewart	Young (IA)	Jones	Paulsen	Walker	Roybal-Allard	Takano	Zinke
Rice (SC)	Stivers	Young (IN)	Jordan	Perry	Walorski	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	
Rigell	Stutzman		Kelly (MS)	Pittenger	Walters, Mimi			
Roby	Thompson (PA)		King (IA)	Pitts	Weber (TX)			
Roe (TN)	Thornberry		Kline	Poliquin	Westrup			
Rogers (AL)	Tiberi		Knight	Pompeo	Westerman			
			Labrador	Posey	Westmoreland			
			LaMalfa	Price, Tom	Whitfield			
			Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Williams			
			Latta	Ribble	Wilson (SC)			
			Long	Rice (SC)	Wittman			
			Love	Rigell	Womack			
			Lucas	Roby	Woodall			
			Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Yoder			
			Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Yoho			
				Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)			
				Rohrabacher	Young (IN)			

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Poe (TX)	Webster (FL)
Pearce	Takai	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

## □ 1802

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 238, not voting 7, as follows:

## [Roll No. 448]

## AYES—188

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Culberson
Aderholt	Buchanan	Davidson
Allen	Buck	Dent
Amash	Burgess	DeSantis
Amodei	Byrne	DesJarlais
Babin	Calvert	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)
Benishkek	Chabot	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Fleming
Black	Cole	Flores
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Blum	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Boustany	Comstock	Fox
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Brat	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bridenstine	Crawford	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Gibbs

Adams	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
Aguiar	Denham	Jolly
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Joyce
Barletta	Deutch	Kaptur
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Beatty	Dingell	Keating
Becerra	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Bera	Dold	Kelly (PA)
Beyer	Donovan	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Blumenauer	F.	Kilmer
Bonamici	Duckworth	Kind
Bost	Duffy	King (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Kinzing (IL)
F.	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Emmer (MN)	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Engel	LaHood
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Lance
Bucshon	Esty	Langevin
Bustos	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)
Capps	Foster	Lawrence
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Lee
Carney	Fudge	Levin
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lewis
Cartwright	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Chu, Judy	Graham	Loebach
Cielline	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Lowenthal
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lowey
Clay	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Cleaver	Grijalva	(NM)
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Cohen	Hahn	(NM)
Connolly	Hanna	Lynch
Conyers	Hardy	MacArthur
Cook	Heck (NV)	Maloney,
Cooper	Heck (WA)	Carolyn
Costa	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Costello (PA)	Himes	Matsui
Courtney	Hinojosa	McCollum
Crowley	Honda	McDermott
Cuellar	Hoyer	McGovern
Cummings	Huffman	McKinley
Curbelo (FL)	Hultgren	McNerney
Davis (CA)	Hunter	Meehan
Davis, Danny	Israel	Meeks
Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee	Meng
DeFazio	Jeffries	Moore
DeGette	Jenkins (WV)	Moulton
Delaney	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)
DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)

## NOES—238

Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, E. B.
Jolly	Jolly
Joyce	Joyce
Kaptur	Kaptur
Katko	Katko
Keating	Keating
Kelly (IL)	Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)	Kelly (PA)
Kennedy	Kennedy
Kildee	Kildee
Kilmer	Kilmer
Kind	Kind
King (NY)	King (NY)
Kinzing (IL)	Kinzing (IL)
Kirkpatrick	Kirkpatrick
Kuster	Kuster
LaHood	LaHood
Lance	Lance
Langevin	Langevin
Larsen (WA)	Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)	Larson (CT)
Lawrence	Lawrence
Lee	Lee
Levin	Levin
Lewis	Lewis
Lieu, Ted	Lieu, Ted
Lipinski	Lipinski
LoBiondo	LoBiondo
Loebach	Loebach
Lofgren	Lofgren
Lowenthal	Lowenthal
Lowey	Lowey
Lujan Grisham	Lujan Grisham
(NM)	(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray	Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)	(NM)
Lynch	Lynch
MacArthur	MacArthur
Maloney,	Maloney,
Carolyn	Carolyn
Maloney, Sean	Maloney, Sean
Matsui	Matsui
McCollum	McCollum
McDermott	McDermott
McGovern	McGovern
McKinley	McKinley
McNerney	McNerney
Meehan	Meehan
Meeks	Meeks
Meng	Meng
Moore	Moore
Moulton	Moulton
Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)	Murphy (PA)

## NOT VOTING—7

Cárdenas	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Hastings	Poe (TX)	
Marchant	Takai	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

## □ 1805

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 190, not voting 5, as follows:

## [Roll No. 449]

## AYES—238

Abraham	Bucshon	Dent
Aderholt	Burgess	DeSantis
Allen	Byrne	DesJarlais
Amash	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dold
Ashford	Carter (TX)	Donovan
Babin	Chabot	Duffy
Barletta	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Benishkek	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Black	Conaway	Fleming
Blackburn	Cook	Flores
Blum	Costa	Forbes
Boustany	Cramer	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Fox
Brat	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gibbs
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Gibson
	Denham	Gohmert

Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis

MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross

Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NOES—190

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)

Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman

Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney

Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert

Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings  
Issa

Pearce  
Poe (TX)

Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1809

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 228, noes 199,  
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

## AYES—228

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buck  
Buchson  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)

Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann

Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill

Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally

Meadows  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Scalise

Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NOES—199

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney

DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fitzpatrick  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
DeFazio  
Kilmer  
Kind

Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree

Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes

Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus

Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—6

Hastings  
Hurt (VA)

Issa  
Pearce

Poe (TX)  
Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1811

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 450 on the Lamborn of Colorado Amendment No. 68 to H.R. 5538, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Act, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 231, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

## AYES—197

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)

Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clawson (FL)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney

DeLauro  
DeBene  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi

Garrett  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Greens, Al  
Grijalva  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren

Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Sean  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Miller (FL)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)

Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes

Pompeo  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Ross  
Tipton  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings  
Issa

Pearce  
Poe (TX)

Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1814

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, this evening I inadvertently voted “nay” on rollcall No. 451. As an opponent of seismic airgun testing, I duly intended to vote “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, earlier today, I inadvertently pressed the wrong button when voting on rollcall Vote No. 451. I intended to vote “no.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 201, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

## AYES—223

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn

Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)

Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson

## NOES—231

Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan

Joyce  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Hardy  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts

Davidson Kelly (MS)  
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA)  
 Denham King (IA)  
 DeSantis King (NY)  
 DesJarlais Kinzinger (IL)  
 Diaz-Balart Kirkpatrick  
 Duffy Kline  
 Duncan (SC) Knight  
 Duncan (TN) Labrador  
 Ellmers (NC) LaHood  
 Emmer (MN) LaMalfa  
 Farenthold Lamborn  
 Fincher Lance  
 Fleischmann Latta  
 Fleming Long  
 Forbes Loudermilk  
 Fortenberry Love  
 Foxx Lucas  
 Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer  
 Frelinghuysen Lummis  
 Garrett Marchant  
 Gibbs Massie  
 Gibson McCarthy  
 Gohmert McCaul  
 Goodlatte McClintock  
 Gosar McHenry  
 Gowdy McKinley  
 Granger McMorris  
 Graves (GA) Rodgers  
 Graves (LA) McSally  
 Graves (MO) Meadows  
 Griffith Stutzman  
 Grothman Mica  
 Guinta Miller (FL)  
 Guthrie Miller (MI)  
 Hardy Moolenaar  
 Harper Mooney (WV)  
 Harris Mullin  
 Hartzler Mulvaney  
 Heck (NV) Murphy (PA)  
 Hensarling Neugebauer  
 Herrera Beutler Newhouse  
 Hice, Jody B. Noem  
 Hill Nugent  
 Holding Nunes  
 Hudson Olson  
 Huelskamp Palazzo  
 Huizenga (MI) Palmer  
 Hultgren Perry  
 Hunter Peterson  
 Hurd (TX) Pittenger  
 Hurt (VA) Pitts  
 Jenkins (KS) Poliquin  
 Jenkins (WV) Pompeo  
 Johnson (OH) Posey  
 Johnson, Sam Price, Tom  
 Jolly Ratcliffe  
 Jones Reed  
 Jordan Reichert  
 Joyce Renacci  
 Rice (SC)

## NOES—201

Adams Cooper  
 Aguilar Costa  
 Bass Costello (PA)  
 Beatty Courtney  
 Becerra Crowley  
 Bera Cummings  
 Beyer Curbelo (FL)  
 Bishop (GA) Davis (CA)  
 Bishop (MI) Davis, Danny  
 Blumenauer DeFazio  
 Bonamici DeGette  
 Boyle, Brendan Delaney  
 F. DeLauro  
 Brady (PA) DelBene  
 Brown (FL) Dent  
 Brownley (CA) DeSaulnier  
 Buchanan Deutch  
 Bustos Dingell  
 Butterfield Doggett  
 Capps Dold  
 Capuano Donovan  
 Cárdenas Doyle, Michael  
 Carney F.  
 Carson (IN) Duckworth  
 Cartwright Edwards  
 Castor (FL) Ellison  
 Castro (TX) Engel  
 Chu, Judy Eshoo  
 Cicilline Esty  
 Clark (MA) Farr  
 Clarke (NY) Fitzpatrick  
 Clay Foster  
 Cleaver Frankel (FL)  
 Clyburn Fudge  
 Cohen Gabbard  
 Connolly Gallego  
 Conyers Garamendi

Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce  
 Russell  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stutzman  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Westmoreland  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebsock  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham  
 (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 (NM)  
 Lynch  
 MacArthur  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marino  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Messer  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross

Flores  
 Hastings  
 Issa

O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascarell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema

## NOT VOTING—9

Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Poe (TX)

Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Trott  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Wagner  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

There was no objection.  
 The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 823

Whereas, on June 28, 2016, suicide bombers attacked the Atatürk International Airport in Istanbul Turkey, opened fire and detonated explosives, resulting in the loss of at least 44 innocent lives and severely wounding over 200, including an American citizen;

Whereas Turkish first responders and law enforcement reacted swiftly and heroically, caring for the wounded and taking immediate actions to prevent subsequent attacks and further loss of innocent life;

Whereas the White House issued a statement condemning the attack “in the strongest possible terms” and states that “We remain steadfast in our support for Turkey, our NATO Ally and partner, along with all of our friends and allies around the world, as we continue to confront the threat of terrorism”;

Whereas the Government of Turkey has stated militants from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) are responsible for the attack, and this attack resembles those carried out by ISIS in other parts of the world;

Whereas the loss of innocent lives in Istanbul strengthens our shared resolve to defeat ISIS and its terrorist affiliates, which pose a growing threat to international peace and stability;

Whereas Turkey is a longstanding member of NATO and has played a crucial role in transatlantic security since joining the alliance more than half a century ago; and

Whereas we stand in solidarity with the people of Turkey in their time of national mourning, ready to provide assistance in bringing to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these attacks, as well as identifying and disrupting any plans to undertake similar assaults in the future: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Istanbul, Turkey, on June 28, 2016, that resulted in the loss of at least 44 lives;

(2) expresses its condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed in the attacks and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured;

(3) supports efforts to bring to justice those involved with the planning and execution of these terrorist attacks; and

(4) declares that the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) poses a fundamental security threat to the United States and our allies.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

□ 1817

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

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 451, I inadvertently voted “aye”, when I intended to vote “no.” On rollcall 452, I inadvertently voted “no”, and I intended to vote “aye.”

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

# CONDEMNING IN THE STRONGEST TERMS THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN ISTANBUL, TURKEY, ON JUNE 28, 2016, THAT RESULTED IN THE LOSS OF AT LEAST 44 LIVES

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 823, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

# CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE PULSE ORLANDO NIGHTCLUB, HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE ATTACK, OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THEIR FAMILIES AND FRIENDS AND ALL THOSE AFFECTED, AND APPLAUDING THE DEDICATION AND BRAVERY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT, EMERGENCY RESPONSE, AND COUNTERTERRORISM OFFICIALS IN RESPONDING TO THE ATTACK

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government

Reform, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Homeland Security be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 827, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 827

Whereas, in the early hours of Sunday, June 12, 2016, a 29-year-old man from Ft. Pierce, Florida, killed 49 and wounded 53 innocent people in a horrific terrorist attack on Pulse Orlando, a lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender nightclub, during Latin night;

Whereas the gunman, who was investigated in 2013-2014 by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (in this preamble referred to as the "FBI") for possible connections to terrorism, pledged his allegiance to the leader of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (in this preamble referred to as "ISIL");

Whereas President Barack Obama called the attack an act of both terror and hate as well as an attack on all of the people of the United States and the fundamental values of equality and dignity;

Whereas the attack is the deadliest mass shooting in the modern history of the United States and the worst terrorist attack on United States soil since September 11, 2001;

Whereas the law enforcement professionals of the city of Orlando and Orange County, Florida, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the FBI, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and other emergency and health care professionals responded to the attack bravely and admirably and in a coordinated manner, saving many lives;

Whereas following the attack hundreds of people stood in long lines to donate blood for those injured in the attack, and the people of Orlando, the State of Florida, and the United States expressed overwhelming support for the victims and their families regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation; and

Whereas the threat of terrorist attacks against the United States and the people of the United States persists, including the threat posed by homegrown terrorists inspired by foreign terrorist organizations like ISIL: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the horrific terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub on June 12, 2016, in which 49 innocent people were killed and 53 injured;

(2) honors the memory of the victims killed in the attack and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies for their families, loved ones, and friends;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery by and pledges continued support for those injured in the attack;

(4) applauds the dedication and bravery of local, State, and Federal law enforcement and counterterrorism officials for their efforts to respond to the attack and secure communities;

(5) stands together with all people of the United States, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation, in the face of terror and hate; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the United States and its allies to defeat the Is-

lamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other terrorist groups at home and abroad and to address the threat posed by homegrown terrorism.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5722) to establish the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, I will not object, but I do want to thank the majority leader and I want to thank the Speaker. We have all joined in this resolution. It is almost exactly like that which we passed for Ronald Reagan—two Presidents who contributed greatly, not only to the wellness of this country and the greatness of this country, but also two Presidents who inspired so many Americans about their country, about their government, and about participation by average citizens in their government.

I thank Mr. CHAFFETZ for bringing this to the floor, and I urge strong support of the resolution.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah.

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

#### H.R. 5722

*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 "John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission Act".

#### SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the "John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission" (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

#### SEC. 3. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(1) plan, develop, and carry out such activities as the Commission considers fitting and proper to honor John F. Kennedy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth;

(2) provide advice and assistance to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, as well as civic groups to carry out activities to honor John F. Kennedy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth;

(3) develop activities that may be carried out by the Federal Government that are fitting and proper to honor John F. Kennedy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth; and

(4) submit to the President and Congress reports pursuant to section 7.

#### SEC. 4. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior.

(2) Four members appointed by the President after considering the recommendations of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation.

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(4) One Member of the House of Representatives appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(5) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(6) One Member of the Senate appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) EX OFFICIO MEMBER.—The Archivist of the United States shall serve in an ex officio capacity on the Commission to provide advice and information to the Commission.

(c) TERMS.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall—

(1) not affect the powers of the Commission; and

(2) be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) RATES OF PAY.—Members shall not receive compensation for the performance of their duties on behalf of the Commission.

(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses during the performance of duties of the Commission while away from home or his or her regular place of business, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, but two or more members may hold hearings.

(i) CHAIRPERSON.—The chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by a majority vote of the members of the Commission.

#### SEC. 5. DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) DIRECTOR AND STAFF.—The Commission shall appoint an executive director and such other additional employees as are necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The executive director and employees of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other employees may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(c) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the Commission, the Secretary of the Interior or the Archivist of the United States may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the employees of that department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(d) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure such temporary and intermittent services as are necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(e) VOLUNTEER AND UNCOMPENSATED SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission may accept and use voluntary and uncompensated services as the Commission determines necessary.

**SEC. 6. POWERS OF COMMISSION.**

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate.

(b) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(c) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this Act. Upon request of the chairperson of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(d) **GIFTS, BEQUESTS, DEVISES.**—The Commission may solicit, accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of money, services, or property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating its work.

(e) **AVAILABLE SPACE.**—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall make available nationwide to the Commission, at a normal rental rate for Federal agencies, such assistance and facilities as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties under this Act.

(f) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—The Commission may enter into contracts with and compensate government and private agencies or persons to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this Act.

**SEC. 7. REPORTS.**

(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress annual reports on the revenue and expenditures of the Commission, including a list of each gift, bequest, or devise to the Commission with a value of more than \$250, together with the identity of the donor of each gift, bequest, or devise.

(b) **INTERIM REPORTS.**—The Commission may submit to the President and Congress interim reports as the Commission considers appropriate.

(c) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than August 31, 2017, the Commission shall submit a final report to the President and the Congress containing—

(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, conclusions, and final recommendations of the Commission.

**SEC. 8. TERMINATION.**

The Commission may terminate on such date as the Commission may determine after it submits its final report pursuant to section 7(c), but not later than September 30, 2017.

**SEC. 9. ANNUAL AUDIT.**

The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior may perform an audit of the Commission, shall make the results of any audit performed available to the public, and shall transmit such results to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

**SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.**

No Federal funds may be obligated to carry out this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 4 of rule XVI, I move that

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2017**

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. CALVERT. 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 for the further consideration of H.R. 5538, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5538.

Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) kindly take the chair.

□ 1824

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), had been disposed of.

**AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out the powers granted under section 3063 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), for his and his colleagues on Appropriations' work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Protection Agency spends as much as \$50 million per year to employ nearly 200 armed agents at an average cost of \$216,000 per year per agent. In total, over the period from fiscal year 2006 to fiscal year 2015, the EPA spent an estimated \$715 million for its criminal enforcement program.

These 200 agents are equipped with guns and ammunition up to 30 millimeter in caliber, camouflage and other deceptive equipment, night vision, unmanned aircraft, and other military-style equipment.

A 2015 report noted that the EPA spent \$24,700 on ammunition between 75 millimeter and 125 millimeter and \$23,000 on ammunition over 125 millimeter. If this is true, what possible use could the EPA have for purchasing rounds of that size?

The EPA is just one of more than 67 Federal agencies that employ armed personnel, many of whom most Americans would never associate with law enforcement. These include the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Reserve Board, and the National Institutes of Health, among others.

Federal agencies should be able to clearly demonstrate their need for armed personnel and, absent such a demonstration, should rely on local law enforcement when there is a need for armed protection.

My amendment would prohibit funding for EPA's armed agents and begin to address the troubling trend of the militarization in our Federal agencies. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concerns about sometimes the perception of overreach, and sometimes the real perception of overreach, by agencies of the United States Government.

I have taken a lot of shots at the Environmental Protection Agency, and probably will continue to do so. However, this amendment reaches too far.

We may not always agree on where it is appropriate to draw the line on environmental laws and regulations. Some think some standards are too stringent, and others will say they are not tough enough. That is a fair policy debate to have, and that is what we are doing tonight. However, we know, no matter where the line is ultimately drawn, there are individuals out there who are willingly and knowingly trying to find ways around those laws.

As such, EPA needs the ability to look into criminal activity, whether it is illegal dumping of waste, negligent

dumping of toxics or oil, and the illegal importation of products from other countries by those who would choose to ignore U.S. law. We can debate the laws and what is appropriate, but we can't give criminals a free pass to ignore the laws that are on the books.

Saying that, I would like to continue to work with the gentleman, recognizing that whether or not these agencies are properly using the police powers that they have and the type of organizations that they have to enforce the law, they must enforce the law and they must be able to protect themselves in sometimes very difficult situations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would not hinder the EPA's ability to enforce the laws on the books. This amendment only limits their ability to employ armed personnel. The EPA will still be able to investigate and prosecute environmental crimes. They will simply have to rely on local law enforcement—or on Federal law enforcement when Federal law enforcement would be appropriate—and when there is a need for armed protection. They could, again, rely on local law enforcement or on Federal law enforcement when the need applies.

If the EPA believes that it needs armed protection, we should have a full disclosure of all of the EPA's criminal enforcement assets and a public debate about the need for the arms and equipment being used by the EPA. When we are talking about 75-millimeter ammunition, we are basically talking about an anti-tank round. When we are talking about 125-millimeter, we are talking about a tank round. They have amphibious assault vehicles, and they have other equipment that really makes them look like a military operation. It is also an enormous amount of money that has been invested here.

I would be happy—and I really appreciate the gentleman's desire—to have a discussion about this, and I look forward to having that discussion. I agree that we want to make sure that the people who work for our Federal agencies are protected, especially when they are involved in investigations in an enforcement capacity. We don't want any one of them to leave his home in the morning to go to work and be injured or worse and not be able to return home that evening. But we do need to have a serious discussion about how much we are spending, and the militarization of the Federal agencies should be of concern to all of us.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would share my concern about the growth of the utilization of these types of weapons within various agencies, not just within the EPA, and whether or not the U.S. Marshals office, which was used in the past, shouldn't be brought back to some degree, espe-

cially the SWAT teams and so forth, which are highly trained in sometimes very delicate situations.

Training, of course, as we know, is extremely important, and the folks who work in various agencies may not get the type of training they need in sometimes very difficult situations. I think we need to look at it, but these agents who are working for the Environmental Protection Agency sometimes need to protect themselves. We can debate whether or not they need the type of ammunition and the types of guns that the gentleman is talking about.

I think that, right now, this amendment goes too far. Again, I will work with the gentleman down the road because I do have some concerns about that. It is not just the EPA. We have got a number of agencies that seem to be arming themselves, which I have some concerns about.

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

Mr. PALMER. I thank the gentleman for expressing his concerns and for his willingness to work with us on this.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that weapons have proliferated among the Federal agencies. As I said, there are 67 agencies. We are spending an enormous amount of money on this, and we are not doing a particularly good job of keeping up with the weapons' inventory. We have had situations in which weapons have been lost or stolen—in one case, with the tragic result of the murder of Kate Steinle, in which the weapon had been stolen from the automobile of a ranger from the Bureau of Land Management.

I just think we have to take a long, hard look at the real need for arming Federal agencies. Some of them make absolutely no sense, like with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and particularly with the EPA. The EPA is one of the most feared agencies in the Federal Government. I put them right up there next to the IRS. To think that you have got armed agents with the kind of equipment and weapons that they have is a serious, serious issue that my amendment addresses. It has already, I think, initiated a much-needed debate on this issue.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I oppose this amendment. I would be happy to work with the gentleman in the future to come to some resolution of this problem. I do agree that it is a concern that we should all work together on, on both sides, because the so-called militarization of some of these agencies is concerning, but individuals within these agencies should be able to protect themselves in situations that may arise from time to time. I would urge opposition of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 77 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, on behalf of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat the New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) was called away. I am standing in for him and want to join the previous amendment offerer in thanking the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, as well as the staff of that committee, for their hard work on this piece of legislation.

This amendment would affect the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse. As a result of the habitat designations, the U.S. Forest Service has begun to construct electric fences around the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse's habitat, which is located around floodplains and streambeds in New Mexico.

The problem is a number of these critical habitat designations coincide with ranching allotments in New Mexico where ranchers hold what we call territorial water rights. Those are water rights that existed and belonged to these ranchers before New Mexico was even a State. These longstanding water rights provide access that is essential to these ranches. This amendment is needed because the Fish and Wildlife Service and Forest Service are not effectively working with ranchers to maintain their operations.

There is also an issue about the science surrounding this mouse. The mouse has never been seen in a number of the critical habitat areas, and the few mouse sightings on record were made nearly a decade ago. The agencies themselves have admitted that the science used to list the species and designate the critical habitat is seriously

limited. Despite that science gap, farmers and ranchers are being denied their private property rights—their territorial water rights—and are being driven from their allotments all for a mouse that may not even exist in these areas.

Voting for this amendment will send a clear message to the Fish and Wildlife Service that species listings that are not backed by sound science will not stand. We cannot allow unsubstantiated science to destroy the lives of American citizens and the history and heritage of the ranching community and the culture of the ranching community that even predates New Mexico's admission into the Union.

For this reason, I ask that my colleagues support the Pearce amendment to delist this species until legitimate and up-to-date science is available.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). The gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the Endangered Species listing of the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act, and it would restrict the Service from offering any critical protections to preserve the species.

I heard clearly what my good friend said, and having a grandfather who is a rancher in Montana, I hear what she is saying. However, once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, the role of Fish and Wildlife Service is primarily permissive—it is permissive—in helping parties to comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

The majority of the habitat for the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse is on Federal land, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is working with the Forest Service to develop a conservation measure that will protect the mouse while, clearly, allowing livestock raising on Forest Service lands and ensuring adequate water for the cattle, which they should do.

Since the Endangered Species listing, members of the livestock community have voiced concerns about the impacts to people who recreate and make their livelihoods on Forest Service lands which result from addressing the needs of the meadow jumping mouse. The Fish and Wildlife Service listened clearly to these concerns, and they have established three working groups to address these concerns. They have come up with creative solutions, like establishing the cattle lanes, which I am sure the gentlewoman was referring to, to make sure the cattle can maintain access to the water while protecting the vegetation that is necessary for the survival of the meadow jumping mouse.

Under this amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to recover the species, though all of the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. The Service would not be able to work collaboratively with these stakeholders to provide ESA compliance. The Service has a statutory requirement to implement the Endangered Species Act. Defunding the agency's ability to fulfill this legal requirement makes everyone more vulnerable to losses, which is an unnecessary cause for the American taxpayer. Additionally, this amendment limits the Service from undertaking required status reviews of the subspecies or from initiating any rulemaking to down list or to delist a species as is appropriate.

I believe that the Fish and Wildlife Service, with the working groups, can come up with a creative solution. We should also allow Fish and Wildlife to be able to down list or to delist the species. If what the gentlewoman is reporting is true, her amendment would not give them the ability to do that. I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a water rights issue in addition to an Endangered Species Act issue. This is an instance in which private water rights are being abrogated for the sake of a mouse that we don't even know exists in this area and the science about which makes it so you can't tell one subspecies from the other of this meadow jumping mouse unless you actually kill the mouse and look at its skull. Now, when it is that extreme in figuring out whether a mouse is endangered or not—whether it is a Preble's meadow jumping mouse or a New Mexico meadow jumping mouse or some other subspecies—we have got a problem with the science.

To block people from territorial water rights—using electric fences in a way that is based on science that is this obscure—doesn't sound, to me, like an effective means by which to work with the ranchers, the culture, and the livelihoods of the people involved. Therefore, once again, I urge support of the Pearce amendment.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), I offer amendment No. 78.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat the Mexican wolf (*Canis lupus baileyi*) as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or to implement a recovery plan for such species that applies in any area outside the historic range of such species.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. PEARCE to offer amendment No. 78 to H.R. 5538. The Pearce-Gosar amendment allows for the responsible State management of the Mexican wolf in Arizona and New Mexico. It will also prevent the United States Fish and Wildlife Service from expanding the population for this species outside of its historic range.

One of the main issues for the wolf recovery is an extremely outdated recovery plan being utilized by the Service. The Mexican wolf was first listed as an endangered species in 1976. In 1982, Mexico and the United States signed the Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan, which the Service is still currently utilizing today. As a result, this plan is significantly outdated and is not based on the best available science.

Without an updated plan that includes recovery criteria, the Mexican wolf will remain on the endangered species list in perpetuity. The Service has recently expressed interest in re-drafting its recovery plan. However, the agency has done this in the past but has failed to make any updates and has instead caved to radical environmental groups.

Another major issue arose early last year when the Service expanded the recovery zone for the wolf by four times its previous size without first securing the funding to manage the new acreage. The results have been disastrous for private citizens who face longer wait times for wolf disturbances, as well as the species, whose numbers have also declined under the failed management plan of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

In December 2015, the Service confirmed that the agency was again considering introducing the species into areas outside its historic range. This expansion effort is extremely misguided, as 90 percent of the Mexican wolf's historic range is in Mexico.

The four Governors from the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah sent a bipartisan letter to Department of the Interior Secretary Sally Jewell expressing serious concern in opposition to this approach.

On July 8, 2015, the Arizona attorney general and the Arizona Game and Fish

Department filed a lawsuit against the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service “for failing their statutory duty to develop an updated recovery plan to guide the Mexican wolf recovery.”

In April of 2016, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish also filed a lawsuit against the Service, claiming that the agency was ignoring the “laws and regulations of New Mexico” by releasing wolves without State permits.

Last month, a Federal judge sided with the New Mexico State government and granted the State a temporary injunction preventing the Service from releasing any more Mexican wolves into the wild.

Adding to this debacle, this week the Department of the Interior’s Office of Inspector General released a scathing report of the Mexican Gray Wolf Recovery Program, which revealed some serious structural issues with the program, including subversive actions taken by the Fish and Wildlife Service staff overseeing the program.

In lieu of the current circumstances, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to allow the respective States to protect and manage the species, not the Washington bureaucrats with a track record of failure.

The amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation; Americans for Limited Government; the Public Lands Council; the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association; Arizona Cattle Feeders Association; Arizona Farm Bureau Federation; Arizona Liberty; Dona Ana Soil and Water Conservation District; Gila County Cattle Growers Association; Idaho Recreation Council; New Mexico Cattle Growers’ Association; New Mexico Wool Growers, Incorporated; New Mexico Federal Lands Council Wildlife biologist Mary Darling; taxpayers John Fowler, James Goughnour, Gary Kiehne, Therese Griffin Hicks, Becky Nutt, Jim and Sue Chilton; and countless other individuals and organizations.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their time and for their good work on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I understand and I hear clearly what the gentleman was saying that the plan needs to be updated, refreshed, and people need to be involved in it. I would be happy to work with the gentleman to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service lives up to its responsibilities in doing that, but I strongly oppose this amendment.

The Mexican wolf is the most endangered subspecies of wolf in the world. The population is now estimated at approximately 97 wolves in the wild. Biologists believe that, when the Mexican

wolf population returns to a healthy number, that it will restore balance to the Southwest ecosystem by keeping deer, elk, and other prey populations strong by preventing overpopulation and overgrazing of habitat.

The reintroduction of wolves into Yellowstone, for example, demonstrates how top predators like wolves maintain the balance of nature. Elk in Yellowstone are now more wary and avoid standing in the open near streams. Willows and aspens have come back and, with them, birds and beavers. With the beavers came the ponds and more fish. The presence of wolves has also led to fewer coyotes, which boosted the population of pronghorn, antelope, and fox.

I have been in Yellowstone, and I have been out there and have seen the stream recovery and all of these things that I just spoken of. I have actually seen this recovery happen. In the Southwest, scientists expect similar benefits to wildlife, sportsmen, and to everyone who enjoys the outdoors.

This amendment would prohibit the Service from managing wolves in the wild, including the capture and removal of problem wolves and assisting livestock producers to manage wolf-livestock conflicts, such as using radio collars and hazardous techniques.

So I oppose the gentleman’s amendment because it would undermine the Service’s ability to work collaboratively with local communities and ranchers. And I hear you clearly say that they need to do a better job with that, and I agree that we need to do the best job we can.

We need to be able to make sure that the ESA compliance to protect private citizens from taking violations under section 9 of the ESA, a third party could sue them. So, by your amendment, you expose citizens from take violations under section 9 of the ESA, and the third party then, in fact, could be sued.

It would prohibit any efforts to prevent conflicts with wolves or update the recovery plan, as I agree, probably needs to be updated.

So it is clear, as you can see, I think we should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts to manage this imperiled species and not block the agency from doing its job.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the gentlewoman that I am from Wyoming. I actually had to endure and watch what the Fish and Wildlife Service actually erroneously did with introducing the nonnative wolves into the Yellowstone Park area. They made superpacks of wolves and actually ended up costing 60 percent of the Shiras moose herd. So I am very, very aware of this.

This amendment will not force the wolf into extinction. They are going extinct because of the Fish and Wildlife Service. States have proven better at species conservation and management than the bloated bureaucracy, and the only way they respond is through frivolous lawsuits.

Again, 90 percent of the Mexican wolf’s historic range is in Mexico. Arizona and New Mexico both want the ability to manage this species in the United States. The Mexican wolf has lingered on the Endangered Species Act for nearly 40 years, and it will go extinct at the rate that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing. It is time to do something right and return it back to the States.

Again, I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I would just like to point out that the Mexican wolf is the most endangered subspecies of all wolves in the world. The population is now estimated at approximately 97 wolves in the wild. So I believe we should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts to manage this imperiled species, not blocking the agency from doing its job.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, administer, purchase, acquire, or operate an unmanned aircraft system owned by the Department of Interior or the Environmental Protection Agency to perform surveying, mapping, or collecting remote sensing data.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents the Department of the Interior and the EPA from using

in-house agency assets and, specifically, their agency owned and operated UAS for land surveying, mapping, imaging, and other such remote sensing activities.

Mr. Chairman, you may have heard that last month the Federal Aviation Administration, the FAA, announced that the new small UAS unmanned aerial system—UAS rule, part 107, including all pilot and operating rules—will be effective on August 29 of this year. That is important because that will allow commercial activity in the UAS arena, not just government activity.

Now, perhaps no new technology in history will revolutionize the aerial surveying and mapping community like unmanned aerial systems. The benefits of commercial and private UAS are incalculable. Technology has moved forward rapidly, and what used to be considered toys are quickly becoming powerful commercial tools that provide enormous benefits in terms of safety and efficiency.

When UAS are performing missions connected to surveying and mapping areas for stewardship decisions and public policy, society is only just beginning to realize the full potential of the unmanned aerial system. Indeed, the demand for UAS for business purposes has been far reaching and continues to grow. UAS technology is already bringing substantial benefits to people's daily lives.

The timely acquisition of geospatial data is critical to assessment, realtime decisionmaking, and mitigation during and immediately following both natural and manmade disasters, including earthquakes, tornadoes, blizzards, floods, volcanic eruptions, wildfires, hurricanes, infrastructure disasters, including collapsed buildings, bridges, and dams, ruptured pipelines, various types of terrorists incidents, and in emergency blue tarp surveys to support postdisaster response.

There is a concern that agencies like the USGS and the Bureau of Land Management are acquiring unmanned aerial systems and regularly utilizing them on projects that can be accomplished by the private sector, directly competing with the private sector. The result is a loss of business for the private sector under contract to other Federal mapping agencies.

The government is getting a leg up on the private sector by obtaining certificates of authorization, or COAs, which are required to fly the UAS and performing services with UAS that are otherwise commercial in nature. Currently, there is no effective enforcement and oversight to prevent government abuse of such authority for commercial purposes.

The fact that government agencies can operate a UAS while the private sector cannot as freely or timely gain airspace access has created an uneven playing field. Allowing the Department of the Interior to use UAS in direct competition with the private sector is not only poor stewardship of taxpayer

money, but it is also an inefficient use of resources. It also results in the government duplicating and directly competing with private enterprise, which is something that we don't seek to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, while I agree there are many other implications in this amendment, I am going to speak about how this would affect the ability to fight wildland fires.

So far this year, wildland fires have burned more than 2.3 million acres. Certainly, in my State, in California, we unfortunately have some significant fires going on right now. Right now, throughout the United States, we have 16 active large fires.

Now, we can get in a policy discussion of whether or not we should be contracting out utilization of this new technology to the private sector. I tend to agree with you. I think it is a better use of taxpayer's money overall to contract this out. This is more of an authorizing decision than it is an appropriating decision. I would hope that the authorizers would meet and make the policy on how we should do this.

Right now, as we sit here today, unmanned aircraft systems are being used by fire managers and fire crews, and we need to make sure that we ensure the safety of these fire crews and protect the communities to the best of their ability.

You are right that this technology has moved very rapidly. This is a way that they use to find the hotspots to be able to use communications with aerial vehicles to drop the water or chemical on the fire more effectively and more efficiently. We may be able to do this with private contractors, but right now we don't know who is the best trained and so forth.

Again, we are the appropriating committee. We pay the bills; and I think because of this technology, the authorizing committees need to set policy on this and start working on doing this and start doing that through their regular order.

So right now, I would oppose this amendment. Our fire crews right now need this equipment, and I wouldn't take that away from them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, last year I rose in opposition to this amendment because it failed to account for the Department's need to utilize unmanned systems in times of emergency. Let me give you a couple of examples. We had a conversation. I was hoping that when I saw the amendment

this year, you might have made some accommodations for this.

Use of remote sensing via unmanned aircraft makes sense. It allows for rapid collection of data and allows for the Department to get a closer look at natural disasters. The Department and the USGS are using unmanned aircraft to monitor the spread of wildfires, as the chairman pointed out, monitor river bank erosion, detect and locate coal seam fires, conduct waterfowl surveys, and inspect abandoned mines.

I think the chairman said it best, we need to have the authorizing committee look at this because, I think the gentleman would agree, there are times when good things can be done; but this amendment, unfortunately, doesn't allow that to happen.

I thank Chairman CALVERT for yielding me the time.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I find a lot in common with the chairman and the gentlewoman from Minnesota. Certainly in times of emergency we would want to use the assets that are available to us immediately. The amendment says it prohibits the Agency to perform surveying, mapping, or collecting remote sensing data. None of those are, generally speaking, an emergency situation; so I find some agreement, but this is what the amendment says.

I just want to let everybody know that this is a \$73 billion market, and while we wait around in the United States and wait on the FAA to promulgate rules beyond the line of sight, et cetera, the market moves further and further away from the United States. It drives more than \$1 trillion in economic activity. More than 500,000 American jobs are related to the collection, storage, and dissemination of imagery and geospatial data. Another 5.3 million workers utilize such data. As much as 90 percent of the government information has a geospatial information component. Up to 80 percent of the information managed by business is connected to a specific location, and it is identified by the Department of Labor as one of just 14 high-gross sectors of the United States workforce.

I find it problematic that we are giving our government a leg up when the private sector is the one that pays for the government, and they are on the cutting edge of this. This amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau; the Business Coalition for Fair Competition; and MAPPS, the association of mapping and geospatial firms.

I understand the arguments on the other side, but I think it is important that we stay on the cutting edge and we move forward in the private sector and not empower and enrich the government sector in this regard. So with

all due respect, I hope that my colleagues will vote in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, based upon the way we read this amendment, it would shut down the Department of the Interior's current operations and eliminate its ability to use unmanned aircraft systems. While that may not be the intent of the amendment, that is what it says and does, according to our folks who have read through it.

Now, hopefully next year, as we go through the authorization process, we can come back here and have a policy because I believe in private contracting for these type of services, but right now I don't want to have the unintended consequence of taking away vital equipment that is being utilized at this time. So I would reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment and hope that we could come to a resolution within the next year and not just within the Department of the Interior. There are other departments who use this.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Appropriations made in this Act for the Environmental Protection Agency are hereby reduced by 17 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will reduce the funding to the Environmental Protection Agency by 17 percent to ensure the EPA bureaucrats are not immune to the negative impacts of their actions in the form of regulation. You wonder why 17 percent. I am going to get to that.

EPA regulations generally jeopardize our Nation's access to affordable, reliable power and will lead to skyrocketing electricity costs. By their own admission, and by design, unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the EPA are pursuing an ideological agenda while imposing real costs in the real world on the economy and on everyday Americans.

An analysis conducted by the National Economic Research Associates, or NERA, in November of 2015 found compliance with the Clean Power Plan would cost consumers and businesses nearly \$300 billion from 2022 to 2033. Now, despite these staggering costs, the Clean Power Plan will have virtually no effect on climate change as it reduces atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations by less than one-half of 1 percent. One-half of 1 percent, and that cost \$300 billion in that period of time.

NERA estimates the Clean Power Plan will burden Pennsylvania—the State where I am privileged to represent a district—with an average annual electricity price of 17 percent. That is where I came up with the 17 percent. They are saying that my constituents are going to pay 17 percent more for their power. So it seems to me that the EPA should feel the pain as well. You can see what the estimated burden imposed on each State is by the Clean Power Plan at the Web site [www.americaspower.org/nera](http://www.americaspower.org/nera). You can check it out for yourself. Because you don't live in Pennsylvania, it might be a little more, it might be a lot more.

This amendment will ensure that bureaucrats in the EPA will feel the impact that their ideological agenda has imposed on the American citizen by reducing the appropriations for the EPA by 17 percent. My consumers, my citizens, my voters didn't have any choice in this. They are just going to have to pay 17 percent more for their electricity. This amounts to a funding reduction of about \$1.4 billion. That is what it costs the EPA. It costs every one of my consumers 17 percent every time they pay their electricity bill. It is only fair that the EPA is forced to make hard decisions as to how to divide up its smaller budgets as it has forced to do what the families that I am privileged to represent have to do if this rule is enacted.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I don't want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to think I am picking on him because I certainly understand and share the gentleman's frustration with EPA and with this administration's overzealous regulatory agenda. In fact, in this bill, as the gentleman well knows, we tried to reverse all of the overreaching agenda that this administration has placed on the American people.

We have gone through this bill line by line for the Agency's budget to identify areas for targeted and strategic cuts. In total, fiscal year 2017 bill cuts EPA by \$164 million, and \$291 million below Obama's budget request. The bill cuts EPA's air regulatory program \$25 million below the enacted level and \$93 million below President Obama's budget request. The bill denies the Obama administration's request for additional staff at EPA and keeps the number of EPA personnel at the lowest level since 1989. That is when George Herbert Walker Bush was President. I am sure you would like to go back to 1976, but I think we have done a pretty good job of cutting it back to 1989.

Unfortunately, the gentleman's amendment would penalize States by cutting the grants they need. It would reduce the funding for the clean water and drinking water grants, which support construction jobs in every district. It would impact the geographic program, such as the Great Lakes, that are important to many Members. It would reduce funding for the clean-up of toxic Superfund sites, and, unfortunately, the gentleman's proposal for a general cut would impact all those important programs.

I would like to remind the gentleman that with the cuts included in this bill, we have already cut EPA funding by \$2.3 billion or 23 percent in this bill since 2011. So we have continuously done this every year. I looked at this bill very carefully and have tried to do everything we could to make sure that we do responsible cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency without damaging the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose this amendment. I think I have said everything I need to say about this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman's efforts over these many years, and I support everything he has done. What vexes me is with everything that we have done and he has done, the EPA still has found a way to reach into the pockets of my consumers, the people that I represent and take 17 percent of their power bill. They didn't say: Well, you have to take it out of the food budget or, you know, your kids' Boy Scouts dues. They just said: We are taking it right off the top. That is what they said to the consumers I have to represent.

Apparently, no matter how much we take from them or have taken from them so far, they haven't gotten the message yet. I appreciate your position, but in an effort to stand up for the citizens I represent as strongly as I can and to say we don't want a 17 percent hike in our power bills just because the EPA says so, I am going to

ask that my colleagues support the amendment and heap a little more trouble on the EPA, as they are heaping the trouble on the constituents that I am privileged to represent.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE) assumed the chair.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the conference report accompanying the bill (S. 524) "An Act to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the prescription opioid abuse and heroin use crisis, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prevent funds from being used to expand the EPA authority pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act, which has served us well since 1973, hasn't needed to be expanded, it has been used over and over again to make sure that we clean up our act.

Section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the EPA to mandate State emission levels to whatever amount the Agency deems appropriate if they find two things. Listen to that again. The Clean Air Act, section 115, allows the EPA—the Federal Government—to mandate all 50 of our States' emission levels to whatever amount the Agency deems appropriate—whatever amount—if they find two things. This has been there since 1973. It hasn't been relevant, but it is now. If the EPA finds that U.S. emissions endanger a foreign nation and the endangered nation has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control emissions in their own nation.

□ 1915

Now, where that comes into play is the Paris climate agreement. It was just signed, and even though it is not a treaty, because we have the Clean Air Act and section 115, it is now operative or potentially operative.

Many believe and have argued that the U.N. Paris climate agreement meets these requirements and, once again, would allow the Federal Government to mandate our State emission levels to whatever amount the agency deems appropriate, period.

The President has proven time and time again that he has no problem circumventing Congress and working unilaterally to achieve his policy priorities. I suspect since he is in favor of the Paris climate agreement, that this is one of his policies.

With the Clean Power Plan caught up in the courts as the President's administration comes to an end, there is a serious concern and a legitimate concern that he will act unilaterally to cement his environmental legacy by enforcing section 114 in this way.

This amendment would block this attempt to delegate nearly unlimited power and authority over the energy sector in each one of our States to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the EPA. Such expansive authority of the EPA would be economically devastating and could threaten the reliability and viability of our Nation's energy sector.

I know the President has got 5, 6 months left to go, and he would like to get as many regulations on the books as possible. We simply cannot let this happen, and we cannot leave it to chance.

I would urge my colleagues to an affirmative vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as has been pointed out, this would block the

EPA from regulating air pollution under section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

Section 115 deals with international pollution and allows the United States to work with other countries in transboundary pollution issues. As we know, pollution doesn't stop at a border. It moves. And it is moving around the planet.

This amendment is a transparent attempt to clearly stop the Paris climate change agreement reached in December 2015. The Paris climate agreement is a milestone in the global effort to combat climate change, something which my constituents feel is very clear, very present, and is a huge problem of which the United States should show leadership in.

More than 190 nations have made commitments to limit their climate-damaging pollution, including all the largest developed and developing countries.

Future U.S. administrations could use section 115 to help ensure that the United States does its part and to provide that other countries do their part too.

The Perry amendment would prohibit the EPA and the White House from even developing a well-considered recommendation or whether or not to use this authority. Congress should not take a tool out of the toolbox for a future administration's climate change mitigation toolbox.

This is a matter of global leadership. The United States needs to meet its Paris climate commitment and, subsequently, any commitment to act in the future.

Congressman PERRY's amendment and similar efforts to thwart the progress on climate change could—I would say "would"—undermine our ability to achieve needed pollution reductions and hit our Paris targets.

This amendment is the latest in a long line of Republican attacks on the Clean Air Act and the EPA's authority to respond to the urgent threat of climate change. A vote for this amendment is another vote, in my opinion, for those who deny climate change is real and to block action to curb the carbon pollution that is driving dangerous climate change.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this is not to deny climate change. This is about authority. Whose authority? The United States and the individual States don't need foreign governments through the Federal administration telling us, telling them how to run their railroads and their businesses and how much they regulate their own clean air pursuant to the 1973 Clean Air Act. That is why we have the Federal Government, and that is why it collaborates with the State.

This agreement is not a treaty ratified by the United States Senate. This is an agreement between individuals that potentially gives the power to the Federal Government to regulate in an unlimited fashion every one of our States.

No one in the States signed up for this. No one in the United States Senate voted on this. This is an agreement between individuals, and it should not be left to stand in this fashion.

This amendment just says that we are going to follow the Clean Air Act, passed in 1973, just like we have been. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed for the States. It has changed between individuals in this administration and people all around the globe that wish to limit the United States' productivity through regulation.

That is why this amendment is important, and that is why I hope Members will support it.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I had the opportunity recently to be in China, and because of our administration and as the Chinese people and government saw, our bold leadership in standing up and saying that the United States was going to play its role in reducing the harmful effects of climate change, China came to the table for the first time ever and said: You know, we are going to do something about it too.

Now, the gentleman keeps saying that the Senate never voted on it. This has never happened. Well, the Clean Air Act is a law and climate change is real.

This is not 1972, 1973, when I graduated from high school back many years ago. The planet, the climate, the oceans, the ice shelves are all changing. The legacy that we leave for our children and for future generations will be: What does the United States, what does our country do? How do we stand up and show leadership?

So this amendment clearly is an attempt to stop the Paris climate change agreement reached in 2015, something that I say with great pride my constituents in the State of Minnesota think is a good idea and something that we need to move forward on.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, no one denies that the 1973 Clean Air Act isn't law. No one denies that. But what we are pointing out is that, with the Paris accord, it activates section 115 in a way never perceived that to happen in 1973 when the law was passed. They didn't think that other governments were going to control the United States State by State by State. But that is indeed what can happen here—and probably what will happen here.

Pursuant to the agenda of the administration to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> produced by United States by 80 percent, I know that the air was dirtier in 1973, as you said, when you were in high school or what have you, but what this is going

to do is take us back to the 1900s, before the time of cars and X-rays and refrigerators and everything that makes a 21st century life livable for us. That is what this is going to do, if we allow the President's agenda to role forward with the Paris climate accord enshrined and then enacted through the Clean Air Act and section 115.

All this amendment wishes to do and seeks to do is make sure that that statute isn't enacted, per the Paris climate agreement—not a treaty, an agreement—between individuals, not between our countries.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the debate couldn't be clearer here right now. Either you believe that climate change is real and it presents a clear and present danger—if you read some of the reports from the Department of Defense, they are very concerned about what is going on in the world with food scarcity, with rising sea levels, with all kinds of potential things that could bring real security risks to our Nation. Do we as a country stand up and do something about it and bring other countries with us? My State is not going to be compelled by a foreign government. My State is part of the United States of America, where we will work together under leadership to do something about climate change. Or do we continue to deny that climate change is real? We ignore what the Department of Defense is saying, and the United States doesn't play a clear leadership role in moving forward and bringing people with us on this issue that affects today, tomorrow, future generations and what this planet will be like for our children.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on March 14, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 13638 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman

from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds for the EPA's proposed Risk Management Plan rulemaking for the remainder of this year.

This RMP is the EPA's program implementing section 112(r) of the 1990 Clean Air Act that requires facilities that use certain materials to develop a plan to prevent accidental releases.

Safety is at the very core of the chemical industry, and industry stakeholders have worked cooperatively with the EPA to achieve a dramatic 60 percent reduction in accidental releases in the 20 years of the RMP program, to date.

While the EPA has proposed several changes, many of the new regulations they have put forward are highly problematic and could actually lead to an increased likelihood of an incident.

The EPA has raced ahead of the other agencies participating in the Federal interagency working group created to improve chemical safety and security, and it is no longer working in coordination with the other Federal agencies involved in this process.

Yet the EPA is moving to finalize the rule, even though changes planned to OSHA's similar program, the process safety management program, are still in their early stages. This lack of coordination has the potential to create duplicative rules for individuals and companies struggling to comply with multiple Federal oversight programs.

I urge Members to adopt my amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would block the EPA from finalizing or implementing a proposed rule that establishes accidental release prevention requirements.

Earlier this year, the EPA issued a proposed rule to amend its risk management program regulations response to a 2013 executive order on improving chemical safety. The proposed rule seeks to improve chemical process safety, assist local emergency authorities in planning and responding to accidents, and improve public awareness to chemical hazards at regulated sources.

This is an important regulation and its need was underscored in the tragedy like the one that occurred in 2013 in west Texas, where a massive explosion in a fertilizer plant killed 15 people and injured more than 160.

This amendment would needlessly and recklessly block efforts to further improve chemical safety and security

in coordination with owners and operators, and I strongly oppose that.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 820, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 83, 86, 107, 118, 127, and 129 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any rule issued after the date of the enactment of this Act that is a major rule described in subparagraph (A) of section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants pursuant to section 6 of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5505).

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. YOHIO OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to destroy any buildings or structures on Midway Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN OF ARKANSAS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for the purpose of destroying any records regarding, related to, or generated by the Inorganic Section of the United States Geological Survey Energy Geochemistry Laboratory in Lakewood, Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult with the National Science Foundation with respect to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 or section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 with respect to any Environmental Impact Statement prepared pursuant to the “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Initiate Section 106 Consultation for Proposed Changes to Arecibo Observatory Operations, Arecibo, Puerto Rico and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings and Comment Period”, published in the Federal Register May 23, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman

from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1930

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments being offered en bloc. They are amendments that address a variety of issues. Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to consideration of these amendments en bloc. I urge the adoption of the amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I just oppose this. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Details” published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 30, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 42939 et seq.), or any rule of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to offer a very simple amendment to restrict funding to the EPA for finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing its proposed rule called the Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Detail, or CEIP.

As many in this Chamber are aware, the United States Supreme Court issued an historic stay back in February on the EPA’s so-called Clean Power Plan, halting the EPA from proceeding on any plans to move forward this harmful and costly regulation, a regulation that would raise household electricity prices by up to 34 percent in some areas of our country.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling, we found that since the stay, the EPA has continued barreling forward, acting as if the Clean Power Plan will most certainly be upheld.

According to the EPA’s own documents, the final regulations of the Clean Power Plan already included the CEIP, meaning that the EPA’s decision to move forward on its implementation, would, in fact, be unlawful and clearly forbidden by the Supreme Court’s stay. Sadly, it is no surprise to many of us that the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA are once again choosing to ignore an order from the highest court in the land, but this amendment will stop the EPA from committing this blatant and unconstitutional violation.

I commend Chairman CALVERT for prohibiting funding to implement the Clean Power Plan in the underlying bill so we can ensure that the will of the Supreme Court and the provisions of the underlying bill are consistent in stopping the regulatory overreach of the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from finalizing or implementing designs and details for the Clean Energy Incentive Program. The Clean Energy Incentive Program is voluntary. It is an option for States. States can choose whether or not to do it. It is not a mandate. The program provides incentives to develop renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.

The amendment is another example of some in the majority’s obstruction to anything that the EPA or this administration does to attempt to address climate change. This program is designed to diversify energy supplies used by power generation and provide cleaner power generation to improve air quality. This amendment is a job creator.

Let me highlight again, this program is designed to reward early investments in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency to reduce harmful emissions from electric-generated facilities. Many States have embraced this. Many States are voluntarily moving forward with this.

But this amendment seeks to remove the barriers that we are trying to bring down in low-income communities so that they are able to invest in renewable energy, they are able to help low-income customers reduce their energy bills; and that is what we should be working forward with States and with consumers who want to reduce their energy bills and reduce the effects of climate change.

I want to state again, State participation in this program is totally optional, so this amendment is another

attempt by some in the majority to block any action to address climate change and to continue this Nation's dependency on Big Oil. There is no reason to block a voluntary program from moving forward. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I once again encourage all Members to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I can't stress enough, the Clean Energy Incentive Program is voluntary.

Why would we tell States that they couldn't choose to participate in something that will help their customers have lower utility bills, help with renewable energy, and help with the environment at the same time?

I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the third sentence of section 107(f)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(f)(1)) (relating to use of recovered sums by the United States Government without further appropriation).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Natural Resource Trustees are Federal officials designated by the President to act on behalf of the public to assess potential damage to natural resources at certain sites.

These trustees are authorized to seek compensation for natural resource damages from responsible parties. Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, CERCLA, these funds collected by trustees are currently not subject to appropriation by Congress.

Unfortunately, in southeast Missouri, we have seen trustees run amuck. They have used money from settlements in places other than where the funds were intended to remedy, essentially resulting in land grabs by the Federal Government.

My amendment would provide congressional oversight in the Natural Resource Damage Assessment process by sending funds collected by the trustees under CERCLA back to the general funds of the Treasury.

This amendment is a necessary step in reining in overreach of the Federal Government and reasserting congressional authority, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the Department of the Interior's ability to conduct damage assessments and inland oil spill preparedness by prohibiting the support of restoration work that is paid for by recovered settlement funds under the Superfund.

In fiscal year 2017, the Department of the Interior will receive nearly \$500 million from the Deepwater Horizon settlement. This amendment would prohibit the distribution of any of those funds to the impacted Gulf States.

The Department's inability to distribute jointly recovered funds to its co-trustees would have a devastating affect on strong Federal, State, Tribal cooperation that the Interior Department has developed over the years, and could lead to a reduction of future joint restoration settlements and a splintering of cooperative restoration efforts among co-trustees, and that would be a travesty.

The amendment could also create uncertainty about its impacts on authorities under CERCLA to retain recovered settlement funds and manage the \$800 million previously recovered in past settlements. This is a reckless amendment with far-reaching impacts.

If the Department of the Interior is unable to effectively administer its Natural Resource Damage Assessment program due to a change in its ability to use appropriated funds, it would likely have a significant effect on NOAA's own ability to effectively manage many of these cases, including the Deepwater Horizon. So I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It is about making sure elected Members of Congress appropriate funds that are collected under CERCLA instead of being delegated to unelected bureaucrats. It is not reckless. It is being responsible, and it is exerting our Article I authority of the power of the purse.

So I encourage this body to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I believe I have the right to close if the gentleman has no further speakers.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage this body to support this amendment. If they are in support of holding the power of the purse, support the Article I authority to make sure that Congress would actually appropriate the funds instead of an unelected bureaucrat.

This is just bringing back the power that has been delegated in the past and making sure that there is more congressional oversight when this money goes to the U.S. Treasury and that the appropriations process is done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to state again that this would not allow the Department to distribute jointly recovered funds with co-trustees. It would have a devastating effect in the way the Federal, State, and Tribal governments work together and as they have worked together over the years. It could lead to a reduction of joint future restoration settlements and a splintering of cooperation restoration among co-trustees. And when people work together, we have better outcomes, we have better results, and that saves the taxpayers money.

This amendment would clearly limit the Department of the Interior's ability to conduct damage assessments and inland oil spill preparedness by prohibiting the support of restoration work that is paid for by recovered settlement funds under the Superfund. I recommend that the amendment be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the decision in Civil Action No. 14-1807 (JDB), United States District Court for the District of Columbia, issued March 29, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

I rise today in support of my amendment. My amendment would bar implementation of a Federal court decision issued on March 29, 2016, that stopped implementation of the 2014 U.S. Fish and Wildlife's decision to issue an Environmental Assessment extension for the issuance of depredation permits for double-crested cormorants.

Since 1998, Fish and Wildlife has allowed the issuance of depredation permits for cormorants that threaten commercially raised fish stocks.

In 2003, Fish and Wildlife issued the Public Resource Depredation Order through a final Environmental Impact Statement which allowed for the Federal Government, State officials, and tribal leaders to take cormorants found committing depredations of public supplies of fish.

Environmental Assessments in 2009 and 2014 renewed both of these depredation orders. On March 29, 2016, the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia issued a decision stopping implementation of the 2014 Environmental Assessment extension as a result of a special interest lawsuit.

In the meantime, Fish and Wildlife Service is beginning a new Environmental Assessment, but new depredation permits are not being issued to many farmers whose fish stocks are being depleted by cormorant populations. This is leading to considerable losses for farmers. Farmers are constantly living on the margin and just getting by.

My amendment prevents the use of funds by Fish and Wildlife for the enforcement of the March 29, 2016, court decision. It ensures that a successful depredation program continues so that our farmers continue to farm and feed America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for the opportunity to offer this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. Let's stand up for small farmers in our communities who find themselves under constant pressure economically. They should not have to compete with bad rulings from activist judges.

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

□ 1945

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in March 2015, the court found the Fish and Wildlife Service had violated

NEPA, in giving an open-ended approval for the lethal removal of the double-crested cormorant, and that they were committing or were about to commit predation on fish, saying that there was not current data or adequate analysis to support this depredation order. The court didn't stop depredation but required a mediation plan.

In May 2016, the court revoked these depredation orders stating that individual permits should be sufficient. The court noted in its decision that the service had ignored environmental benefits of the double-crested cormorants by controlling invasive species fish and economic disruption claims were imprecise, speculative, and not compelling.

This amendment seeks to ignore the findings of the court. In other words, this amendment would tell Fish and Wildlife you don't have to follow what the court said you needed to do, and it prevents the service from using appropriated funds to enforce a court's order on the taking of the double-crested cormorant.

This language does not affect the law's prohibition against the taking of migratory birds, and people who would take the cormorant would knowingly be violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and be subject to charges from wildlife officials or other law enforcement agencies.

So the gentleman might not like how the court ruled, but this is the ruling of the court. We are a society that follows the law, and Fish and Wildlife is compelled to comply with the court.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a unique situation where the Fish and Wildlife Service has already begun a new environmental assessment. In the meantime, there are fish farmers who are hurting because of this ruling as they are seeing their stock being eaten by these cormorants, with no recourse to take against them.

These cormorants not only affect fish farmers, they also affect smallmouth bass populations in the Lake States. These farmers should have the right to protect their crops while this new environmental assessment is being put in place, and I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can stand up for small farmers that are doing their best to feed our country.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 88 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Representatives WESTMORELAND, COLLINS, and SMITH, I offer amendment No. 88.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay legal fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); or

(3) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if this election cycle has shown us anything, it is that the American people are tired of our officials in Washington, D.C., not listening to the voice of the people. They are tired of a Federal bureaucracy that is accountable to no one and operates in the shadows without proper oversight.

The United States is facing a crisis of executive overreach, and nowhere else is this truer than at the Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA's escalation of sue and settle cases to change the law through Federal Court rulings threatens to shut down American businesses. By operating hand in hand with radical environmentalist groups that are willing participants in the scam, the EPA's use of sue and settle not only endangers the economy, but also our constitutional separation of powers.

According to a 2011 GAO report, between 1995 and 2010, three large environmental activist groups like the Sierra Club received almost \$6 million in attorney fees alone. Under our amendment, no funds can be used to pay legal fees under any settlement regarding any case arising under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act, period. Litigants can still sue, but they will no longer be financially rewarded by the American taxpayer for their efforts.

I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment to reduce the secretive transfer of U.S. tax dollars to private self-interest groups. It is inexcusable to allow this legal collusion.

By restricting Federal agencies from paying attorney fees, we will not only reduce Federal spending, but also reduce the incentive for these self-interest groups to continue suing the Federal Government and taking the American taxpayers' dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that Congress can ensure taxpayers are protected from funding the legal efforts of special interest groups and reinforce our constitutional powers.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the Equal Access to Justice Act is the law of the land. It allows for the Federal payment of legal fees—within limits—to individuals, small businesses, and nonprofits where they are the prevailing parties in actions against Federal agencies unless the agency is able to show that the action was substantially justified or that special circumstances make the award unjust. This law helps deter government misconduct and encourages all parties—not just those with resources—to hire legal counsel to assert their rights.

Now, I know my colleagues, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, will agree with me that the ability to challenge Federal actions is the most important tool for ensuring government accountability.

The Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the Endangered Species Act are also the law of the land. These laws have contributed greatly to the protection and improvement of public health in this country.

A study by the nonpartisan Environmental Law Institute found that the Equal Access to Justice Act has been cost effective, and it only applies to the meritorious litigation and that existing legal safeguards and independent discretion of Federal judges continue to ensure its prudent application.

Here is a fact: the claim that large environmental groups are getting rich on attorney fees is simply not supported by available evidence. In 2011, the GAO did a study. It was requested by House Republicans on cases brought against the EPA. They found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorney fees were awarded only about 8 percent of the time. Among environmental plaintiffs, the majority of cases were brought by local groups rather than national groups. That is just a fact. It is completely unfair to target these important environmental safeguards for removal from the protections of the Equal Access to Justice Act.

But more importantly, this amendment would have a serious consequence on the public health. In order for our Nation's environmental safeguards to work properly and ensure the protection of public health, citizens—including those citizens with limited means—must have the ability to challenge Federal action. The Smith amendment is clearly designed to make it more difficult for citizens—every citizen—to ensure the accountability of the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may con-

sume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

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

I rise in support of this amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia. The Constitution grants the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to Congress, not the executive branch. Yet many executive branch agencies are using sue and settle techniques to circumvent the rule-making process to enact overly broad and costly regulations, without any input or comment from the public.

One of the worst offenders is the EPA, which has increasingly relied on outside special interest groups to bring lawsuits demanding expanded regulations. And the EPA is all too willing to settle immediately.

My colleague's amendment would restrict the use of taxpayer dollars from paying the legal fees of these outside groups when suing the Federal Government under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment does not prohibit affected parties from bringing these lawsuits, but restricting agencies' ability to pay attorney fees will reduce the incentive of using lawsuits as a way to expand the power of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as the young lady across the aisle made note of the GAO report of 2011, also in that same report, as I noted, is that that report recognized that environmentalist groups such as the Sierra Club received almost \$6 million in settlement fees from just suing the government. Under no circumstances should the government be rewarding any group to sue the government on their behalf. They definitely don't do that to every individual citizen and to every small-business owner that is being targeted by the EPA where they are being targeted by other Federal agencies. This is about fairness, and this is making sure that self-interest groups are not profiting off of the Federal Government.

I encourage the body to support the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state again that the GAO report clearly found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorney fees were only awarded about 8 percent of the time, and among environmental plaintiffs, the majority of those cases were brought by local groups rather than national groups.

So this amendment is clearly designed to make it much more difficult for citizens—my constituents—to ensure that there is accountability in the Federal Government so that they can have their day in court with being a plaintiff against the government when they feel it necessary.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf-Requirements for Exploratory Drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf" as published February 24, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 9916).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds from this act from being used to finalize, implement, or enforce the new Arctic regulations the Department of the Interior rushed to last week.

In addition to the billions of dollars already spent—\$7 billion—to develop these sales, these regulations would cost an additional \$2 billion for the oil and gas industry.

This regulation is nothing more than a tactic to lock safe Arctic energy development up in red tape because exploration would become full of unnecessary operational burdens.

The National Petroleum Council Arctic report found that Arctic resources

can be safely developed today using existing, field-proven technology. Locking up Arctic resources only hurts our Nation by preventing responsible energy development.

I ask my colleagues to support the State of Alaska, stand up for the Alaskan Natives of the North Slope who support this production in energy exploration, and vote "yes" on my amendment.

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

□ 2000

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment would block the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from finalizing regulations that deal with exploratory drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf that has conducted mobile oil offshore drilling units. Oil and gas exploration on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf is expensive and requires industry to make significant investments. Blocking this rule creates uncertainty for industry and other stakeholders. Delaying or inhibiting implementation of this rule will likely defer, rather than encourage, future Arctic exploration and development.

The amendment would also undermine efforts to protect Alaska Natives' health, livelihood, and cultural traditions. As we know, there are Alaska Natives that do have grave concerns about what is going on with oil drilling and exploration in Alaska.

The impact of a catastrophic oil spill would have extremely high cultural and societal costs to these Native Alaskans. The amendment would derail efforts to set specialized safety requirements and environmental precautions to account for the extreme environmental conditions, geography, and remoteness, like to fix infrastructure in existing operations in the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf.

The amendment stands in the way of efforts to reduce the risk of oil spill in an extreme sensitive environment where responding to any spill may be beyond current oil spill response capabilities. We need to protect our precious Arctic resources and ensure that they are managed responsibly.

Therefore, I must oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the young lady that the Natives of Alaska on the North Slope support this legislation. They want the development. They have talked about it. They have been really working close with the oil industry as partners. I think we ought to accept the fact that they are the most affected. If they want it, we ought to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I think this is something where people clearly in this Chamber know that the gentleman from Alaska and I are going to disagree on.

I will state for the RECORD that I have spoken with many Native Alaskans who do oppose this, so they are not all of one mind throughout Alaska on this issue. They are concerned about the effect an oil spill would have on their coastal and societal costs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska for which notice of availability was published in the Federal Register on April 13, 2015 (80 Fed. 19678).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds from this act being used to implement a Department of the Interior management plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which designates the entirety as wilderness.

This would include the 1002 area that was set aside by Congress for potential development in the future, an area that holds 10 billion barrels of oil at the minimum and probably 37 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

I am trying to do this because we already did this act. In the Alaska National Lands Act, we set that area aside. Now the Department that regulates it is trying to make it all wilderness with no drilling to take place.

I ask for a "yes" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise, respectfully, in opposition to this amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Alaska.

This amendment would block the implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge, a plan that will already have been in place for nearly 2 years by the time this language will take effect and a plan that received broad support upon its implementation.

At more than 19 million acres, the Arctic Refuge is one of the crown jewels of our Nation's public lands, and like Yellowstone and the Grand Canyon before it, this iconic landscape deserves to be protected for generations to come.

Included in the CCP is a recommendation for expanded wilderness designations which nearly 1 million people from all 50 States—including native, faith-based, business, and conservation groups—have submitted comments of support for.

The Arctic Refuge's Coastal Plain is the biological heart of the refuge, which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls the "center for wildlife activity."

The plan's current wilderness recommendation would ensure that these pristine habitats will remain intact for future generations. This is critical to supporting native wildlife and maintaining traditional and subsistence activities on the refuge.

Since President Eisenhower established the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Members of both parties have stood up to protect this truly unique national treasure. Republican Senator William Roth introduced the first bill to designate the refuge's Coastal Plain as wilderness in 1987.

A bill to protect this place as wilderness has been introduced every Congress since. And this Congress, 128 Members from both sides of the aisle have pledged their support.

I have the utmost respect for my friend and colleague Mr. YOUNG. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that this was an act of Congress that set aside the 1002 area by the Senator from Washington State. That is crucially important because it is an area that has great potential 74 miles away from the existing pipeline. It also is an area that has the Village of Kaktovik that supports the drilling and development in 1002.

I am just saying that no agency has a right to overcome a law of the Congress. I am not talking about the 19 million acres. I am talking about the small acreage, a parcel no bigger than the Dulles Airport, to allow that to be continued to be considered by the Congress of the United States, who set it aside at the insistence of Scoop Jackson from Washington State with the help of Senator Ted Stevens and myself, for potential drilling. It has to have an act of Congress, but you can't drill in a wilderness area.

So I am saying no money shall be spent. No regulatory agency can turn

and make it an off-limits area to develop the oil if this Congress so decides.

I urge a “yes” on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

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

My friend from Alaska is correct. The ultimate decision and the final disposition of this incredible place is up to the Congress of the United States. However, the question before us now is how should this area be managed until Congress finally resolves this issue?

I am proud to have authored an amendment a few months back that showed that there is bipartisan support in the House for a final wilderness determination. I believe eventually that bipartisan support will be a majority of the Congress. But in the meantime, those of us that are working to protect this very important iconic place know that we are expressing the voice of the American people.

Nearly 1 million people commented in support of the wilderness recommendation. These are people from all 50 States. It includes Native Americans. It includes Native Alaskans. It includes people from the faith community, the business community, and the environmental community. This is a uniquely important place with wildlife that, in many cases, are not found anywhere else and with a connection for all of us of because the migratory bird species that spend part of their lives in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge travel to almost all 50 States in other parts of their life stage.

We all have a stake in this. We need to do the right thing. I believe the administration is doing the right thing by managing this area as wilderness while we continue to work on an act of Congress that will settle this longstanding question.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that most people don't know what they are talking about. We follow the laws of the Congress. We should. I respectfully suggest that I am not suggesting the whole—and I am not supporting it right now—the Arctic Wildlife Range, I am talking about 100,000 acres of land that we set aside—the Congress. The Senate agreed to it. The conference agreed to it. And here we are trying to let a regulatory agency tell us how to manage it. That is inappropriate.

I listened to another gentleman on this floor today talking about over-regulation of the EPA. That is what is wrong with this Nation today, is regulatory law allowing the executive branch to run this Nation without the people's voice being heard. That is what is happening here.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to be up in this area, and this protected area en-

compasses a wide range of Arctic and sub-Arctic ecosystems. The native flora and fauna is magnificent. The refuge is incredible with its biological diversity.

I understand that the gentleman from Alaska feels strongly about this issue in a way that I feel differently about and that he has been an advocate for his State for decades, but on this important issue, we just simply disagree.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I didn't point out one more obvious truth. The President will not sign a bill loaded up with anti-environmental riders just like this one. We only make our path for this bill harder by including it. I hope my colleagues would join me in opposing it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the World War I Centennial Commission.

The United States entered World War I in 1917. More than 4 million Americans served in the Great War, including 350,000 African Americans and the first woman ever to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

In order to properly commemorate and celebrate the brave service these Americans gave to us, the World War I Centennial Commission was established by this body in 2013. In addition to the memorial, the Commission is responsible for planning and executing educational and commemorative activities.

I ask the Chair and ranking member to work with me as this bill progresses to find the necessary resources for the Commission to do its work. While it is true that there are no World War I veterans still among us, their sacrifice must not be forgotten.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I pledge to work with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

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

I understand and share the gentleman's interest in the World War I Centennial Commission. The committee may be willing to consider funds for the Commission to carry out its mis-

sion, but we need to make sure that the process is open and transparent.

Report language accompanying this bill encourages the Commission to submit a budget request in the future so that we might review it in detail. The Commission will serve as the lead organizer for the Nation's commemorative event so that America can tell the story of the Great War that profoundly shaped our history.

I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that the work of the Commission is important and look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue.

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

□ 2015

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service—

(1) to issue a final rule for the proposed regulations listed under docket number FWS-R7-NWRS-2014-0005; or

(2) to implement the final rule entitled “Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves” and dated (80 Fed. Reg. 64325 (October 23, 2015)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the funds in this act from being used to issue the final rule by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which would seize authority away from the Alaskan Fish and Game of the State of Alaska to manage fish and wildlife for both nonsubsistence and subsistence uses on Federal wildlife refuges in Alaska. In addition, this amendment prohibits funds to be used on the existing National Park Service rule that interferes with State wildlife management authority on national preserve lands, which is guaranteed hunting under the Alaska National Lands Act in Alaska.

The two rules in question violate the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the ANILCA, passed by Congress and signed into law in 1980, which protects the ability of the State

of Alaska to manage wildlife across the State on State, private, and Federal lands. This Chamber voted in favor of a similar amendment and this language in the sportsmen's package, H.R. 2604, back in February.

These regulations are nothing more than an illegal overreach of the Federal Government on the State of Alaska. It is agreed in the Constitution, and it is in the law that they manage all fish and game on all lands in the State of Alaska.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment would block Federal rules aimed at protecting wolves, wolverines, black bears, grizzly bears, and lynx from some of the most egregious hunting and killing methods. These methods include shooting defenseless, swimming caribou from motorboats; using airplanes to scout and shoot grizzly bears; luring grizzlies with rotting meat and pet food to get a point-blank kill; killing wolf, black bear, and coyote mothers and their dependent pups and cubs at their dens; and the trapping of grizzly and black bears with steel-jawed leg-hold traps and wire snares. These methods are inhumane and contrary to our values here in this great country.

We should support the scientists, rangers, and wildlife managers in the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service in their efforts to maintain healthy ecosystems.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and strike this poison pill rider from this bill. These are egregious things that we should not tolerate, and we should not codify them in law.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed in the comments that were just made because all he said was not true. The State does not den; the State does not snare; the State does not trap; the State does not kill wantonly. The State manages. To have the Federal Government manage the game when it is the law and when it is in the Constitution of the State of Alaska—an agreement made with this body—and to have an agency take that over and with the propaganda that has been espoused on this floor from the Humane Society is inappropriate of this body. It is a flat-out lie. That is what it is. It is not true.

The State manages, and they have not used these practices, but they have a right and should have a right to manage the fish and game on the property which was guaranteed to us.

I understand where this pressure is coming from. We in Alaska face this every day. No one understands that we have people in Alaska and that we have natives in Alaska who actually want the State to manage their fish and game or who would like to manage it by themselves, which I do support; but to have the Federal Government come in is wrong, and it is against our Constitution. I will stand by this amendment to stop moneys being spent by an agency that has overreached.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

I respect the concern of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and his advocacy for his State, but I oppose this proposal which, in this case, does not present an opportunity for a balanced approach to wildlife management. Let me clarify why the National Wildlife Refuge is proposing these rules.

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, certain types of inhumane hunting, such as bear baiting and den hunting, has affected Federal refuge areas for wildlife. In fact, one refuge in the Kenai Peninsula had an emergency closing due to the extreme decrease in the number of brown bears, which was caused by these inhumane hunting practices.

Rather than shutting down areas in which these hunting methods are causing the overkilling of native Alaskan predators and restricting access to all hunters, it seems reasonable to me to provide for a balanced approach that provides for a means of traditional, permit-based hunting.

Nothing in the rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service would limit traditional hunting tactics, but, rather, it would continue and protect existing hunting practices. Unfortunately, this amendment does not address the wildlife diversity and mechanisms in place to maintain it. Therefore, it impacts the National Wildlife Refuge's ability to maintain its parks in a responsible manner and provide native animals with a refuge.

We as Members of Congress have a Federal responsibility to ensure that our National Wildlife Refuges are being used in the most responsible manner possible. The very agency Congress has vested with the responsibility to manage our wildlife thinks these killing tactics pose a threat to the necessary diversity of the wildlife, and I agree with them.

I urge my colleagues to support the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service to effectively manage our National Wildlife Refuges for future generations of Americans. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman.

I will say, though, that all of these instances that have been referred to have not happened under State management. I suggest, respectfully, that the Fish and Wildlife is no longer a manager of fish and wildlife. They have become people who prohibit activity on the refuges. That was not why these refuges were made. They were made by the people who hunt and fish, and now we are having other groups that say this is inhumane, which has nothing to do with it.

I am a little bit shocked that we are reading the thing from the Humane Society, PETA, and all of these other groups. Those are not the true facts. I ask the gentleman to, please, look at the true facts.

Management is crucial to the State of Alaska. As I mentioned before, we ought to really think about, maybe, management by the native corporations on their lands, too; but in having the Federal Government manage, it has done a miserable job of the management of game. Their idea of management is to just leave them walking around and to let nature take care of it. I happen to know a little bit about nature, and it doesn't take care of it. We are just talking about management, and the State has that right under its constitution; so I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment circumvents the established rulemaking process, which solicits public input and uses the best available science to reach a decision. Alaska's aggressive predatory control practices and disregard for science-based management in the approach of the Service would negatively impact the stability of the ecosystems and wildlife throughout the region.

Thirty-one biologists and scientists stated on March 28, 2016, in a letter to Interior Secretary Jewell and Service Director Ash:

The most current and best available science is clear that predator control measures that are intended to restore the herd, such as moose and caribou, are doomed to failure because the herds need to access nutrition. Their main limiting factor is Alaska's intensive management scheme, which is the wrong approach to conserving natural systems.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove Arctic Sales 255, 258, and 262 from the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program for which notice of availability was published on March 18, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 14881).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It prevents funding from this act to be used to remove 3 Arctic Sales that have already taken place from the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program.

The economic benefits that would be associated with offshore development in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas are tremendous. In those two areas alone, we have the potential to produce about 23.6 billion barrels of oil and 104 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Potentially creating 54,700 jobs nationwide will generate billions of dollars in revenue for the State and local governments. May I suggest, respectfully, that this money can be used in conservation efforts, in land and water conservation funds. You can't have that program without the development of oil; yet everybody I know on that side supports the program.

The second thing is, if I can say one thing, we sit with our heads in the sand when, across the border, China and the other nations are developing. We must, in fact, be part players of this program. We need to do it wisely and to do it safely and to do it for the benefit of the American people.

Now, if you don't believe in fossil fuels, I understand that, but there is no way that we are not going to be using fossil fuels for many years to come. If we are to do so, let's use that which is safe. We have already proven it can be done safely in the Arctic. It is not the frontier that people think it is. It is 150 feet deep. If we don't do this off our shores, it will be done by foreign countries.

I am asking the Department of the Interior not to withdraw those sales. It means money to the Treasury; it means we have less of a dependence on foreign oil; and it means we will be actively involved. When other countries are involved, we will be there with our equipment, and we will be able to have an oil spill recovery if they spill the oil, because they will not. I know how the parties play in this. We will. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would mandate that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management include specific areas in the Alaska region of the Outer Continental Shelf in its 2017–2022 lease schedule. This amendment would undermine the Bureau's fundamental mission to manage the development of offshore resources in an environmentally and economically responsible manner.

The 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program was proposed in March of this year, and the public comment only closed a few weeks ago. The Bureau is required by law to consider the environmental impacts of the leasing decision. This includes a comprehensive Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. It is inappropriate to circumvent this process.

Lease sales should be informed by sound science and by using the best data available. This amendment would violate multiple environmental statutes, including NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act. The amendment undermines the environmental protection that is required by law. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, these leases were put up for lease in 2017–2022. We are not asking for any additional new leases. We are asking for the leases that remain in the sales. Then we address the environmental issue as the sales take place before we have development. I am suggesting, respectfully, if we don't have those areas open, the 3 Arctic Sale areas, then the leases will not be issued in any other area.

Oil is not where you want it to be—it is where it is. I am saying we can address all of the issues the gentleman is concerned with after the sales take place and we receive the money. If it can't be done safely, it can be stopped at that time. This happened with Shell.

I am just saying not to let an agency or an administration get ahead of itself and say, "Oh, we are going to take the leases back." That is the prerogative of an agency, yes; but the leases were put up to begin with, so we ought to take and accept that. Let's go through the process, and the process will follow through. Then we will decide on the environmental impact, on the culture. Then we will have the way to do it right and correctly.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, obviously, we disagree once again.

My concern is that this amendment would mandate the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to include specific areas in the 2017–2022 lease sale schedule and that the Bureau needs to up-

hold the law. It is required to follow the law and to consider the environmental impacts of leasing decisions. This amendment would also violate, as I pointed out, quite a few statutes: NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

□ 2030

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 93 printed in House Report 114–683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to require changes to an existing placer mining plan of operations with regard to reclamation activities, including revegetation, or to modify the bond requirements for the mining operation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. This is an area called the Forty Mile Mining District area in the State of Alaska that has been mined since 1895.

There was an attempt by the BLM to go in and stop this mining. These are not large mines. These are mom-and-pop operations, placer operations. They put down ridiculous regulations and reclamation now, and they want them to reclaim the land back to the original state before it was ever mined, not of the disturbance of the mining they were doing. It is amazing to me that they would even think about doing this.

I am talking about people who have been there for 20 years, most of them retired. They are really, if I have to say anything, the mom-and-pops of Alaska; they are the spirit of Alaska.

All of a sudden, they have a big agency coming in and saying: You have to

have a reclamation area, and this is the way that we want it done.

Yet, they don't recognize what has been done in the past and how it has worked. What they are proposing is wrong, and it costs a considerable amount of money to these small mom-and-pop miners.

One of our big plaques in the State of Alaska is the gold pan. Yet, we have this agency coming in for 140 acres. That is all they are talking about. For some reason, they got an idea that we want to put them out of business.

I am just saying, no, they should not impose these regulations. Follow the State mining law, and the reclamation that takes place now works. Let them continue to do that, and we can reclaim the land. They are agreeable to that. They just can't do what they are asking them to do because they can't afford to do it. It is that simple.

This is a simple amendment to try and protect mom-and-pop operations in the State of Alaska like you would do in your State for any other operation where the Federal Government is coming in and trying to take it away.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, most of the 186 active mining operations on the BLM—these are Federal managed lands in Alaska—are placer mining operations.

Between 4 and 800 miles of BLM Federal managed streams have historic or active placer mining impacts, and there is a legacy of historic claims with reduced ecosystem function.

Now, BLM continues various outreach activities, including public meetings and interactions with individual miners, and is working with industry to incorporate best practice management and to use new science-based reclamation techniques to accelerate stream recovery.

I hear what the gentleman is saying about State lands and State recovery. And what the State of Alaska chooses to do with recovery in its own State boundaries is one thing, but these are Federal lands. In the course of reclamation activities, it may be necessary to increase an annual cost to miners to recover these streams and restore the ecosystem function.

The amendment prohibits assessing the cost of reclaiming these areas to placer miners who are profiting from Federal mineral extraction on federally managed lands, BLM lands. So the taxpayers all across this country should not be shouldering the burden of these restoring costs. The responsible party should. So that is why I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest one thing to the

gentlewoman; we are only talking about 49 families. This is small. I am not talking about all the other placer mining. This is, in fact, the Forty Mile Miners. I mean, they have been there forever.

Like I say, you can go there and it is like looking into a museum of 1859. And they are patented claims. It is their land. A lot of it is State land.

They are claiming it because it is placer mining. The BLM is claiming they have the authority to impose a reclamation system that does not work.

Did they consult? No.

I am just saying, keep in mind that we are not talking about corporations. We are not talking about large industry. We are talking about, very frankly, if you go up there—and I wish you would—you will find out they are a pretty good group of older Alaskans, some hippies. We still have a few of those left. And they are not making any money.

This is an occupation, but if they have to do what the BLM is suggesting they do—by the way, there are fish in that stream now, and it was mined in 1895. What they are asking, it will break them. They can't do it, and you will say good.

Well, that is taking people—this is a huge area, the total area. That, I am not arguing. I am just talking about this little Forty Mile group. So give them a break. Let them go out and make enough money to buy Saturday night party time.

I urge the passage of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alaska has convinced me of one thing: I need to go back to Alaska, and I need to spend some time with you there.

I still oppose this amendment. The American taxpayer should not be accepting the burden of restoration costs to make sure that these waterways are reclaimed to how they should be.

I continue to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 820, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 108, 109, 110, 112, 115, 117, 121, 124, 125, and 126 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 16, lines 4 and 24, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF TENNESSEE

Page 16, lines 4 and 23, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 72, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 81, line 18, insert "or if a Federal or State emergency declaration has been issued due to a threat to public health from heightened exposure to lead in a municipal drinking water supply before the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That in a State in which such an emergency declaration has been issued, the State may use more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this title to the State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients" before the semicolon at the end.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 120, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$300,000) (increased by \$300,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act for the "DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION" may be used in contravention of section 320101 of title 54, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used may be used to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PIN-GREE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments en bloc. They are noncontroversial amendments that affect a variety of issues. Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to consideration of these amendments en bloc.

I urge adoption of the amendments. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Maine, the ranking member, and the chairman of the subcommittee for their kindness and their support of the Jackson Lee amendments.

Let me indicate that in the sum total of my amendments, amendments Nos. 124, 125, and 126, my amendments promote support for national historic areas in our Nation, promote partnership strategies in preserving our urban life refuges, and promote outreach programs by the Smithsonian Institution on the fantastic historical and artistic knowledge of our Smithsonian houses, which facilitate an appreciation for America all over the world.

In particular, my amendment No. 124 is an amendment that expresses support for the national historic areas and for the continuation of a national policy of preserving for public use historic sites, buildings, and other objects of national significance.

My amendment No. 125 is an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to eliminate the urban wildlife refuge partnership. Additionally, there is an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to limit outreach administered by the Smithsonian.

The idea behind these three amendments is to, again, recognize the great history of this Nation, even as young as this country is. In particular, in my congressional district, we have Freedmen's Town that had Camp Logan. It was a place of freed African American slaves, which grew into an amazing community. In addition, the Allen Brothers, who founded Houston, are buried in that same neighborhood.

In addition to that, we have something called the Juneteenth Trail. That is the trail the slaves traveled from Galveston up to Houston. The trail has an enormous amount of history, and that is part of the history of celebrating Juneteenth. To preserve that history is very important.

In the second amendment, I want to make sure that we maintain a program that helps and introduces urban youth to the wonders of wildlife and historic preservation.

Finally, I think it is important that we recognize the historic importance of the Smithsonian and continue to emphasize its outreach capacity to ensure that it reaches Americans of all levels to speak about the story of this great Nation.

My amendments, again, ask these simple questions: Is our history worthy of knowing, studying, and preserving?

It is.

Is it important to work with our State and local governments to help them preserve their history?

My amendments answer that question by supporting policies that will work with State and local governments that will reach out to urban youth so they can understand the wildlife preservation through the urban wildlife refuge programs, and then, of course, the Smithsonian that provides an eye to the history of this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment Nos. 124, 125, and 126 in the en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendments Number 124, along with my other Amendments Number 125 and Number 126 to H.R. 5538—"Department of the Interior and the Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017."

I also commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes support for National Historic Areas in our nation.

Indeed, among other agencies, this measure funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Most Americans do not know that this measure also funds a very special agency, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and its adjunct, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee Amendments are simple because they send a very important message from the Congress of the United States: that we value tradition, that we think about the impact of history and tradition on future generations to come and that if we recognize and know our history, we are able to work together as an American family in the spirit of respect, unity and growth.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 124 encourages us to preserve history, whereby the National Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation are charged to redouble their efforts to assist state and local governments and community groups in identifying and working to preserve nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts, for example those relating to communities founded by newly emancipated slaves, such as Freedmen's Town in home District of Houston, Texas.

Indeed, just west of downtown Houston lies the Fourth Ward.

It is the city's oldest African American community, but before it was the Fourth Ward, this community was known by its original name, Freedmen's Town, given by freed slaves who settled it shortly after receiving the news of their emancipation on Juneteenth.

Freedmen's Town prospered during the turn of the century.

Economic, community, and social development were at a peak until local government became threatened by the prosperity of this area and its residents.

In the 1920's, Freedmen's Town was the "Harlem of the Southwest."

The area was filled with many restaurants, jazz spots, and night clubs.

As the years passed and with the coming of integration, many of Freedmen's Town residents began to move towards Texas Southern University, in the Third Ward, and other areas of the city.

Freedmen's Town has a rich and colorful past and is still home to many significant historical landmarks and features.

It was famous for its hand laid brick streets, constructed by Houston's Rev. Jeremiah Smith and his congregation over half a century ago.

Houston's first cemetery, Founder's Cemetery at Valentine and West Dallas, contains the graves of military men who fought in the Civil War, as well as the historical remains of John and Augustus Allen, the founders of Houston.

Behind Founder's Cemetery lies Congregation Beth Israel, the oldest Jewish cemetery in Houston, which is beautifully maintained to this day.

Among other historical churches in the area, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church built in 1866 continues to be a major focal point of Freedmen's Town, though it has been relocated from its original site on "Baptist Hill" where the Music Hall and Coliseum now stand.

Rev. John Jack Yates, the first Black pastor of Antioch, was a dynamic and influential leader known for his deep commitment to the education of Black youngsters.

He often used his personal finances to send Freedmen's Town children to school.

Today, Jack Yates High School in the Third Ward stands in his honor.

Although Freedmen's Town is a nationally registered historical site, and the largest intact freed slave settlement left in the entire nation, its official designation protects only 40 of the 80 blocks or more of the remaining Freedmen's Town area.

To preserve what remains of Freedmen's Town will require the combined efforts of community groups working with local, state, and federal government to reach a consensus of projects worthy of preservation.

One such project for Freedmen's Town is the "Bricks Street Project," which is intended to preserve the original brick pavers of Freedmen's Town along Andrews Street and Wilson Street.

These streets were found to contain brick pavers patterns which may be unique to the Freedmen's Town area, and are consistent with brick patterns seen on architectural features located in the Historic District.

Mr. Chair, hearts break when irreplaceable structures are destroyed or damaged beyond repair, instead of preserved and protected as they deserve.

A plaque pointing out "on this site a great building once stood" simply cannot tell the story in whole or in full.

Equally tragic is the loss of traditions: a way of living or crafting wood or farming, of celebrating holidays or worshipping or feasting on "Juneteenth" cuisine.

The preservation of artifacts as well as traditions is important to telling the story of the people who settled a community.

Thus, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 124.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 to H.R. 5538—"Department of the Interior and the Environment

and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017.”

I also comment Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes partnership strategies in preserving our urban wildlife refuges.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 prohibits the utilization of funds to eliminate Urban Wildlife and Refugee Partnerships.

According to some estimates, 80 percent of the U.S. population currently resides in urban communities, and the challenge before us is ensuring our natural resources are conserved and valued by the American people and that our youth are beneficiaries of Urban Wildlife and Refugee partnerships.

Thus, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 works to facilitate the nurturing and education of Americans, especially our youth on the imperative of exposure to urban wildlife and refugee facilities across our nation.

Picture this: nature meets skyline near Houston's Buffalo Bayou, one of many sites where Texas works with Houston Wilderness to create shared conservation messages and strategies.

Indeed, I commend the work of the Houston Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership, in Texas.

Additionally, the Texas Mid-Coast Refuge Complex will work with Houston Wilderness, an alliance of business, environmental and government interests, to create a coordinated conservation presence in the metro area.

Moreover, young people deserve exposure to the educational opportunities and excitement these urban wildlife and refugee parks have to offer, where their minds are developed and enriched; indeed, where they get to interact with and see wildlife they have read about in their school books.

Urban wildlife and refugee parks spark creativity in a healthy dose for the imagination of our young people so that they have an appreciation of nature and all the beautiful inhabitants it offers us.

From Houston, to Rhode Island to Baltimore, to Chicago and everywhere in between, young people have the opportunity to spearhead replanting projects along various rivers; learn about birding and be partners and stakeholders in their communities' parks and zoos while also sharpening their minds.

For all these reasons, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126 to H.R. 5538—“Department of the Interior and the Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017.”

I also commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes outreach programs by the Smithsonian Institution on the fantastic historical and artistic knowledge our Smithsonian houses and facilities an appreciation for America and the world over.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126 prohibits funds to be utilized to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

As I mentioned earlier, the Smithsonian Institution operates as our national museum and

attracts not only Americans and American youth but also dignitaries from across the globe, from Africa to Asia to Europe and everywhere in-between.

Indeed, our historical Smithsonian Institution has attracted intellectuals, kings, dignitaries and youth from across the country and others who have come from afar to witness in person the diversity of the art housed in our Smithsonian Institution, the world's largest museum and research complex which includes 19 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park.

No doubt, these Museums have enriched our lives: the African American History and Culture Museum, African Art Museum, the Air and Space Museum, the Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center, American Art Museum, the American History Museum, the American Indian Museum, Anacostia Community Museum, the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Freer Gallery of Art, Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the National Zoo, the National History Museum, the Portrait Gallery, Postal Museum and the Renwick Gallery.

By promoting and protecting the buildings, landscape, special places and qualities that enrich and captivate the exceptional American imagination, attracting visitors from across the globe, we preserve our history for future generations to come and educate the general public about American history.

For all these reasons, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee and subcommittee for their work on this very important issue.

This en bloc amendment includes two amendments that I offered that would provide specific relief to my hometown. Many of you have heard me on the floor of this House talk about the incredible challenge that my hometown of Flint, Michigan, faces.

Through no fault of its own, during a time when a State-appointed emergency manager was literally running every aspect of city government, a terrible decision, a thoughtless and really not science-based decision was made to use river water to replace water from the Great Lakes as the drinking water source. That decision caused a series of events that led to lead leaching into the water and, quite literally, poisoning a city of 100,000 people. The impact of this event will be long felt in my hometown.

We all have an obligation. Even though the principal responsibility lies with the State, we all have an obligation to contribute to the efforts that this city will painfully go through in order to recover. The amendments within this en bloc amendment that I offered will help.

The committee has already done great work to provide some flexibility to States in administering the clean drinking water revolving loan fund, the state revolving loan fund, which in this

case would provide the State of Michigan with tools to assist the City of Flint in making the kinds of changes to its water system to prevent this from ever happening again and correct the problem in the first place.

There is another amendment that would actually allow the city some help in transitioning to a permanent water source derived from Lake Huron and away from dependence on either the Detroit water system or this river water, which was the source of the problem.

I will just say this: It will take a lot more to fix this problem and a lot of commitment from the State and the Federal Government, but it means a lot to the people back home.

I just want to express my gratitude to the ranking member and to Chairman CALVERT for their work on this. It will help my hometown of Flint, but it will also potentially be of value to other communities facing water emergencies.

I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the en bloc amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman CALVERT for supporting this amendment as well as my friend, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM. Thank you to you both.

Mr. Chair, this amendment reduces the Smithsonian Institution account on page 120, line 23, of the bill by \$300,000, and then increases it by the same amount. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center receives a \$300,000 increase over last year's enacted funding amount, consistent with the President's request in his fiscal year 2017 budget.

The Congressional Budget Office scored this amendment as budget neutral, and more than enough money exists in the \$515,000 increase to the Smithsonian's 'Administration' account, which funds the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center, to accomplish the goal of my amendment.

Frankly speaking, I do not care where the Committee, or the Board of Regents, wish to reallocate funds from, I only wish to seek assurance that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center will receive the \$300,000 increase it so justly deserves. Thank you again, Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, for agreeing to this funding level moving forward.

According to the Smithsonian's budget justification to Congress, these additional funds will be used to provide for the salaries and benefits of one associate program director, one curator for Asian Pacific studies, and one education coordinator.

With the addition of three additional staff, the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center will be able to continue to serve as the leading voice on the Asian Pacific American experience, as well as host events in cities across the country.

Mr. Chair, I believe the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center deserves our support, and I thank everyone in this Chamber this evening for agreeing with me.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

□ 2045

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to declare a national monument under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, in the exclusive economic zone of the United States established by Proclamation Numbered 5030, dated March 10, 1983.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to bar funding for the creation of any national marine monuments in the EEZ through Presidential proclamation. I do this on behalf of commercial fishermen on Long Island and throughout the Nation who, like so many other hardworking Americans, are increasingly under assault from the executive overreach of this administration.

This amendment uses the power of the purse to ensure the President does not abuse the Antiquities Act to lock out commercial fishermen from portions of the EEZ that contain essential fisheries. Any efforts to create a marine-protected area must be done through the transparent process laid out by Magnuson-Stevens, not through executive fiat that threatens to put thousands of hardworking men and women out of business.

The Antiquities Act has been an effective tool in the past to preserve historic sites like the Statue of Liberty, but the overly broad interpretation of this law held by the current administration is threatening to shut down thousands of square miles of ocean from fishing through a Presidential proclamation.

In the northwest Atlantic, ocean fishermen from my district and throughout this region work in some of the most productive fishing areas in the world. This area is currently under consideration for a marine monument designation with little public input and zero transparency. The concerns regarding the marine monument designations reach nationwide, where the administration's closed and secretive process have left fishermen and regional fishery managers extremely concerned.

Recent marine monument designations proclaimed by the Obama administration have been the largest in U.S. history, locking out all fishing in perpetuity, a severe departure from the original intent of the Antiquities Act to preserve historical sites and archaeological treasures.

Mr. Chairman, protecting the seafood economy, coastal communities, and the hardworking men and women who provide for their families through commercial fishing is a top priority for my constituents on the east end of Long Island.

I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman BISHOP for their support of this amendment to rein in executive overreach on behalf of America's fishermen. I urge all my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, since Theodore Roosevelt's designation of our first national monument, Devil's Tower in Wyoming, 16 Presidents from both parties have used the Antiquities Act to protect more than 160 of America's best known and loved landscapes. Only three Presidents have not.

Many national monuments created through the Antiquities Act have since become some of our greatest national parks, like Zion, Bryce Canyon, Death Valley, Joshua Tree, and Glacier Bay to name a few. All of these parks were first national monuments that Congress decided warranted national park status.

The Antiquities Act has also been used on a bipartisan basis to preserve Federal marine areas as marine national monuments, with both President George W. Bush and President Obama using the Antiquities Act to protect some of the most unique and vulnerable areas of the Pacific Ocean.

To be clear, the Antiquities Act may only be used on existing Federal lands and waters, areas which belong to all Americans and are typically designated only after an extensive locally driven stakeholder outreach process. Instead of honoring this long bipartisan history of the Antiquities Act that has saved so much for our country, this amendment would foreclose any opportunity for local communities to seek to protect their regions' most valued marine resources located in Federal waters.

We have a generational responsibility to ensure that historic and cultural resources and important conservation areas found on our Nation's public lands and waters are available to future generations. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to help protect our Nation's most

treasured public resources through the Antiquities Act.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), also a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Antiquities Act has protected some of our most extraordinary landscapes. In my neck of the woods, it was central to the creation of Olympic National Park. It is a big deal for our oceans, too. President George W. Bush and President Obama both used the act to create marine national monuments and to help vulnerable ecosystems in our waters.

Like our forests, the ocean is an essential resource that matters to livelihoods and to the health of our planet, and we need to be sure they are around for future generations, including my daughters. But this amendment would deny any President, regardless of party, the ability to use the Antiquities Act to create marine national monuments.

The Zeldin amendment would put more than 4.5 million square miles out of reach of protection and would curb our Nation's ability to show the world that we care about our waters. We have seen the benefits of protecting sensitive areas that are at risk. It helps drive tourism while protecting fish populations that are essential to fisheries and coastal communities.

The Nation's leading aquariums support protection of unique and vulnerable ocean areas, as do hundreds of thousands of people, hundreds of scientists, educators, businessowners, boaters, surfers, beachgoers, and members of faith-based organizations, together with conservation organizations representing millions of people.

The Antiquities Act was created 110 years ago. Rather than engaging in an attack on this law, I urge my colleagues to join me and the American people in celebrating our shared history and its 110th anniversary. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, if the President was to designate the Plum Island Lighthouse tonight under the Antiquities Act, I would certainly welcome that, as in all the past precedent of important use and historical use of the Antiquities Act for good reason.

I introduced this amendment on behalf of all those commercial fishermen, those hardworking commercial fishermen all along the northwest Atlantic concerned that, if this marine monument is enacted by this President, they will be put out of business.

I look forward to working with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, especially from this region, who are concerned both with the important desire for conservation, the important work of protecting and utilizing the Antiquities Act productively, but also ensuring that we are not putting our commercial fishermen out of business.

Mr. Chairman, again, I thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman BISHOP. I would ask all of my colleagues to please support this important amendment, which is very important for my region, not just Long Island, but the entire northwest Atlantic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate my colleague from New York suggesting that he is very much in favor of the balance between conservation and supporting our commercial fishermen. Being from the State of Maine, we certainly look at both of those things. I will look forward to working with him, but I do think this amendment is an attack on our national monument Antiquities Act policies, and it should be recognized as that.

I do understand his concern about the inclusion of groups and the importance of a public input process. In New England, we take that very seriously. I agree with him that there is a vital need in the monument designation process for local voices to be heard, but the way to ensure that that occurs is not by an amendment that would stop monument designations in their tracks, and it is certainly not by stopping monument designation powers in the entire exclusive economic zone, the EEZ area.

Today we should be talking about the importance of public input in the monument process, about the importance of an open and transparent process that uses common sense. Instead, we are debating an amendment that sends the wrong message about this important conservation tool for our oceans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this attempt to stop local coordination, collaboration, and information sharing. I do hope that the gentleman from New York and I and the other people who represent coastal communities can find a way to balance conservation and our fishing industries and work together on that.

For now, I oppose the Zeldin amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 95 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE SPECIFIC SECTIONS

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 114, 119, or 445.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes three riders that undercut sound implementation of the Endangered Species Act as it pertains to the gray wolf, the greater sage-grouse, and the lesser prairie chicken.

Despite what many of my colleagues assert, the gray wolves are not recovered. Attempts by the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove Endangered Species Act protections for wolves have failed time and again, and they have failed because the Endangered Species Act requires listing and delisting decisions be based on sound science.

The scientific experts have shown, and courts have confirmed, that the best available science does not justify the removal of all ESA protections for gray wolves at this time. This is true whether you are talking about proposals to delist wolves in the western Great Lakes, Wyoming, or nationwide.

In fact, the only instances in which wolves have been delisted is through unprecedented and unfortunate congressional action in 2011 to remove protections from wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains. These wolves are now continually persecuted by hunters and ranchers despite the positive impacts they have had on the ecosystem and the minimal toll they take on livestock.

Gray wolves are incredible animals. Their reintroduction to the Western United States has revitalized Yellowstone, and wolf-related tourism around Yellowstone generates more than \$35 million annually for local economies. And, yet, gray wolves occupy only 5 percent of their historic range.

With respect to the lesser prairie chicken, the Fish and Wildlife Service has gone to great lengths to accommodate development interests and, at the same time, protect the bird. Populations of the bird are declining rapidly, and 80 percent of the short grass prairie it calls home has been plowed, paved, or otherwise destroyed.

The Obama administration is undertaking an unprecedented effort to conserve the bird and its habitat, and, thereby, avoid the need for Endangered Species Act protections.

Federal agencies have worked closely with the States throughout the process of developing science-based strategies to conserve sage-grouse and their habitat. Claims that the States have been frozen out of the process just don't reflect realities. In fact, the 10 resource management plans released by the In-

terior Department are all based on plans developed by the States, not one-size-fits-all plans, but individual plans to suit each State. Because of these plans, the Fish and Wildlife Service determined that listing the greater sage-grouse under the Endangered Species Act was not warranted.

The ESA has been the catalyst for the conservation of many species and landscapes across the country. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I don't know quite how many clichés to use here, but where a scalpel could have been helpful, this is a meat ax that not only has missed the fingers, it has cut off the entire hand.

In 2012, the Fish and Wildlife Service did declare the gray wolf was recovered, and the Endangered Species Act demands that that goes back to State for enforcement. A court vacated that not on the basis of the science, but on a technicality. So the Fish and Wildlife Service, what it wishes to do is done in the bill. This amendment would force them to do what they don't want to do. Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't get it right that often. For heaven's sake, let them do what they want to do this time.

In 2014, the prairie chicken was listed, but they did not look at the State requirements, so it was vacated by a district court. So, once again, the underlying bill tells them what they wish to do. In fact, the Department of Justice has said they don't have any intent of appealing that decision. This allows them to do what they do. The amendment would require the Department of Justice to do what they don't want to do.

The sage-grouse last year was not listed even though it was then put in plans that would act as if it were listed, but the issue is when it was first started, Secretary Salazar told the States to actually come up with plans. Every State that has a sage-grouse population has a plan. The basic bill allows those State plans to go into effect. This amendment would prohibit the State plans from going into effect. So, in essence, this amendment tells the Fish and Wildlife Service to do what it doesn't want to do, the Justice Department to do what it doesn't want to do, and the States can't do what they do want to do.

In essence, we are doing the thing backwards, and we are harming people in the process. This is an amendment that simply sounds good on paper, but it misses the mark, and it hurts people.

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

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio), my colleague and co-sponsor of this amendment.

□ 2100

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Chairman, of course, I have tremendous respect for the chairman of the committee, but it wasn't quite an accurate statement.

Courts have found that what Fish and Wildlife said is: If you want to have delisting and manage the wolf, you must adopt an acceptable management plan. Courts have found that neither Wyoming nor Minnesota have adopted adequate management plans. In fact, we have seen basically management to the point of extirpation. Even in States that have theoretically adopted plans, like Idaho, they are attempting to reduce the population to unsustainable levels.

There is a fabulous "Dear Colleague" from Mr. RIBBLE showing the biggest, fiercest, ugliest looking wolf I have ever seen attacking a small school child. Of course, there have been no wolf attacks in the lower 48 in the recorded history of the United States, but that is what we are protecting against here tonight.

They talk about predation on cattle. If we had better management of cattle, better husbandry—it is, basically, disease and weather are the biggest cause of loss of cattle. Then the number two cause is other predators. That would be coyotes. And guess what? Wolves kill coyotes. And wolves' preferred prey is not cattle.

So what is this insane obsession with killing wolves? I don't get it. I mean, were you frightened by a wolf as a small child. I don't get it. This is an incredible, iconic top species which actually helps regulate the ecosystem. Look at Yellowstone since we had wolves reintroduced there and how much more healthy it is.

I just don't get this irrational behavior. I would urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and don't substitute political science and stupidity for science.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would try to bring some clarity about the amendment, and I stand in opposition to this amendment.

We have heard a lot of hyperbole here this evening, but I want to try to set the record straight.

We cannot have it both ways. We can either have an Endangered Species Act and we can have the Fish and Wildlife Service and their scientists manage it, or we can get rid of it and just have the court do it.

So it appears that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when things don't go the way they like by the Fish

and Wildlife Service, they are fully supportive of the court system. When things don't go right in the court system, it appears, Mr. Chairman, that they are fully supportive of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

What I would prefer is that we protect the Endangered Species Act and the agency that was directed to manage it and to manage these rare populations or endangered species like the gray wolf.

In the 1990s—and I am from Wisconsin—there were only a handful of mating pairs of gray wolves in northern Wisconsin. Throughout the Great Lakes region today, there are 3,700 wolves in this area. It is an economically and ecologically unsustainable number.

The Fish and Wildlife Service rightly decided that the population had recovered and that their program to protect this species had been so completely successful that it was time to delist and turn the power back to the States to manage, which in fact they were doing, until a court decided that the Fish and Wildlife Service and the experts there protecting the Endangered Species Act just didn't get it right.

Well, we cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chair, and it is time that this Congress tells the courts what the laws are and how we want these things managed. What we are doing here in this bill and in the underlying language is protecting both the Endangered Species Act and the Fish and Wildlife Service scientists who are giving the proper jurisdiction to manage endangered species, including the gray wolf.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am very happy to support this amendment, and I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time and for his commitment to this issue and the preservation of the Endangered Species Act.

There are many of us in Congress concerned about the continual assault that is being waged against the ESA. On an appropriations bill, and particularly the one before us today, we see attempts to reduce the scope of the Endangered Species Act and to continue to weaken its protections.

We must continue to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service to make sure they are hearing from all stakeholders and taking their concerns seriously. But that does not mean we get rid of the ESA.

We have so many strong examples of how the Endangered Species Act works and worked over the past 40 years. One of my favorites that my colleagues often hear me speak of is the success of the bald eagle and the fact that it now thrives in Maine, where it was once endangered. Where they were only once 30 nesting pairs in Maine, now there are over 630 nesting pairs of bald eagles in Maine.

There are so many other success stories, from the peregrine falcon to

the brown pelican to the sea otter. All of these success stories were based on sound science and local input through the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. You are darn right there are success stories with the ESA. That is because the agency that was designed to implement the laws decided the species were recovered. They delisted them, and they are doing fine. That is why there are so many eagles in this country.

That is not what happened with the gray wolf. The scientists at the agency decided that they had recovered. They delisted them, by rule. The courts got involved in D.C.—not in the State where the wolves are, but in D.C.—and said, "No, we disagree with all the sound science," the sound science of the agency, and they took it over. That is why we are here.

Congress makes the laws. The executive branch implements the laws. The courts interpret the laws. The agency implemented the law. Using sound science, they found that those wolves should be delisted. And they delisted them by rule. And then D.C. environmental groups went to a D.C. court and said: We don't like the decision. And now, all of a sudden, they are back.

Mr. Chairman, this is the way to respond, by law.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of—

- (1) Executive Order 13653; or
- (2) Executive Order 13693.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I firmly believe that addressing the causes and consequences of climate change is perhaps the most pressing issue of our time.

Each week, I share the latest scientific facts with my constituents about climate change—its impact on coral reefs, on disease migration, community displacement, species extinction, sea level rise, cloud movement, and so much more.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is no shortage of material to draw upon. Our best scientists are warning us that, unless carbon emissions were dramatically cut, we face severe consequences ecologically and economically, not to mention global instability.

We need to be doing more in this body to address the causes and consequences of climate change. Instead, we have an appropriations bill laden with riders aimed at undermining climate action.

We have section 122, which prevents the Bureau of Land Management from cutting emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas; section 417, prohibiting regulation of carbon dioxide methane as part of Clean Air Act title V permits; section 418, prohibiting establishment of a greenhouse reporting program for manure management; section 436, stripping the executive of its ability to incorporate the social cost of carbon into rulemakings and guidance; and, section 439, prohibiting regulation of oil and gas sector methane emissions under section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

Another provision of the bill requires the EPA to make the false assumption that burning biomass is carbon neutral. In reality, in 2012, EPA's scientific advisory board directly challenged the claim that all forest biomass is carbon neutral, explaining that while some type may indeed be carbon neutral, it is not appropriate to assume that all types of forest biomass are carbon neutral.

Numerous studies have underscored that using some types, particularly slow-growing trees, can actually increase atmospheric carbon for many decades. To know what types of biomass are truly low carbon, scientists need to assess them, and EPA deserves to have its scientific judgment uncorrupted by Congress.

With this amendment, I seek to render inert the anticlimate action riders of this bill. Executive Order 13653, titled "Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change," requires Federal agencies to integrate considerations of the challenges posed by climate change effects into their programs, policies, rules, and operations to ensure that they continue to be effective, even as the climate changes.

Executive Order 13693, titled "Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade," requires Federal agen-

cies to carry out a range of actions to improve Federal sustainability. These include tracking and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, climate resiliency measures, energy conservation and renewable energy targets, green building goals, and other positive steps. Federal agency actions have major impacts on our contributions to global warming.

For that reason, I offer an amendment to ensure that no funds are spent on activities that are not in compliance with the President's 2013 executive order on climate change adaptation and the 2015 executive order on sustainability.

It is the right thing to do to run an effective and efficient government. It is the right to do to return the highest value to the American taxpayer.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the gentleman wants to ensure that funds are being expended on climate and sustainability executive orders issued by the President.

Simply put, the President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. We would not be doing our job if we allowed this President or any President to unilaterally make policy decisions without allowing Congress to weigh in with appropriate policy debates.

In the meantime, we must use our congressional power of the purse to rein in executive branch overreach, which is exactly what we are going to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge everyone to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to authorize, permit, or conduct geological or geophysical activities (as those terms are used in the final programmatic environmental impact statement of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management entitled "Atlantic OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Planning Areas" and completed February 2014) in support of oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and development in any area located in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, or Straits of Florida Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment would essentially prohibit geological or geophysical activities in support of oil and gas exploration and development in the Atlantic in fiscal year 2017. Most importantly, this includes seismic airgun blasting.

In March of this year, the Department of the Interior removed the Atlantic Ocean from offshore oil and gas drilling until 2022. However, the administration is still considering permits to conduct seismic airgun blasting for subsea oil and gas deposits. Not only is this unnecessary, because drilling is not permitted, but this exploratory process would cause undue harm to marine resources.

Seismic airgun pulses are loud, repetitive, explosive sounds. The produced sound can travel over enormous distances, due to its low pressure and high amplitude. Because sound travels so efficiently underwater, the noise from a blast can be heard up to 2,500 miles from the source, roughly the distance from Washington, D.C., to Las Vegas.

What these loud, repetitive, explosive sounds ultimately do is harm a range of aquatic species and the communities that rely upon them.

Numerous studies have shown that noise from seismic airgun testing negatively impacts fish. Examples include 40 to 80 percent reduced catches in the Atlantic of cod, haddock, rockfish, herring, sand eel, and blue whiting. Sea turtles and invertebrates have also been found to demonstrate alarm and avoidance responses when exposed to seismic blasts.

The critically endangered North Atlantic right whale species, of which less than 500 remain, use sound to find food, locate mates, and keep track of their young. The area proposed for blasting includes the only known right whale calving grounds in the world. Seismic airgun blasting could displace right whales from their habitats and tip the species toward extinction.

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

□ 2115

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the administration, as already mentioned, already removed the Atlantic leases from consideration in the 5-year lease plan from 2017 to 2022. This language is completely unnecessary, and I urge all the Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan amendment to prohibit seismic testing in the Atlantic, which I have cosponsored, along with colleagues from New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina.

After taking into account the overwhelming opposition to offshore drilling in the Atlantic, including my home State of North Carolina, the Obama administration wisely removed the prospect of drilling from the 5-year Oil and Gas Leasing Program for the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf.

Now that there are no foreseeable plans to drill among the dynamic ecosystems and pristine beaches of the Atlantic Coast, we should move immediately to prevent seismic testing and other geological and geophysical activities. Not only are these activities unnecessary in light of the administration's decision, they also pose a significant environmental threat.

Seismic testing is hugely disruptive to marine ecosystems. Its negative impacts include displacing fish over a large geographic area, reducing catch rates for commercial fishermen, and impacting the reproduction, foraging, communication, and other vital behaviors of marine mammals, including the North Atlantic right whale, one of the most endangered species on the planet.

Further, the data generated from the seismic testing is proprietary and, therefore, unavailable to the public or to policymakers who might rely on it to inform public policy, planning, or debate regarding the economic and environmental impact of offshore energy exploration.

Instead of allowing oil and gas companies to conduct an unnecessary and ecologically damaging activity, just miles from our Nation's coastline, we should be investing our time and money in advancing energy efficiency, renewable fuels, alternative energy technologies, including offshore wind development to reduce dependence on fossil fuels.

I thank my colleague from Virginia for taking the leadership on this amendment. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. BEYER. How much time is left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk just for 1 minute about the community impacts. Along the Atlantic Coast nearly 1.4 million jobs and over \$95 billion in gross domestic product rely on healthy ocean ecosystems. In my State of Virginia that is 91,000 jobs and nearly \$5 billion in GDP.

The Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils have formally updated their policy position to express opposition and serious reservation to seismic airgun blasting.

Our chair kindly says this isn't necessary because the Obama administration has taken the drilling off the table until 2022, but it has not taken seismic airgun off the table, and that research will go on.

I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to put a moratorium on airgun blasting. Oil and gas development should not come at the expense of coastal communities and the marine species on which they rely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, seismic testing has been done all over the globe for decades, not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being hurt or killed due to seismic activity.

In fact, I am on the Natural Resources Committee. We got Abigail Hopper's own testimony in the committee saying that there hadn't been a verifiable instance.

Go to BOEM's Web site. Their Chief Biologist has a written statement there. Not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being hurt or killed due to seismic.

If we want to find out what resources are available in this country for future energy independence, let's allow the seismic to happen off the coast of South Carolina, off the coast of Georgia, off the coast of North Carolina, to see if there are resources that may be harvestable to help with American energy independence going forward.

Stopping seismic is just ludicrous because there is not a single verifiable instance. Go do the research yourself on the BOEM Web site. Look at the Chief Biologist, listen to Abigail Hopper, the Director's own testimony in Natural Resources, and you will hear it for yourself.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this amendment. I urge everyone to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 76 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 78 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 80 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas.

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 88 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 90 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 92 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 94 by Mr. ZELDIN of New York.

Amendment No. 95 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 96 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 97 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 223, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—195

Abraham	Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Denham
Allen	Buck	DeSantis
Amash	Burgess	DesJarlais
Amodei	Byrne	Duffy
Babin	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Chabot	Ellmers (NC)
Barton	Chaffetz	Emmer (MN)
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Coffman	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fleming
Black	Comstock	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Blum	Cook	Fortenberry
Bost	Cramer	Fox
Boustany	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Garrett
Brat	Davidson	Gibbs

Gibson	Lucas	Rothfus	Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Torres	Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Norcross	Ruiz	Tsongas	Byrne	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Goodlatte	Lummis	Royce	O'Rourke	Rush	Turner	Calvert	Hunter	Reed
Gosar	Marchant	Russell	Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Upton	Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Gowdy	Massie	Salmon	Pascarell	Sánchez, Linda	Valadao	Carter (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Sanford	Paulsen	T.	Van Hollen	Chabot	Issa	Rice (SC)
Graves (MO)	McCauley	Scalise	Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas	Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Griffith	McClintock	Schweikert	Pelosi	Sarbanes	Veasey	Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Grothman	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Vela	Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Guinta	McKinley	Sensenbrenner	Peters	Schiff	Velázquez	Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Guthrie	McMorris	Sessions	Peterson	Schrader	Visclosky	Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Hardy	Rodgers	Shimkus	Pingree	Scott (VA)	Walden	Collins (NY)	Jones	Rohrabacher
Harper	McSally	Shuster	Pocan	Scott, David	Walters, Mimi	Comstock	Jordan	Rokita
Harris	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Poliquin	Serrano	Walz	Conaway	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Hartzler	Mica	Smith (NE)	Polis	Sherman	Wasserman	Cook	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Posey	Simpson	Schultz	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Stefanik	Price (NC)	Sinema	Waters, Maxine	Crawford	King (IA)	Rothfus
Holding	Mooney (WV)	Rangel	Quigley	Sires	Watson Coleman	Crenshaw	Kirkpatrick	Rouzer
Hudson	Mullin	Reed	Stewart	Slaughter	Welch	Cuellar	Kline	Royce
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Smith (WA)	Whitfield	Culberson	Knight	Russell
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Rice (NY)	Speier	Woodall	Wilson (FL)	Davidson	Labrador	Salmon
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Richmond	Takano	Yarmuth	Woodall	Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Sanford
Hunter	Newhouse	Rigell	Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)	Young (IN)	Denham	LaMalfa	Scalise
Hurd (TX)	Noem	Tiberi	Rogers (KY)	Titus	Zeldin	DeSantis	Lamborn	Schweikert
Hurt (VA)	Nugent	Tipton	Ros-Lehtinen			DesJarlais	Lance	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Tonko				Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Trott				Duffy	Long	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Wagner	Costa	Himes	Poe (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Loudermilk	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walberg	Gallego	Issa	Ruppersberger	Duncan (TN)	Love	Shimkus
Jones	Perry	Walker	Garamendi	Marino	Sewell (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Lucas	Shuster
Jordan	Pittenger	Walorski	Granger	Messer	Swalwell (CA)	Emmer (MN)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Katko	Pitts	Weber (TX)	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	Farenthold	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Kelly (MS)	Pompeo	Webster (FL)				Fincher	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom	Wenstrup				Fleischmann	Massie	Stewart
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Westerman				Fleming	McCarthy	Stivers
Kline	Renacci	Westmoreland				Flores	McCauley	Stutzman
Knight	Ribble	Williams				Forbes	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Labrador	Rice (SC)	Wilson (SC)				Fox	McHenry	Thornberry
LaHood	Roby	Wittman				Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Tiberi
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Womack				Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Tipton
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Yoder				Gibbs	Rodgers	Trott
Lance	Rohrabacher	Yoho				Gohmert	McSally	Turner
Latta	Rokita	Young (AK)				Meadows	Messer	Upton
Long	Rooney (FL)	Young (IA)				Goodlatte	Valadao	Valadao
Loudermilk	Roskam	Zinke				Gosar	Mica	Walberg
Love	Ross					Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Walden
						Granger	Miller (MI)	Walker
						Graves (GA)	Moolenaar	Walorski
						Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi
						Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
						Griffith	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
						Grothman	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
						Guinta	Noem	Westerman
						Guthrie	Nugent	Westmoreland
						Hardy	Nunes	Williams
						Harper	Olson	Wilson (SC)
						Harris	Palazzo	Wittman
						Hartzler	Palmer	Womack
						Heck (NV)	Perry	Woodall
						Hensarling	Peterson	Yoder
						Herrera Beutler	Pittenger	Yoho
						Hice, Jody B.	Pitts	Young (AK)
						Hill	Poliquin	Young (IA)
						Holding	Pompeo	Young (IN)
						Hudson	Posey	Zinke
						Huelskamp		

## NOES—223

Adams	DeFazio	Jolly
Aguilar	DeGette	Joyce
Ashford	Delaney	Kaptur
Bass	DeLauro	Keating
Beatty	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	Dent	Kennedy
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kildee
Beyer	Deutch	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Kind
Blumenauer	Dingell	King (NY)
Bonamici	Doggett	Kinzing (IL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dold	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Donovan	Kuster
Brooks (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Langevin
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Larsen (CT)
Buchanan	Ellison	Lawrence
Bucshon	Engel	Lee
Bustos	Eshoo	Levin
Butterfield	Esty	Lewis
Calvert	Farr	Lieu, Ted
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Lipinski
Capuano	Foster	LoBiondo
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Loeb
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Cartwright	Gabbard	Lowe
Castor (FL)	Graham	Lujan Grisham
Castro (TX)	Graves (LA)	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Grayson	Luján, Ben Ray
Cicilline	Green, Al	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Lynch
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	MacArthur
Clay	Gutiérrez	Maloney
Cleaver	Hahn	Carolyn
Clyburn	Hanna	Maloney, Sean
Cohen	Heck (NV)	Matsui
Cole	Heck (WA)	McCollum
Connolly	Herrera Beutler	McDermott
Conyers	Higgins	McGovern
Cooper	Hill	McNerney
Costello (PA)	Hinojosa	Meehan
Courtney	Honda	Meeks
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Meng
Crowley	Huffman	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Israel	Moore
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Moulton
Curbelo (FL)	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
		Neal

## NOT VOTING—15

Costa  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Granger  
Hastings  
Himes  
Issa  
Marino  
Messer  
Pearce  
Poe (TX)  
Ruppersberger  
Sewell (AL)  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2141

Messrs. HINOJOSA, KINZINGER of Illinois, and GRAYSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. FINCHER and McHENRY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, during rollcall Vote No. 453 on H.R. 5538, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: “No” on rollcall No. 453.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

## AYES—219

Abraham	Barr	Boustany
Aderholt	Barton	Brady (TX)
Allen	Benish	Brat
Amash	Billirakis	Bridenstine
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Ashford	Black	Brooks (IN)
Babin	Blum	Buck
Barletta	Bost	Bucshon

## NOES—203

Adams	Clay	Ellison
Aguilar	Cleaver	Engel
Bass	Clyburn	Eshoo
Beatty	Cohen	Esty
Becerra	Connolly	Farr
Bera	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Cooper	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Foster
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Courtney	Fudge
Bonamici	Crowley	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Gallego
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Gibson
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Graham
Buchanan	DeFazio	Grayson
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	Delaney	Green, Gene
Capps	DeLauro	Grijalva
Capuano	DelBene	Gutiérrez
Cárdenas	Dent	Hahn
Carney	DeSaulnier	Hanna
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Cartwright	Dingell	Higgins
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Dold	Honda
Chu, Judy	Donovan	Hoyer
Cicilline	Doyle, Michael F.	Huffman
Clark (MA)	Duckworth	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Edwards	Jeffries

Johnson (GA) McGovern Schakowsky  
 Johnson, E. B. McNerney Schiff  
 Kaptur Meehan Schrader  
 Katko Meeks Scott (VA)  
 Keating Meng Scott, David  
 Kelly (IL) Moore Serrano  
 Kennedy Moulton Sherman  
 Kildee Murphy (FL) Simpson  
 Kilmer Nadler Sinema  
 Kind Napolitano Sires  
 King (NY) Neal Slaughter  
 Kinzinger (IL) Nolan Smith (NJ)  
 Kuster Norcross Smith (WA)  
 Langevin O'Rourke Speier  
 Larsen (WA) Pallone Stefanik  
 Larson (CT) Pascrell Takano  
 Lawrence Paulsen Thompson (CA)  
 Lee Payne Thompson (MS)  
 Levin Pelosi Titus  
 Lewis Perlmutter Tonko  
 Lieu, Ted Peters Torres  
 Lipinski Pingree Tsongas  
 LoBiondo Pocan Van Hollen  
 Loeb sack Polis Vargas  
 Lofgren Price (NC) Veasey  
 Lowenthal Quigley Vela  
 Lowey Rangel Velázquez  
 Lujan Grisham Reichert  
 (NM) Rice (NY) Visclosky  
 Luján, Ben Ray Richmond Wagner  
 (NM) Ros-Lehtinen Walz  
 Lynch Roybal-Allard Wasserman  
 MacArthur Ruiz Waters, Maxine  
 Maloney, Rush Watson Coleman  
 Carolyn Ryan (OH) Welch  
 Maloney, Sean Sánchez, Linda Whitfield  
 Matsui T. Wilson (FL)  
 McCollum Sanchez, Loretta Yarmuth  
 McDermott Sarbanes Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—11

Blackburn Mullin Sewell (AL)  
 Hastings Pearce Swallow (CA)  
 Himes Poe (TX) Takai  
 Marino Ruppersberger

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2144

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 161, noes 262,  
 not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

## AYES—161

Abraham Bost Clawson (FL)  
 Aderholt Boustany Coffman  
 Allen Brat Collins (GA)  
 Amash Bridenstine Collins (NY)  
 Babin Brooks (AL) Conaway  
 Barletta Brooks (IN) Cook  
 Barr Buchanan Cramer  
 Benishek Buck Crawford  
 Bilirakis Burgess Culberson  
 Bishop (UT) Byrne Davidson  
 Black Carter (GA) DeSantis  
 Blackburn Carter (TX) DesJarlais  
 Blum Chabot Duffy

Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam  
 Duncan (TN) Jones  
 Ellmers (NC) Jordan  
 Farenthold Kelly (MS)  
 Fincher Kelly (PA)  
 Fleischmann Labrador  
 Fleming LaHood  
 Flores LaMalfa  
 Forbes Lamborn  
 Fox Latta  
 Franks (AZ) Long  
 Garrett Loudermilk  
 Gibbs Luetkemeyer  
 Gibson Lummis  
 Gohmert Marchant  
 Goodlatte Massie  
 Gosar McHenry  
 Gowdy McKinley  
 Granger McMorris  
 Graves (GA) Rodgers  
 Graves (MO) Meadows  
 Griffith Messer  
 Grothman Miller (FL)  
 Guinta Miller (MI)  
 Guthrie Mooleenaar  
 Harper Mooney (WV)  
 Harris Mullin  
 Hartzler Mulvaney  
 Hensarling Murphy (PA)  
 Hice, Jody B. Neugebauer  
 Holding Newhouse  
 Hudson Noem  
 Huelskamp Olson  
 Huizenga (MI) Palmer  
 Hultgren Perry  
 Hurd (TX) Pittenger  
 Hurt (VA) Pompeo  
 Issa Posey  
 Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe  
 Jenkins (WV) Reed  
 Johnson (OH) Renacci

## NOES—262

Adams DeFazio Jeffries  
 Aguilar DeGette Johnson (GA)  
 Amodei Delaney Johnson, E. B.  
 Ashford DeLauro Jolly  
 Barton DelBene Joyce  
 Bass Denham Kaptur  
 Beatty Dent Katko  
 Becerra DeSaulnier Keating  
 Bera Deutch Kelly (IL)  
 Beyer Diaz-Balart Kennedy  
 Bishop (GA) Dingell Kildee  
 Bishop (MI) Doggett Kilmer  
 Blumenauer Dold Kind  
 Bonamici Donovan King (IA)  
 Boyle, Brendan Doyle, Michael King (NY)  
 F. F. Kirkpatrick  
 Brady (PA) Duckworth Kline  
 Brown (FL) Edwards Knight  
 Brownley (CA) Ellison Kuster  
 Bucshon Emmer (MN) Lance  
 Bustos Engel Langevin  
 Butterfield Eshoo Larsen (WA)  
 Calvert Esty Larson (CT)  
 Capps Farr Lawrence  
 Capuano Fitzpatrick Lee  
 Cárdenas Fortenberry Levin  
 Carney Foster Lewis  
 Carson (IN) Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted  
 Cartwright Frelinghuysen Lipinski  
 Castor (FL) Fudge LoBiondo  
 Castro (TX) Gabbard Loeb sack  
 Chaffetz Gallego Lofgren  
 Chu, Judy Garamendi Love  
 Cohen Graham Lowenthal  
 Cole Clark (MA) Lowey  
 Comstock Clark (NY) Lucas  
 Connolly Grayson Lujan Grisham  
 Conyers Green, Al (NM)  
 Cooper Green, Gene Luján, Ben Ray  
 Costa Grijalva (NM)  
 Costello (PA) Gutierrez Lynch  
 Courtney Hahn MacArthur  
 Crenshaw Hanna Maloney,  
 Crowley Hardy Carolyn  
 Cuellar Heck (NV) Maloney, Sean  
 Cummings Heck (WA) Matsui  
 Curbelo (FL) Higgins McCarthy  
 Davis (CA) Hill McCaul  
 Davis, Danny Himes McClintock  
 Davis, Rodney Israel McCollum  
 Jackson Lee Jackson Lee McDermott  
 Meeks Meeks McGovern  
 Meehan McNerney  
 Meeks Meeks Meehan

Meng Rigell  
 Mica Rogers (KY)  
 Moore Rohrabacher  
 Moulton Ros-Lehtinen  
 Murphy (FL) Roskam  
 Nadler Roybal-Allard  
 Napolitano Royce  
 Neal Ruiz  
 Nolan Russell  
 Norcross Ryan (OH)  
 Nugent Sánchez, Linda  
 Nunes T.  
 O'Rourke Sanchez, Loretta  
 Palazzo Sarbanes  
 Pallone Scott, Austin  
 Pascrell Schakowsky  
 Paulsen Schiff  
 Payne Schrader  
 Pelosi Scott (VA)  
 Perlmutter Scott, David  
 Peters Sensenbrenner  
 Peterson Serrano  
 Pingree Sherman  
 Pitts Simpson  
 Pocan Sinema  
 Poliquin Sires  
 Polls Slaughter  
 Price (NC) Smith (NJ)  
 Price, Tom Smith (WA)  
 Quigley Speier  
 Rangel Stefanik  
 Reichert Stewart  
 Rice (NY) Stivers  
 Richmond Swallow (CA)

## NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX) Pearce  
 Hastings Poe (TX)  
 Kinzinger (IL) Ruppersberger  
 Marino Sewell (AL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2147

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 188, noes 239,  
 not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

## AYES—188

Abraham Brat Crawford  
 Aderholt Bridenstine Culberson  
 Allen Brooks (AL) Davidson  
 Amash Brooks (IN) Denham  
 Babin Buck DeSantis  
 Barletta Barletta Burgess  
 Barr Byrnes DesJarlais  
 Barton Carter (GA) Duffy  
 Benishek Carter (TX) Duncan (SC)  
 Bilirakis Chabot Duncan (TN)  
 Bishop (MI) Chaffetz Emmer (MN)  
 Bishop (UT) Clawson (FL) Farenthold  
 Black Collins (GA) Fincher  
 Blackburn Collins (NY) Fleischmann  
 Blum Conaway Fleming  
 Bost Conyers Flores  
 Boustany Cook Forbes  
 Brady (TX) Cramer Foxx

Franks (AZ) Loudermilk  
Garrett Love  
Gibbs Luetkemeyer  
Gohmert Lummis  
Goodlatte Marchant  
Gosar Massie  
Gowdy McCarthy  
Granger McCaul  
Graves (GA) McClintock  
Graves (LA) McHenry  
Graves (MO) McKinley  
Griffith McMorris  
Grothman Rodgers  
Guinta Meadows  
Guthrie Messer  
Harper Miller (FL)  
Harris Miller (MI)  
Hartzler Moonenar  
Hensarling Mooney (WV)  
Hice, Jody B. Mullin  
Hill Mulvaney  
Holding Murphy (PA)  
Hudson Neugebauer  
Huelskamp Newhouse  
Huizenga (MI) Noem  
Hultgren Olson  
Hunter Palazzo  
Hurd (TX) Palmer  
Hurt (VA) Perry  
Issa Peterson  
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger  
Jenkins (WV) Pitts  
Johnson (OH) Pompeo  
Johnson, Sam Posey  
Jones Price, Tom  
Jordan Ratcliffe  
Kelly (MS) Ribble  
Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)  
King (IA) Rigell  
Knight Roby  
Labrador Roe (TN)  
LaMalfa Rogers (AL)  
Lamborn Rogers (KY)  
Latta Rohrabacher  
Long Rokita

## NOES—239

Adams Davis, Rodney  
Aguilar DeFazio  
Amodei DeGette  
Ashford Delaney  
Bass DeLauro  
Beatty DelBene  
Becerra Dent  
Bera DeSaulnier  
Beyer Deutch  
Bishop (GA) Diaz-Balart  
Blumenauer Dingell  
Bonamici Doggett  
Boyle, Brendan Dold  
F. Donovan  
Brady (PA) Doyle, Michael  
Brown (FL) F.  
Brownley (CA) Duckworth  
Buchanan Edwards  
Bucshon Ellison  
Bustos Engel  
Butterfield Eshoo  
Calvert Esty  
Capps Farr  
Capuano Fitzpatrick  
Cárdenas Fortenberry  
Carney Foster  
Carson (IN) Frankel (FL)  
Cartwright Frelinghuysen  
Castor (FL) Fudge  
Castro (TX) Gabbard  
Chu, Judy Gallego  
Cicilline Garamendi  
Clark (MA) Gibson  
Clarke (NY) Graham  
Clay Grayson  
Cleaver Green, Al  
Clyburn Green, Gene  
Coffman Grijalva  
Cohen Gutiérrez  
Cole Hahn  
Comstock Hanna  
Connolly Hardy  
Cooper Heck (NV)  
Costa Heck (WA)  
Costello (PA) Herrera Beutler  
Courtney Higgins  
Crowley Himes  
Cuellar Hinojosa  
Cummings Honda  
Curbelo (FL) Hoyer  
Davis (CA) Huffman  
Davis, Danny Israel

Rooney (FL) Ross  
Ross Rothfus  
Rouzer Rouzer  
Royce Royce  
Russell Russell  
Salmon Salmon  
Sanford Sanford  
Scalise Scalise  
Schweikert Schweikert  
Scott, Austin Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner  
Sessions Sessions  
Shimkus Shimkus  
Shuster Shuster  
Smith (MO) Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE) Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX) Smith (TX)  
Stewart Stewart  
Stutzman Stutzman  
Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry Thornberry  
Tiberi Tiberi  
Tipton Tipton  
Trott Trott  
Upton Upton  
Wagner Wagner  
Walberg Walberg  
Walker Walker  
Walorski Walorski  
Walters, Mimi Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX) Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup Wenstrup  
Westerman Westerman  
Westmoreland Westmoreland  
Whitfield Whitfield  
Williams Williams  
Wittman Wittman  
Womack Womack  
Woodall Woodall  
Yoder Yoder  
Yoho Yoho  
Young (AK) Young (AK)  
Young (IN) Young (IN)

Meeks Meng  
Mica Mica  
Moore Moore  
Moulton Moulton  
Murphy (FL) Murphy (FL)  
Nadler Nadler  
Napolitano Napolitano  
Neal Neal  
Nolan Nolan  
Norcross Norcross  
Nugent Nugent  
Nunes Nunes  
O'Rourke O'Rourke  
Pallone Pallone  
Pascarell Pascarell  
Paulsen Paulsen  
Payne Payne  
Pelosi Pelosi  
Perlmutter Perlmutter  
Peters Peters  
Pingree Pingree  
Pocan Pocan  
Poliquin Poliquin  
Polis Polis  
Price (NC) Price (NC)  
Quigley Quigley  
Rangel Rangel  
Reed Reed  
Reichert Reichert

Crenshaw  
Hastings

Renacci Rice (NY)  
Rice (NY) Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam Roskam  
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz Ruiz  
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger  
Rush Rush  
Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda Sanchez, Linda  
T. T.  
Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes Sarbanes  
Schakowsky Schakowsky  
Schiff Schiff  
Schrader Schrader  
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)  
Scott, David Scott, David  
Serrano Serrano  
Sewell (AL) Sewell (AL)  
Sherman Sherman  
Simpson Simpson  
Sinema Sinema  
Sires Sires  
Slaughter Slaughter  
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)  
Speier Speier  
Stefanik Stefanik

## NOT VOTING—6

Marino  
Pearce

Stivers Swalwell (CA)  
Takano Takano  
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)  
Titus Titus  
Tonko Tonko  
Torres Torres  
Tsongas Tsongas  
Turner Turner  
Valadao Valadao  
Van Hollen Van Hollen  
Vargas Vargas  
Veasey Veasey  
Vela Vela  
Velázquez Velázquez  
Visclosky Visclosky  
Walden Walden  
Walz Walz  
Wasserman Wasserman  
Schultz Schultz  
Waters, Maxine Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman Watson Coleman  
Webster (FL) Webster (FL)  
Welch Welch  
Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth Yarmuth  
Young (IA) Young (IA)  
Zeldin Zeldin  
Zinke Zinke

Poe (TX)  
Takai

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

□ 2150

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

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
valled by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 231, noes 197,  
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]  
AYES—231

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Baretta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishak  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan

Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham

DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte

Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer

Lummis  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moonenar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer

## NOES—197

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cuellar  
Cummings

Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda

Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott

McGovern	Price (NC)	Slaughter	Labrador	Nunes	Smith (NE)	Rice (NY)	Scott, David	Torres
McNerney	Quigley	Smith (WA)	LaHood	Perry	Stewart	Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Meehan	Rangel	Speier	LaMalfa	Pittenger	Stivers	Roby	Sessions	Turner
Meeks	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)	Lamborn	Pitts	Stutzman	Rogers (AL)	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Meng	Richmond	Takano	Lance	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Vargas
Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)	Latta	Pompeo	Tiberi	Rooney (FL)	Simpson	Veasey
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Long	Posey	Tipton	Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Titus	Loudermilk	Price, Tom	Trott	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Love	Reed	Upton	Ruiz	Slaughter	Visclosky
Napolitano	Rush	Torres	Lucas	Renacci	Valadao	Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Neal	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas	Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Wagner	Rush	Smith (TX)	Walz
Nolan	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen	Lummis	Rice (SC)	Walberg	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Norcross	T.	Vargas	Massie	Rigell	Walker	Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Schultz
O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey	McCarthy	Roe (TN)	Walorski	T.	Stefanik	Waters, Maxine
Pallone	Sarbanes	Vela	McClintock	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi	Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Schakowsky	Velázquez	McHenry	Rokita	Wenstrup	Sarbanes	Takano	Weber (TX)
Payne	Schiff	Visclosky	McKinley	Roskam	Westerman	Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Pelosi	Schrader	Walz	McMorris	Ross	Westmoreland	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Rodgers	Rothfus	Whitfield	Schiff	Thornberry	Williams
Peters	Scott, David	Schultz	McSally	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)	Schrader	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Serrano	Waters, Maxine	Meadows	Royce	Wittman	Scott (VA)	Tonko	Yarmuth
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman	Messer	Russell	Womack			
Pocan	Sherman	Welch	Mica	Salmon	Woodall			
Poliquin	Sinema	Wilson (FL)	Miller (MI)	Sanford	Yoder			
Polis	Sires	Yarmuth	Moolenaar	Schweikert	Yoho			
			Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)			
			Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)			
			Mulvaney	Shimkus	Young (IN)			
			Newhouse	Shuster	Zeldin			
			Noem	Smith (MO)	Zinke			

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai  
Marino Poe (TX)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2153

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 170, noes 257,  
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

## AYES—170

Allen	Cramer	Grothman
Amash	Crawford	Guinta
Amodei	Davidson	Guthrie
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hardy
Barr	Denham	Harris
Benishek	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Bost	Fincher	Hultgren
Brat	Fleischmann	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fleming	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Issa
Buck	Fox	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Chabot	Garrett	Jolly
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte	Jordan
Coffman	Gosar	Joyce
Cole	Gowdy	Kelly (PA)
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	King (IA)
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Kline
Cook	Griffith	Knight

## NOES—257

Abraham	Dent	Kinzing (IL)
Adams	DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Aderholt	Deutch	Kuster
Aguilar	Diaz-Balart	Langevin
Ashford	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Babin	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Barton	Dold	Lawrence
Bass	Donovan	Lee
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Becerra	F.	Lewis
Bera	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Beyer	Edwards	Lipinski
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Engel	Loeback
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lofgren
Boustany	Esty	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Farenthold	Lowe
F.	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Fitzpatrick	(NM)
Brady (TX)	Flores	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brooks (AL)	Portenberry	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Foster	Lynch
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	MacArthur
Buchanan	Fudge	Maloney,
Burgess	Gabbard	Carolyn
Bustos	Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Garamendi	Marchant
Byrne	Gibson	Matsui
Calvert	Gohmert	McCaull
Capps	Graham	McCollum
Capuano	Granger	McDermott
Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	McGovern
Carney	Grayson	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Meehan
Carter (TX)	Green, Gene	Meeks
Cartwright	Grijalva	Meng
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Miller (FL)
Castro (TX)	Hahn	Moore
Chu, Judy	Hanna	Moulton
Cicilline	Harper	Murphy (FL)
Clark (MA)	Heck (NV)	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Heck (WA)	Napolitano
Clay	Hensarling	Neal
Cleaver	Higgins	Neugebauer
Clyburn	Hill	Nolan
Cohen	Himes	Norcross
Comstock	Hinojosa	Nugent
Conaway	Honda	O'Rourke
Connolly	Hoyer	Olson
Conyers	Huffman	Palazzo
Cooper	Hurd (TX)	Pallone
Costa	Israel	Palmer
Costello (PA)	Jackson Lee	Pascarell
Courtney	Jeffries	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Culberson	Kaptur	Peters
Cummings	Katko	Peterson
Curbelo (FL)	Keating	Pingree
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kelly (MS)	Polis
DeFazio	Kennedy	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kildee	Quigley
Delaney	Kilmer	Rangel
DeLauro	Kind	Ratcliffe
DelBene	King (NY)	Reichert

## NOT VOTING—6

Hastings Murphy (PA) Poe (TX)  
Marino Pearce Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2157

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the ayes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 226, noes 202,  
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

## AYES—226

Abraham	Chaffetz	Forbes
Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amash	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Barletta	Comstock	Gibbs
Barr	Conaway	Gohmert
Barton	Cook	Goodlatte
Benishek	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Boustany	DeSantis	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bridenstine	Donovan	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Burgess	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Byrne	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hill
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Holding
Chabot	Flores	Hudson

Huelskamp	Miller (FL)	Schweikert	Quigley	Scott (VA)	Tonko	Hurd (TX)	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin	Rangel	Scott, David	Torres	Hurt (VA)	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Reed	Serrano	Tsongas	Issa	Moolenaar	Shimkus
Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Sessions	Rice (NY)	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen	Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Mullin	Shimkus	Shimkus	Richmond	Sherman	Vargas	Jenkins (WV)	Mullin	Simpson
Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Shuster	Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Veasey	Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Sinema	Vela	Johnson, Sam	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Jenkins (KS)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)	Ruiz	Sires	Velázquez	Jolly	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Visclosky	Jones	Newhouse	Stefanik
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Stewart	Noem	Smith (NJ)	Walz	Jordan	Noem	Stewart
Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Stivers	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman	Joyce	Nugent	Stivers
Jones	Nunes	Stutzman	Sánchez, Linda T.	Speier	Schultz	Katko	Nunes	Stutzman
Jordan	Olson	Thompson (PA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Stefanik	Waters, Maxine	Kelly (MS)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Joyce	Palazzo	Thornberry	Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman	Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Thornberry
Katko	Palmer	Tiberi	Schakowsky	Takano	Welch	King (IA)	Palmer	Tiberi
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Tipton	Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)	King (NY)	Perry	Tipton
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Trott	Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth	Kinzinger (IL)	Peterson	Trott
King (IA)	Pittenger	Turner		Titus		Kline	Pittenger	Turner
King (NY)	Pitts	Upton				Knight	Pitts	Upton
Kline	Poliquin	Valadao				Labrador	Poliquin	Valadao
Knight	Pompeo	Wagner				LaHood	Pompeo	Valadao
Labrador	Posey	Walberg				LaMalfa	Posey	Vela
LaHood	Price, Tom	Walden				Lamborn	Price, Tom	Wagner
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Walker				Lance	Ratcliffe	Walberg
Lamborn	Reichert	Walorski				Latta	Reed	Walden
Latta	Renacci	Walters, Mimi				Long	Renacci	Walker
Long	Ribble	Weber (TX)				Loudermilk	Ribble	Walorski
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)				Love	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi
Love	Rigell	Wenstrup				Lucas	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Lucas	Roby	Westerman				Luetkemeyer	Roby	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland				Lummis	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield				MacArthur	Rogers (AL)	Westerman
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Williams				Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland
Massie	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)				Massie	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCarthy	Rokita	Wittman				McCarthy	Rokita	Williams
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Womack				McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Roskam	Woodall				McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
McHenry	Ross	Yoder				McHenry	Roskam	Womack
McKinley	Rothfus	Yoho				McKinley	Ross	Woodall
McMorris	Rouzer	Young (AK)				McMorris	Rothfus	Yoder
Rodgers	Royce	Young (IA)				Rodgers	Rouzer	Yoho
McSally	Russell	Young (IN)				McSally	Russell	Young (AK)
Meadows	Salmon	Zeldin				Meadows	Salmon	Young (IA)
Messer	Sanford	Zinke				Meehan	Scalise	Young (IN)
Mica	Scalise					Messer	Schweikert	Zinke
						Mica	Scott, Austin	

## NOES—202

Adams	DeSaulnier	Lance
Aguilar	Deutch	Langevin
Ashford	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Dold	Lawrence
Becerra	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee
Bera	F.	Levin
Beyer	Duckworth	Lewis
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer	Ellison	Lipinski
Bonamici	Engel	LoBiondo
Boyle, Brendan F.	Eshoo	Loeb sack
Brady (PA)	Esty	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Farr	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lowe y
Buchanan	Foster	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Butterfield	Fudge	Lynch
Capps	Gabbard	MacArthur
Capuano	Galleo	Maloney, Carolyn
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Carney	Gibson	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Graham	McCollum
Cartwright	Grayson	McDermott
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	McGovern
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	McNerney
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	Meeks
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Meng
Clark (MA)	Hahn	Moore
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Moulton
Clay	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Nadler
Clyburn	Honda	Napolitano
Cohen	Hoyer	Neal
Connolly	Huffman	Nolan
Conyers	Israel	Norcross
Cooper	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Costa	Jeffries	Pallone
Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen
Crowley	Jolly	Payne
Cuellar	Kaptur	Pelosi
Cummings	Keating	Perlmutter
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Peters
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pingree
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pocan
DeFazio	Kilmer	Polis
DeGette	Kind	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
DeBene	Kuster	Reichert
		Rice (NY)
		Richmond
		Roybal-Allard
		Royce

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai  
Marino Poe (TX)

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

□ 2200

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

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF  
ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on  
which further proceedings were post-  
poned and on which the ayes prevailed  
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 237, noes 191,  
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—237

Abraham	Cole	Foxx
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Allen	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Amash	Comstock	Garrett
Amodei	Conaway	Gibbs
Babin	Cook	Gohmert
Barletta	Costa	Goodlatte
Barr	Costello (PA)	Gosar
Barton	Cramer	Gowdy
Benishek	Crawford	Granger
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Gene
Black	Davidson	Griffith
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Blum	Denham	Guinta
Bost	Dent	Guthrie
Boustany	DeSantis	Hanna
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Hardy
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Bridenstine	Donovan	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hartzler
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Bucshon	Ellmers (NC)	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Emmer (MN)	Hice, Jody B.
Byrne	Farenthold	Hill
Calvert	Fincher	Holding
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Huelskamp
Chabot	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Forbes	Hultgren
Coffman	Fortenberry	Hunter

## NOES—191

Adams	Doggett	Levin
Aguilar	Dold	Lewis
Ashford	Doyle, Michael F.	Lieu, Ted
Bass	Duckworth	Lipinski
Beatty	Edwards	LoBiondo
Becerra	Ellison	Loeb sack
Bera	Engel	Lofgren
Beyer	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Esty	Lowe y
Bonamici	Farr	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Brady (PA)	Foster	Lynch
Brooks (AL)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Carolyn
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Matsui
Bustos	Galleo	McCollum
Butterfield	Garamendi	McDermott
Capps	Gibson	McGovern
Capuano	Graham	McNerney
Cárdenas	Grayson	Meeks
Carney	Green, Al	Meng
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	Moore
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Castor (FL)	Hahn	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Nadler
Chu, Judy	Higgins	Napolitano
Cicilline	Himes	Neal
Clark (MA)	Hinojosa	Nolan
Clarke (NY)	Clarke (NY)	Norcross
Clay	Clawson (FL)	O'Rourke
Cleaver	Clay	Pallone
Clyburn	Cleaver	Pascarell
Cohen	Clyburn	Paulsen
Connolly	Cohen	Payne
Conyers	Connolly	Pelosi
Cooper	Conyers	Perlmutter
Costa	Cooper	Peters
Costello (PA)	Courtney	Pingree
Courtney	Crowley	Pocan
Crowley	Cummings	Polis
Cuellar	Davis (CA)	Price (NC)
Cummings	Davis, Danny	Quigley
Curbelo (FL)	DeFazio	Rangel
Davis (CA)	DeGette	Reichert
Davis, Danny	Delaney	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	DeLauro	Richmond
DeGette	DelBene	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	DeSaulnier	Royce
DeLauro	Deutch	
DeBene	Dingell	

Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano

Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres

Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings  
Marino

Pearce  
Poe (TX)

Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

## □ 2203

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185, not voting 6, as follows:

## [Roll No. 461]

## AYES—242

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coffman  
Cole

Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs

Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly

Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney

Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions

Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Veasey  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NOES—185

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clawson (FL)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold

Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski

LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes

Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)

Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas

## NOT VOTING—6

Hastings  
Marino

Pascrell  
Pearce

Poe (TX)  
Takai

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

## □ 2207

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 202, not voting 6, as follows:

## [Roll No. 462]

## AYES—225

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford

Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fors  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling

Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie

NOES—235		
Abraham	Graves (LA)	Olson
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Allen	Griffith	Palmer
Amash	Grothman	Paulsen
Amodei	Guinta	Perry
Babin	Guthrie	Peterson
Barletta	Hardy	Pittenger
Barr	Harper	Pitts
Barton	Harris	Poliquin
Benishek	Hartzler	Pompeo
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Posey
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Blackburn	Hill	Reichert
Blum	Holding	Renacci
Bost	Hudson	Ribble
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brat	Hultgren	Roby
Bridenstine	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Issa	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Ross
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Rothfus
Chabot	Joyce	Rouzer
Chaffetz	Katko	Royce
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Rush
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Cole	Kind	Salmon
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Scalise
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Conaway	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cook	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Labrador	Sessions
Crawford	LaHood	Shimkus
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Shuster
Cuellar	Lamborn	Simpson
Culberson	Latta	Smith (MO)
Davidson	Long	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Denham	Love	Stefanik
Dent	Lucas	Stewart
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
DesJarlais	Lummis	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Donovan	Marchant	Thornberry
Duffy	Massie	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Turner
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Upton
Farenthold	McKinley	Valadao
Fincher	McMorris	Wagner
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleming	McSally	Walden
Flores	Meadows	Walker
Forbes	Messer	Walorski
Fortenberry	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fox	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gibbs	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gibson	Mulvaney	Williams
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gosar	Newhouse	Womack
Gowdy	Noem	Woodall
Granger	Nugent	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Nunes	

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin  
Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai  
Marino Poe (TX)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2213

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois  
changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 194, noes 234,  
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

## AYES—194

Adams	DeSaulnier	Kilmer
Aguilar	Deutch	Kind
Ashford	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Bass	Doggett	Kuster
Beatty	Dold	Langevin
Becerra	Donovan	Larsen (WA)
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)
Beyer	F.	Lawrence
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Lee
Bonamici	Edwards	Levin
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	Lewis
F.	Engel	Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Esty	Loeb sack
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Lofgren
Bustos	Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal
Butterfield	Foster	Lowe y
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Capuano	Fudge	(NM)
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Carney	Gallego	(NM)
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lynch
Cartwright	Gibson	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Graham	Carolyn
Castro (TX)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy	Green, Al	Matsui
Cicilline	Green, Gene	McCollum
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	McDermott
Clarke (NY)	Gutiérrez	McGovern
Clay	Hahn	McNerney
Cleaver	Hanna	Meehan
Clyburn	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Cohen	Higgins	Meng
Connolly	Himes	Moore
Conyers	Hinojosa	Moulton
Cooper	Honda	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Hoyer	Nadler
Costello (PA)	Huffman	Napolitano
Courtney	Israel	Neal
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Nolan
Cummings	Jeffries	Norcross
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Davis, Danny	Jolly	Pascarell
DeFazio	Kaptur	Payne
DeGette	Keating	Pelosi
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
DeLauro	Kennedy	Peters
DeBene	Kildee	Pingree

Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes

## NOES—234

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

Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai  
Marino Poe (TX)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2218

Messrs. COHEN and RUSH changed  
their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236,  
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

## AYES—192

Adams	Doggett	Lawrence
Aguilar	Dold	Lee
Ashford	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Bass	F.	Lewis
Beatty	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Becerra	Edwards	LoBiondo
Bera	Ellison	Loeb sack
Beyer	Engel	Lofgren
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Esty	Lowe y
Bonamici	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	(NM)
F.	Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Lynch
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Maloney,
Buchanan	Gallego	Carolyn
Bustos	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Graham	Matsui
Capps	Grayson	McCollum
Capuano	Green, Al	McDermott
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McGovern
Carney	Grijalva	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Cartwright	Hahn	Meng
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Moore
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Moulton
Chu, Judy	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Nadler
Clark (MA)	Honda	Napolitano
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Neal
Clawson (FL)	Huffman	Nolan
Clay	Israel	Norcross
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pallone
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Conyers	Jolly	Pelosi
Courtney	Jones	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kaptur	Peters
Cummings	Keating	Pingree
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Poliquin
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Polis
DeFazio	Kilmer	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kind	Quigley
Delaney	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
DeLauro	Kuster	Reichert
DelBene	Lance	Rice (NY)
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Richmond
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard

Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano

Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas

Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—5

Hastings  
Marino

Pearce  
Poe (TX)

Takai

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 120, 425, 426, or 427.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strips the dirty water riders in this bill. These four poison pill riders do not need to be in the bill. Each in its own right is a good example of a bad rider, and together they represent an assault on clean water, an attempt to forcibly supplant Agency expertise with ideology.

The first dirty water rider, section 120, undermines the Interior Department's Stream Protection Rule which updates regulations which would allow coal mining companies to pollute and often extinguish altogether our mountain streams. We need this rule, and it is sufficiently flexible to accommodate regional variability. It is stringent enough to protect the people of Appalachia from the negative health and environmental impacts of mountaintop removal mining.

The second dirty water rider, section 425, prohibits the EPA from updating the definition of fill material under the Clean Water Act. It was never congressional intent to allow mining refuse and similar material—some of it hazardous—to qualify as fill material and thereby bypass a more thorough environmental review and meet Federal pollution standards.

Downstream water users have every right to be concerned that the section 404 process fails to protect them from the discharge of hazardous substances. To freeze those definitions in time, as section 425 does, ties the hands of implementing agencies despite evolving scientific understanding and current regulatory insights. Current and future administrations must have the discretion to implement key terms and clarify them when needed.

The third dirty water rider, section 426, requires that certain dredge and fill activities be completely exempted from the permitting process. This is in

direct contravention to the text of the Clean Water Act and essentially bars the executive from being able to implement the environmental safeguards contemplated in the act.

The fourth rider, section 427, blocks the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers' Clean Water Rule, which restores critical pollution standards to our Nation's small streams and wetlands. At stake is the protection of almost 60 percent of U.S. streams. Headwaters and nonperennial streams supply drinking water to more than 117 million Americans.

American businesses need certainty. They need to know when the Federal Government has authority and when it doesn't. Without updated guidance, businesses will often not know when they need an Army Corps permit. This uncertainty will continue in the light of the recent Supreme Court decision and underscores the need for the Clean Water Rule to clarify the limits of Federal authority.

These riders are a far cry from sensible adjustments to the Clean Water Act. On the contrary, they are just the latest in a seemingly endless effort to undo clean water protections and regulatory clarity. All four of these riders are not only unnecessary, they pose a significant threat to water quality, public health, and fish and wildlife populations.

Just as important is poison pill riders like these that prevent us from doing our jobs and pass appropriations bills that have any chance of passing the Senate, any chance of being signed by our President. I urge my colleagues to oppose these riders and support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, first, I want to point out that we have had separate and stand-alone debates on each of the provisions that the gentleman is trying to address, so obviously we have already had this debate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Over the last few days, we have heard from our colleagues across the aisle that it is the market that is responsible for the downturn in coal, not this administration's regulations. But if you issue regulation upon regulation that completely overhauls the entire industry sector, is that really just the market at work?

Instead of acknowledging that it is the onerous regulations that play a big part in the problems impacting the coal industry, this administration has blamed coal's troubles on the market; and, incredibly, this has been what our friends on the opposite side of the aisle seem to agree with.

## NOES—236

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodi  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foss  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lipinski  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson

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

□ 2230

They are minimizing the devastating impacts of regulations like Office of Surface Mining's proposed stream protection rule.

So let me tell you about the real-world consequences: lost jobs, lost revenues, lost taxes, lost resources. The stream protection rule would reduce total recoverable coal by 65 percent. That means a decrease of \$3 billion in coal taxes. Our towns and counties rely on the revenue to pay for schools, police, emergency services, and so much more.

A big drop in coal production means a big drop in good-paying jobs. Over 100,000 jobs are at risk because of this rule. Coal puts food on the table, pays the bills, and supports our families.

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

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Without the good jobs coal provides, families are having to make tough decisions, decisions that will impact these individuals' lives: How will they get their bills paid? How will they make their car payment or their house payment?

It is time we stand up for these hard-working miners, their families, and American energy. Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with my friend from West Virginia that it is time we stand up for coal miners and their families. It is time we stand up for their health. I don't know West Virginia's health statistics, but I do know those from southwest Virginia. They, unfortunately, have the highest negative health consequences of any counties in Virginia.

The New York Times did a story a few years ago about the 20 counties in America where the death rate was going up. Seven were in the coalfields of southwest Virginia. The incidence of sickness, birth defects, cancer, and all kinds of illnesses are much higher when you look at the streams that have been buried by coal refuse.

Let's look at this. In this so-called war on coal, no administration has put as much money into research on trying to bring coal back—coal gasification and carbon capture sequestration—trying to make coal a vital part of our economy again, without the health consequences and without environmental consequences. This is what we are trying to do.

We cherish these people also. Let's take care of them in a strong way rather than subjecting them to environmental conditions and lifestyles that destroy their lives.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, as I mentioned earlier, we already had a number of debates about each of the provisions that the gentleman is trying to

strike; therefore, this amendment is totally unnecessary. Nevertheless, the committee included each of these provisions for sound reasons, and each have their own merit. Broadly speaking, these policy provisions are included in the bill to put the brakes on flawed policies that this administration is trying to implement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I would just agree with the distinguished chairman of this committee that, yes, we have had debates. It is important that we continue the debates, and ultimately, wisdom will emerge. It is this back-and-forth, hopefully, that gets us to the very best policies and the very best laws.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to process any application under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) for a permit to drill or a permit to modify, that would authorize use of hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, despite technological improvements, we know that extracting, transporting, and burning oil and gas is a dirty and dangerous business. There is simply no disputing that.

Our reliance on these outdated fuel sources is placing people and our environment at risk. This is especially true for offshore drilling and the activities used to extract as much oil and gas as possible from these wells, methods such as hydraulic fracturing, called fracking, and acid well stimulation.

Offshore fracking has been occurring for over 20 years off California's coast, and yet we know very little about the impacts on our oceans. That is why, last year, I introduced H.R. 1951, the Offshore Fracking Transparency and Review Act, which would require an environmental impact statement to be produced for fracking and acid well stimulation. We simply must know more about these activities before they should continue.

While my legislation has not been afforded a hearing, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, BOEM, and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, BSEE, completed a programmatic assessment providing the first attempt to examine offshore well stimulation treatments, which resulted in a legal settlement with stakeholders in my congressional district earlier this year.

This assessment confirmed that the potential for negative impacts on the environment and wildlife from offshore fracking and acid well stimulation, as well as the many unknowns as to the extent of the impacts, are well confirmed. Despite this, they decided that a more thorough analysis of potential impacts would not be undertaken.

Regrettably, this has resulted in a missed opportunity to fully examine the risks posed by these treatments through a full environmental impact statement, as my legislation would require. Additionally, there is a severe lack of transparency as to what types of chemicals are being used for tracking and well stimulation activities and how they would be polluting our waters.

So I join my constituents in expressing significant concerns over the impacts that these activities may have on our local environment, marine life, and public health.

Given the many questions surrounding the impacts of offshore fracking activities, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds to process any application for a permit to drill or permit to modify that includes hydraulic fracturing and acid well stimulation in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf. This would provide a pause in activities to allow us to study both the need to extend the life of these wells as well as the safety and long-term impacts of these activities.

My amendment provides a measured approach to a very uncertain practice that could have long-term and severe consequences to our oceans and public health. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. First, I want to say I have enjoyed serving with the gentlewoman from California for a number of years. We have shared many a plane

ride back and forth here to Washington, D.C., but we disagree on this issue.

In May, the Department of the Interior issued a finding of no significant impact with respect to these operations. This followed a review of 23 oil and gas platforms currently operating off the shore of California. The review drew upon the best available science and reaffirms these operations are operating as safely as they should.

The amendment is nothing more than another attempt to restrict offshore development for oil and gas. I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, also to my colleague with whom I have enjoyed serving and with whom we share a particular affinity for a certain portion of a coastline along my district which I know he and I both appreciate, I want to close by reiterating that oil and gas extraction, transportation, and combustion is inherently risky and dirty. And this we do know. There is no denying it.

But what we don't know equally concerns me. We have very little knowledge of the long-term impacts of offshore fracking and well stimulations on our oceans and our marine life as well as our public health, yet these activities continue to occur off our coast.

□ 2240

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply provides a pause in the use of fracking and acid well stimulation on the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf so that we have the chance to evaluate the need for and potential impacts of these practices.

Let's make sure we fully understand the potential damage we are doing to our sensitive coastal and ocean environments, the species that live in them, and our public health.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that BSEE has done an enormous amount of study and assessment. They continue to do so as they look at the operations of oil and gas industry in California, certainly off the coast of California.

Many people don't realize how large a producer the State of California is in the oil and gas industry. It has a long history in the State of California, one of the largest oil companies in the country, Chevron, still one of the few that operates out of the State of California, and we are certainly very proud of that.

It has not been a perfect history, but the science has improved. The production practices have improved, and it is certainly an important part of our economy, and we want to make sure that they continue to operate safely. We are going to make sure that these agencies do the necessary regulatory work that they need to do.

So I am opposed to this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate—

- (1) the Law Enforcement and Investigations unit of the Forest Service; or
- (2) the Office of Law Enforcement and Security of the Bureau of Land Management.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will ensure that none of the funds made available by this legislation are used to abolish the Bureau of Land Management or the U.S. Forest Service law enforcement units.

BLM and the Forest Service law enforcement units are highly specialized, highly trained professionals responsible for enforcing a range of Federal laws across our public lands. These responsibilities include enforcing grazing regulations, monitoring mine safety, protecting archaeological resources, and enforcing fire restrictions.

A vote for this amendment will simply send the message that Congress supports these important responsibilities and does not condone any effort to undermine or eliminate this important Federal authority and the officers in those law enforcement units.

Today, more than ever, Federal law enforcement officers charged with protecting our public lands deserve our respect and support. Tragically marked by the illegal occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge by armed militants earlier this year—an occupation, I remind you, that House Republicans refused to officially condemn—there is a growing hostility toward Federal land management and is increasingly exposing Federal law enforcement officers to violence, threats of violence, intimidation, and disrespect.

Whether it is individuals like Cliven Bundy who believe they are above the law and refuse to pay below-market, federally subsidized grazing fees, violent secessionists plotting to bomb a Federal facility, or treasure hunters determined to deface and loot precious cultural resources, law enforcement officers at Federal land management agencies enforce critical laws like the Endangered Species Act, the Lacey Act, the Native Americans Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and they deserve our support.

But despite these important functions, House Republicans aim to strip Federal land management agencies of their law enforcement authority, going so far as to introduce legislation, H.R. 4571, to completely dissolve BLM and Forest Service law enforcement authority.

To do so would be disrespectful and outright dangerous. Instead of pouring gasoline on the fire and contributing to the climate that leads to violent armed occupations, we should stand up for the integrity of the Federal law enforcement officers, and not cast them away with scorn, neglect or disrespect.

With this amendment, we have an opportunity to send a clear message that Congress supports Federal law enforcement officers and the rule of law across our public lands.

Please support this amendment to ensure that none of the funds made available by the bill can be used to abolish BLM or Forest Service law enforcement units. I urge my colleagues to support federal law enforcement officers by voting in favor of this simple, commonsense and, indeed, reassuring amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the bill provides funds for law enforcement functions of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Even if these agencies wanted to, they could not eliminate their law enforcement offices and responsibility. Neither could they provide more or less funding for them without the approval of the Appropriations Committee, and this committee has no desire to end the law enforcement function of either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

This amendment has no purpose and, therefore, it is not needed. It is nothing more than a nuisance amendment, in my opinion. I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4571, does exactly that, strips the authority. And Congress can and has the authority to strip from law enforcement units and Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management their authority and their ability to enforce the laws that they have been responsible under their jurisdiction to enforce.

So this amendment, as I said earlier, is a reassurance that the intentions are both good intentions, to retain these services, but that, by approving this amendment, we effectively negate and hold harmless and impotent the present legislation that is out there to, indeed, get rid of these units.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, there is no need for this amendment, and I would oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

#### COMPLIANCE WITH GREAT LAKES COMPACT

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by a State in contravention of the interstate compact regarding water resources in the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin consented to and approved by Congress in Public Law 110-342.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this appropriations bill. While not perfect, the bill funds the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative at \$300 million so that critically important work to clean up the Great Lakes can continue.

My amendment would prohibit funds in this act from being used by States in violation of the Great Lakes Compact, an agreement among the eight Great Lakes States outlining how this precious and nonrenewable resource is to be managed.

The compact prohibits water from being pumped to areas beyond the drainage basin, and sets strict criteria for any diversion request.

To that end, a municipal government outside the basin recently had its ap-

plication approved to divert up to 8.2 million gallons per day from Lake Michigan, most of which will be returned after being treated.

This diversion request was only approved after conditions were met lowering the volume of water to be withdrawn as well as reducing the service territory it would be provided to.

□ 2250

Going forward, it will be important to ensure that the approval of this request does not set a precedent that will threaten to deplete this resource by encouraging further diversion requests that do not uphold the strict water management standards outlined in the compact. As freshwater supplies in other parts of the country and the world dwindle, the desire to divert water by tanker or the construction of pipelines could become a greater threat to the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are a nonrenewable source. Less than 1 percent of the water is renewed annually through rainfall and snow melt. The onslaught of climate change will likely cause water levels to decline in the future. Irresponsibly diverting water from the basin could threaten the fragile ecosystem, putting fish and wildlife at risk by degrading water quality and damaging habitats.

This amendment is supported by the Alliance for the Great Lakes, the National Wildlife Foundation, and Citizens Campaign for the Environment.

[From Citizens Campaign for the Environment]

#### MEMORANDUM OF SUPPORT: COMPLIANCE WITH THE GREAT LAKES COMPACT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5538—HIGGINS

##### Background

While seemingly inexhaustible, the Great Lakes are truly a gift of the glaciers, as rainfall and snowmelt only naturally replenish about one percent of the water annually. Once water removal from the Great Lakes for any reason extends beyond one percent annually, lake levels will decrease. The existing strains on this fragile ecosystem, such as pollution, invasive species, and climate change, will only be exacerbated if the sheer quantity of water is jeopardized by Great Lakes water export.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact has been law in New York and the United States since 2008. The Compact is a valuable interstate agreement that builds on century-old interstate and international protections for the Great Lakes. The Compact specifies how each Great Lakes state will act to protect Great Lakes water quantity. The Compact prohibits water diversions out of the basin, with limited exceptions.

##### Justification

A municipal government that is considered a community in a straddling county of the Great Lakes Basin recently had its diversion application approved after strict conditions regarding the volume of water and service territory were met, among others. Going forward, it will be important to ensure that the approval of this request does not set a precedent that will threaten to deplete this resource by encouraging further diversion requests that do not uphold the strict water management standards outlined in the Compact.

Congress can help ensure compliance with the Great Lakes Compact by prohibiting federal funds from being used by states to break the strict guidelines laid out in the Compact. Predicted to be more valuable than oil, our abundant fresh water resources are the envy of many who suffer from already strained, polluted, or disappearing water resources. Congress must protect the integrity of the Compact if we are to protect Great Lakes water quantity for future generations.

ALLIANCE FOR THE GREAT LAKES,

JULY 12, 2016.

Hon. BRIAN HIGGINS,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HIGGINS: On behalf of the Alliance for the Great Lakes, I thank you for offering an amendment to H.R. 5536, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, regarding compliance with the Great Lakes Compact. The Alliance for the Great Lakes is pleased to support this amendment.

The Alliance for the Great Lakes appreciates that you recognize the importance of the Great Lakes to our region, our communities, and our way of life. The Great Lakes provide economic engines for our communities and recreational opportunities for families. They hold almost 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water and supply drinking water to more than 30 million people. In order to protect this amazing resource, the Great Lakes Compact was adopted in 2008. It provides significant protections to Great Lakes water because it prohibits diversions of Great Lakes water, with limited exceptions, and requires each state to enact water management programs for in-basin water use. Your amendment is a good reminder of how important the Great Lakes Compact is to protecting this precious natural resource.

Recently the Compact Council approved with conditions the first diversion request under the exception standards of the Great Lakes Compact. This diversion will serve the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin. Given this development, the Alliance for the Great Lakes supports your amendment that seeks to uphold the spirit and intent of the Great Lakes Compact. The Alliance for the Great Lakes and our partners will work to ensure that this diversion approval with conditions is enforced and sets a high bar for any future diversion requests.

Thank you for your continued leadership on Great Lakes issues.

Sincerely,

MOLLY M. FLANAGAN.

JULY 12, 2016.

Hon. BRIAN HIGGINS,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HIGGINS: On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and our 248,000 members and supporters in New York, we thank you for offering an amendment to H.R. 5536, The Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, regarding the Great Lakes Compact (Compact) and wish to express our support for this effort.

As you well know, our Great Lakes are a wonder of the world. They hold almost 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water, supply drinking water to more than 30 million people, and are the foundation of our economy and way of life. The Great Lakes are vast, but fragile, and are susceptible to water withdrawals and diversions. As a result, the Compact was negotiated and adopted in 2008 to help protect and sustain our Great Lakes. The Compact provides significant protections to Great Lakes water because it prohibits diversions of Great Lakes water, with limited exceptions, and promotes the wise use of in-basin water resources.

Given the recent approval with conditions of the first diversion request under the Compact by the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin, NWF supports your amendment that seeks to uphold the spirit and intent of the Compact. It is important to ensure that this diversion approval with conditions is enforced and sets the right precedent. Therefore, we share your efforts to reinforce the strength of the Compact and protect the largest surface freshwater system in our country.

We thank you for your continued leadership and look forward to working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

MARC SMITH,

*Policy Director, National Wildlife  
Federation's Great Lakes Regional Center.*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, by prohibiting the use of funds by States in violation of the compact, Congress can send a clear message that it takes seriously its responsibility to protect the largest surface freshwater system in our Nation.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIGGINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with the amendment and am willing to accept the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR.  
LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 102 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Secretarial Order 3289, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on September 14, 2009, and addressing the impacts of climate change on America's water, land, and other natural and cultural resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would ensure that the Department of the Interior continues to address the impacts of climate change on our public lands, on our waters, and cultural resources by maintaining a 2009 Secretarial order on climate change.

Across the country, our public lands and wildlife are often on the front lines of climate change.

Every week, we learn more from scientists about the impacts of rising levels of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. Ocean acidification, droughts,

increased frequency of wildfires, heat waves, extreme weather events, diminished air quality, habitat loss, species migrations, and more changes than even these to our environment are occurring because of climate change.

The Department of the Interior is in a unique position when it comes to climate change because it is responsible for where fossil fuels are extracted, how fossil fuels are extracted, and the amount of fossil fuels extracted from our public lands and our waters.

Of course, fossil fuels, when burned, contribute a significant amount of climate-changing pollution to the atmosphere. In addition, the Department of the Interior is also responsible for managing much of our public lands and waters that are impacted by that damaged climate.

Therefore, the Department of the Interior should play a significant role in both promoting the transition to a low-carbon economy and mitigating the effects of climate change on our public lands and waters.

That is why I am so glad the Department is finalizing a rulemaking for renewable energy development on public lands, paving the way for massive clean energy development.

The Department of the Interior also recognizes that climate change is drastically changing the landscape and the wildlife it is working to preserve, and so the Department has taken a series of commonsense steps to protect our national resources from the impacts of climate change.

These steps include coordinating responses across multiple bureaus of the Department; communicating the science of climate change impact; establishing regional hubs to study existing climate change impacts and management strategies; engaging the public through education; developing a network of local, State, and national partners to devise strategies for responding to climate impacts; and understanding and limiting the Department's own pollution footprint.

The complexity of a changing climate require multidisciplinary teams covering large swaths of the landscape who strive to understand what is going on, respond appropriately, and adapt long-term management strategies so that the public lands, waters, and resources continue to be accessible to the public and resilient to the impacts of climate change. My amendment supports these commonsense measures to help our public lands and resources become more resilient to the impacts of climate change so that future generations will continue to benefit from our rich natural and cultural resources. My amendment also ensures that these Department of the Interior actions continue into the next administration.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Department of the Interior's efforts by voting "yes" on my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on efforts to address climate change. I understand that. Simply put, though, we are not here to write blank checks. Some programs may have merit; many certainly do not.

We would not be doing our jobs if we allow the Secretary of the Interior to just unilaterally make policy decisions without allowing Congress to weigh in with appropriate policy debates, and certainly, we are not going to allow a future Secretary to be bound by a prior Secretary's fiat without congressional input.

In the meantime, we must use congressional power of the purse to rein in the executive branch overreach. I would think that whoever is in power, we cannot allow an executive to continue to use executive orders in violation of the separation of powers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues that these Secretarial actions that I am asking to continue have been going on since September of 2009 with approval and with oversight and reports back to this Congress. These are rational, logical steps that the Secretary has put into place.

I ask my colleague, what would you oppose? We should not communicate responses across multiple bureaus? We don't need to understand the science of climate change impacts? We don't need regional hubs to study this, which are ongoing?

All we are saying is let's continue this course of action. We need to develop resiliency. We know these impacts. The science is overwhelming. This is an ongoing activity. To deny this now means to stop what is already ongoing, and that would be a shame at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to continue the actions of the Department of the Interior to really coordinate and understand climate change impacts.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, just call me old-fashioned. I just think that the folks that are elected to office should have some authority around this town.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 103 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 13693.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe climate change represents one of the greatest threats to our economic livelihood, our national security, and the health of the planet.

To help combat this growing threat, on February, 19, 2015, the President issued a historic executive order which requires that the Federal Government commit to key sustainability goals. This executive order builds off of ongoing low-cost efforts throughout the administration to reduce emissions, save energy, and achieve key sustainability goals.

□ 2300

The efforts bolstered by this executive order have already helped Federal agencies save \$1.8 billion in cumulative energy costs. Surely we can all agree that the Federal Government, as the country's largest consumer of energy, should be a leader in cutting energy costs and saving taxpayer dollars, which is exactly what this executive order enables us to do.

Specifically, the executive order directs Federal agencies to ensure 25 percent of their total energy consumption is from clean energy sources by 2025 and reduces energy use at Federal buildings by 2½ percent per year between 2015 and 2025. These are worthy realistic goals to strive for because the consequences of not acting are dire.

Unmitigated global warming will reduce our global gross domestic product by almost a quarter in the next 80 years. As a professor at Stanford University said, we are basically throwing away money by not addressing climate change.

And to be clear, Mr. Chairman, this isn't something that only environmental groups are concerned about. Citigroup issued a report that found that minimizing temperature rises could reduce the global gross domestic product loss by \$50 trillion.

While climate change will have catastrophic long-term consequences, the effects of our warming planet are already being felt in our own backyards. Given the nature of this threat and the modest, yet worthy, goal this executive order sets to help combat the economic security and health risk climate change poses to us, I hope we can push through these commonsense measures. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on an executive order issued by the President. Simply put, the President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. Again, call me old-fashioned, but around here you should be able to pass a law in the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, have it signed, and not do things unilaterally.

Obviously, we were not consulted. From the perspective of the majority, we have a problem with this executive order. We would not be doing our jobs if we allowed the President to unilaterally make policy decisions without Congress having the ability to weigh in with these appropriate policy debates.

In the meantime, we must use our congressional power of the purse to rein in the executive branch overreach.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman may have a little confusion and not be as concerned about funds that are expended, but really funds that are saved—the \$1.8 billion in cumulative energy costs and the billions of dollars we will save by addressing climate change. I know in 2015, in the gentleman's home State of California, they had the worst water shortage in 1,200 years, which has been intensified 15 to 20 percent by global warming. In my home State of Wisconsin, farmers are facing more pests and widespread disease from higher humidity and warmer winter temperatures.

I would argue that this isn't about spending funds. This is about saving taxpayer funds, which is what I thought people on the other side of the aisle also would want to do. I hope that the gentleman might change his mind and support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, obviously, being from California, we have our own versions of what is going on with the drought, and certainly the science that I look at is different than the gentleman's look at the science that he is at; but that is what policy debates are all about. We should debate that here in the Congress, we should debate that in the Senate, and it shouldn't be decisions that are unilaterally made by any President of the

United States. That is why we have a democracy here, not a king.

I oppose this amendment, and I encourage all of the Members here to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 104 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 102(a)(1) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(1)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

The amendment is very simple. It offers a choice for those in Congress to make. It is a choice for Members to vote on whether we want to keep our public lands public or not.

Very simply, my amendment says that none of the funds available through this bill can be used in violation of the law with regard to keeping our public lands public. This amendment would not undo anything or undermine any current congressional or administrative land exchanges that are done legally.

The amendment would, however, prohibit the use of funds in this bill to pursue any extra-legal ways to turn Federal land over to private owners through various things like a commission, or others that have been espoused.

The district I have the honor of representing in Colorado is over 60 percent public lands. Public lands are not only beautiful and majestic, but they are the fundamental drivers of our mountain area economies in counties like Grand and Eagle and Summit Counties.

Public lands are good for our body, mind, and soul. A U.S. Army veteran of

the Kosovo and Iraq war who lives in Colorado recently said: "I fought to protect all that makes our Nation great, and that includes the public lands that belong to every American."

Not only are our public lands good for our souls, but they are also one of our largest economic drivers in our State and throughout the Rocky Mountain region and, indeed, across the country. Over \$646 billion is generated economically through our public lands, and visiting our public lands supports over 6 million jobs. From small businesses to ski resorts, from gas stations to diners, our economy thrives largely in part because of the public lands in areas like the one I have the honor of representing.

A recent poll across six Western States revealed that 96 percent of Americans support protecting public lands for future generations. Clearly, it is a top priority for our families. People want to see our public lands stay public and they want to see the maintenance for access of outdoor areas on our public lands as a critical focus of the Federal Government.

States simply don't have the resources to take on the responsibilities for maintaining and keeping our Federal lands safe. Selling these lands outright to private owners would undoubtedly lead to loss of access, loss of jobs, devastate our economy, and hurt the quality of life in districts like mine.

If you talk to the people on the ground who use these lands, whether it is sportsmen and recreational shooters, hikers, bikers, campers, hunters, or motorized activists, they don't want our land, the land they use, taken away from them. Obviously, those concerned with environmental well-being, water quality, and public health also strongly support our public lands.

With this amendment, I offer a clear choice to my colleagues. Support the protection of public lands and let's cast a vote to do that. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that current law regarding public lands must be followed. There is nothing in this bill that contradicts that. We are not going to be getting rid of public lands in this bill. As such, there is no purpose or relevance for this, so I would oppose this. I think this is trying to get people all excited that we are going to be getting rid of public lands in this bill, which is not true.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I, again, thank the gentleman that there is not any sale of public lands in this bill. I would point out that there are Members in this body—in fact, the chair of

the authorizing committee in this general area—who speak regularly about privatizing our public lands, so there is a real threat. This is not simply something that comes out of nowhere. I think the peace of mind that we would get by including this kind of language in an appropriations bill would make it very clear that Congress supports the opinion of the American people, supports the economy in districts like mine, and wants to keep our public lands public.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2310

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, there is no need for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 105 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Dog Management" published by the National Park Service in the Federal Register on February 24, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 9139 et seq.; Regulation Identifier No. 1024-AE16).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this bipartisan amendment to the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act to ensure my constituents and those who visit the Golden Gate National Recreation Area will be able to enjoy the park as it is intended to be enjoyed.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is in the bay area and was envisioned to have multiple complementary uses. This is enshrined in its mission statement "to preserve and enhance the natural, historic, and scenic resources of the lands north and south of the Golden Gate for the education,

recreation, and inspiration of people today and in the future." However, the National Park Service is moving forward on a severely restrictive rule on an activity that many bay area residents presently enjoy in the GGNRA, and that is dog walking.

Dog walking off leash has been allowed in certain areas of the GGNRA for 40 years, but under a new proposed rule this amendment addresses, it would dramatically restrict access. While the NPS wants to treat all parks the same, the GGNRA has enjoyed off-leash walking for decades with little or no problems. As one of our Nation's few urban parks, it requires dog rules that fit the unique place in our community.

I have heard from literally thousands of San Francisco and San Mateo County residents who oppose the rule. Dog owners certainly must act responsibly. As a dog owner myself, I understand that I must make sure my dog is well trained and safe for all visitors to the GGNRA. I don't think all of the GGNRA should be open to off-leash dogs, only designated off-leash areas that won't impact our native wildlife and flora and fauna.

I love my dog, Buddy, a beautiful yellow Lab. I love walking him, and he certainly enjoys the fresh air and being off leash and free to roam. So this amendment is for Buddy and for all the "Buddies" in the bay area that enjoy the GGNRA. Buddy has been there for me, and, tonight, I am here for him and for all of his four-legged buddies.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. If you come by my office, the gentlewoman can meet our dog, Callie, whom we refer to as the "barker of the House." As a fellow dog lover, I have no problem with the gentlewoman's amendment and would happily support it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, in reclaiming my time, I will accept that on behalf of the 200,000 dogs in San Francisco and the many more in San Mateo County, and I thank the gentleman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 106 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 302(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1732(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman

from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, many of our Nation's public lands, those lands which belong to all Americans, are managed under a multiple use mandate. This means that they are managed to support a wide variety of uses, including hunting, fishing, hiking, and other recreation activities, alongside responsible energy development, the preservation of historic and cultural resources, the conservation of some of our Nation's most iconic landscapes, and wildlife habitat protection.

The resource management plans that were recently finalized by the Bureau of Land Management to protect the greater sage-grouse and the broader sagebrush sea landscape strike the appropriate balance between the many uses of our public lands. The plans, which were developed in close consultation with the States and which reflect an unprecedented collaboration among stakeholders, allow for the responsible resource development, recreation, and preservation of the habitat which the greater sage-grouse requires to survive and thrive.

Without these plans, it is highly likely that the greater sage-grouse would need to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. However, language in the underlying bill blocks funds from being used to implement the resource management plans, upsetting the carefully crafted balance that is required under the multiple use mandate. This harmful provision could also put the many other species that depend on this landscape at risk, including elk, mule deer, and pronghorn antelope; and it would deprive hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts of opportunities to use their public lands and enjoy the benefits of renewable wildlife resources.

This is why hunters and sportsmen across the West support the sage-grouse conservation plans and strongly oppose any effort to block the plans from moving forward, including groups such as the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, the Archery Trade Association, and the Dallas Safari Club, just to name a few. My amendment would allow the BLM management plans to go into effect if failing to implement the plan would impact the multiple use mandate and, thereby, deprive outdoor enthusiasts of their ability to use these Federal lands.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which protects opportunities for sportsmen and sportswomen and other outdoor enthusiasts, who depend on our public lands.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, of course the Federal lands are managed according to current law, and current law requires that they be managed for sustained yield and multiple use. There is nothing in this bill that contradicts that—nothing. There is no purpose for this amendment, so I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires the Bureau of Land Management to manage the public lands it administers according to two principles, as we both agree: multiple use of the landscape and sustained yield of renewable resources.

Multiple use and sustained yield mean balance. Opportunities to hunt, fish, and watch wildlife are just as important and have just as much legitimacy under the laws as activities like grazing, mining, logging, and drilling. Unfortunately, the balance has swung too far toward the second set of activities, resulting in significant damage to wildlife habitat and diminished uses and yields for people who wish to enjoy the outdoors.

Updating and implementing resource management plans is critical to maintaining balance and complying with the law. In this case, it not only guarantees that those who wish to enjoy the great outdoors can do so, but, in complying with the multiple use mandate, it does all that is necessary to prevent the greater sage-grouse from being listed under the Endangered Species Act.

This very balanced plan recognizes the needs and interests of all parties who seek to use these lands so as not only to protect the great sage-grouse, but to make sure our sports enthusiasts also have access to it. The failure to implement this plan could put all of those uses in danger.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 111 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 30, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$1,750,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

□ 2320

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, in a bipartisan effort with ANN KIRKPATRICK, we are offering this amendment. It is an amendment on behalf of Native American schoolchildren dangerously rutted in flood-prone dirt roads that cause Native American kids to miss school, on an average, 10 days a year. I have one of the pictures here of a whole series. You can take the whole seasons here and you can see what these bus routes are like.

When it rains, when it snows—and it does in parts of Utah and Arizona—you look at the Navajo Nation and you are going to find that kids are missing 10 days a year on average because of roads like this.

Now, the funding for the BIA to take care of these roads has not changed since 1988. We are asking for a modest shift of less than \$2 million to deal with this situation.

I have a county in my district, a county that is larger than the State of New Jersey, and yet, the population there is less than 15,000 people. That is a tremendous tax burden for them to try to maintain such massive roads. It is hard to imagine sometimes on the East Coast how massive some of these areas are, but they need a little maintenance money for these roads and for these schoolchildren.

So I have joined with ANN KIRKPATRICK in offering this amendment. I would encourage Members to vote for it. It is less than \$2 million. It will make a huge difference on the Navajo Nation, in particular, where we desperately need to make sure that kids can get to school in a consistent manner. We have dealt with the funding for nearly 30 years at the same level. It is time to make that adjustment. I would encourage Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's legitimate concern for the condition of BIA roads, but reluctantly must oppose this amendment because it takes even more money from an already starved EPA.

EPA's main operating account is already cut by \$92 million in the bill. Amendments have cut an additional \$116 million. Again, while I share the concern that the gentleman has, the fact is that the bill already provides \$30 million for BIA road maintenance. This is \$3.2 million more than the budget request.

So although road maintenance is critically important, I cannot support the offset. I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's amendment. I have experience firsthand with Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, as a matter of fact, and with Ms. MCCOLLUM. We were at the Navajo reservation about a year ago, and my back is still hurting from the road that we were on. It was quite an experience.

So they need help. I think this is a very modest amount of money. I appreciate the support that our colleagues give to Indian Country. They certainly deserve it.

I would encourage adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), we agree that these roads need to be fixed. In fact, Chairman SIMPSON and I, just sitting on the bus, we did 500 steps. I had one brand of tracking equipment, and he had another. I won't mention the names here.

We are not opposed to fixing these roads, but we just wanted to take an opportunity on this amendment to point out how much has already been cut from the Environmental Protection Agency. They have had \$164 million cut. There have been other cuts that have come through. At the same time, Members come to the floor and complain that they haven't done the delisting, and they haven't been out there, and they haven't checked this out, and they haven't done this, and they haven't done that. Well, we need to give them the tools in the toolbox.

We know that this amendment is going to pass. We hope that the schoolchildren arrive to school safely. As a teacher, I want them there every day to be educated, but we really need to figure out a way to fund some of these other projects besides already taking out an already pared-down Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I think you would find the mutual bipartisan approach to achieve the goal. I don't think anybody is in opposition to this.

The reality is, in nearly 30 years, the funding level hasn't changed. It is very modest. It is less than \$2 million.

I hope people find it in their heart to let this pass. It makes a world of difference to people. We can debate about where to pull those funds. I have offered this amendment in a bipartisan way from this fund. It is the way it is structured, and I do hope it passes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, again, I fully respect the gentleman's concern.

Although he says this is a modest offset, that may be true, but we have one modest offset on top of another modest offset on top of another modest offset. Before you know it, the EPA is just starving and cannot do its mission.

I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 113 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$468,000)(increased by \$468,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nearly identical to an amendment that passed by voice vote last year. I hope we will agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida wants to cut it short, I will accept the amendment right now.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,282,000) (increased by \$15,282,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would designate an additional \$50 million within the Superfund accounts specifically for the enforcement division.

This amendment does not take money from other programs. Rather, it

designates a portion of already allocated monies for enforcement. It is revenue neutral and would equal the amount the EPA said it needs to hold accountable those companies which have polluted the lakes, streams, and even the homes of my constituents and our constituents.

As I mentioned yesterday, there are still well over 1,000 active Superfund sites across this great Nation. In my district alone and home to the author of the Superfund bill, there are over 13 sites that are still contaminated today.

I want to tell you about just three of those sites, in particular, named for the company responsible for dumping lead and arsenic into the ground, streams, and the lakes. It is called the Sherwin-Williams Sites. These sites include Sherwin-Williams/Hilliard's Creek Site located in both Gibbsboro and Voorhees, the Route 561 Dump Site in Gibbsboro, and the United States Avenue Burn Site, which is in Gibbsboro.

Early in the 1930s, Sherwin-Williams purchased a former paint and varnish manufacturing plant in Gibbsboro and expanded their operation throughout that facility. For 20 years, the company allowed these chemicals from their synthetic varnish to be disposed of in that area. The contamination happened not only at the manufacturing plant, but in two separate disposal sites, dump sites that they created. Just one of the Sherwin-Williams disposal methods included pumping sludge into holes in the ground around the property.

These chemicals from the varnish seeped into the groundwater, contaminating not only that property, but properties and streams around the entire area.

□ 2330

The facility was closed in 1977, and Sherwin-Williams tried to pass the bag by selling the property to a developer in 1981. The soil in the groundwater beneath these sites is contaminated with chemicals, including lead and arsenic, which have devastating effects on both human health and children's development. After the devastating events in Flint, Michigan, I know we understand so many of the horrific effects of lead exposure, but I think it bears repeating what my constituents and Americans across the country are facing.

Lead exposure can have serious long-term health consequences in adults and children. Even at low levels lead in children can cause IQ deficiencies, learning disabilities, impaired hearing, many of those things that we have heard about over the past few months. It also leads to problems in pregnant women and also harms fetuses. According to EPA, long-term exposure to high levels of arsenic can lead to skin lesions and a variety of cancers, including skin, bladder, and lung cancer.

We must hold companies like Sherwin-Williams accountable for the havoc that they have caused in both

Gibbsboro and Voorhees. For almost 40 years, this ground has laid there. For the author of the Superfund bill, Jim Florio, this was one of the driving forces for writing this, and yet 40 years later it stays there, still not being addressed by the company that caused it. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, Jim Florio was a good friend of mine, a great guy.

As I mentioned during the debate on the gentleman's previous Superfund amendment, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's support for robust funding for the Superfund program, particularly the cleanup program. I agree, we need to make progress to address the backlog of 1,300 sites, as the gentleman mentioned, on the national priorities list, and the bill proposes to do so with the \$40.1 million increase for cleanup work.

However, the gentleman's amendment proposes to increase EPA's enforcement budget by \$15.2 million, offset by other reductions within the Superfund account. Presumably, those reductions would come at the expense of the cleanup program. So I reluctantly oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no." Certainly, I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do, but we just don't agree to the offset. I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Jim Florio's vision, unfortunately, caused by this site, just being one of many in New Jersey and in this site, but the fact of the matter is we have to hold accountable those companies that are still active, that are still making profits today while the cause that they had in these two particular sites still go unaddressed. Forty years, the company is still making money, still not being held accountable. This is one way we can start holding them accountable.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Again, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 116 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 91, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 95, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 96, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment along with my colleagues Mr. PETER KING of New York and Mr. RAUL RUZ of California. The amendment is small, but its impact is large and very important to our three districts and many others across the country that have rural towns with volunteer fire departments.

All this amendment does is increase funding for the Volunteer Fire Assistance grant program from \$13 million to \$15 million. VFA funds are awarded to volunteer fire departments that protect small communities of less than 10,000 people and help them prepare to respond to wildfires.

Sadly, I have a perfect example of this need in my district right now. The small town of Nederland in Boulder County, Colorado, is battling the Cold Springs forest fire, with the fire crews largely made up of volunteers, initially. As just one example, Charlie Schmidtmann, who is a captain with the Nederland Fire Protection District, and Bretlyn Schmidtmann, who is an ER nurse, a paramedic, and volunteer firefighter already lost their home to the Cold Springs fire, even as they continue to work to save neighbors' homes. It is this sort of heroic work that we need to support through the funding that they need so they have the tools that they need to fight fires swiftly and effectively.

For some reason, we still don't treat fires the way we treat other natural disasters. Wildfires are underfunded when it comes to mitigation, prevention, and suppression. Fires often occur in rural communities with smaller populations.

The Volunteer Fire Assistance program is critical to moving the needle on wildfire management, preventing large wildfires from getting out of hand while they are still small. Though this grant program is small, its impact is incredible. The Volunteer Fire Assistance program provides matching funds to volunteer fire departments protecting communities with 10,000 or fewer residents.

Volunteer fire departments provide nearly 80 percent of the initial attack on wildfires across the United States, but, unfortunately, these volunteer fire departments frequently lack significant financial resources. \$2 million may not sound like a lot in this town, but it makes an enormous difference for our volunteer fire departments across the country.

In recent years, the threat of wildland fires has increased steadily across the country. The 10-year average cost to the Federal Government of suppressing wildland fires continues to go up; but instead of funding communities that might be able to suppress the fires in the initial phase, we have been underfunding that very program that can save taxpayer money by preventing large forest fires.

I ask for your support for this amendment, which has been endorsed by the National Association of State Foresters and International Association of Fire Chiefs, in adding \$2 million to this program.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. This is a good amendment. We are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for accepting this important amendment on behalf of the many small towns and volunteer fire departments across the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 119 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by the Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the modification to boating restrictions contained in the news release issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Minor Modification to Boating Restrictions at Havasu Wildlife Refuge" and dated May 20, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, bipartisan amendment. The Gosar-Sinema-Cook-Kirkpatrick-Amodei-Buck-Cramer-Duncan-Franks-Jones-McClintock-Schweikert-Zinke-Salmon-Heck amendment will assist with keeping Lake Havasu open for all users.

On May 20, 2015, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued new motorized boating restrictions that arbitrarily expanded a no-wake zone on Lake Havasu, a renowned fishing and boating destination on the Colorado River popular with visitors from Arizona, California, Nevada, and around the world. These arbitrary wake restrictions effectively prohibited tubing, waterskiing, and wakeboarding in an area utilized by recreational enthusiasts for decades. This action was taken behind closed doors with no advance notice and without opportunity for public comment.

These new mandates were announced and implemented just 2 days before Memorial Day weekend, an economically vital weekend, as tourists spend more than \$200 million annually in the area and support 4,000 full-time jobs. Further, 75 percent of tourists are interested in waterskiing and recreational boating activities while visiting Havasu.

The Service has attempted to justify the May 2015 “temporary restrictions” by stating that they are necessary to address safety concerns. The Arizona Game and Fish Department recently submitted formal comments refuting this claim, stating there were only four incidents in the last 3 years in the area—three groundings and one swamping.

The Department went on to state: “The temporary restriction imposed in May 2015 . . . includes a safe, traditional, very popular waterskiing and wakeboarding flat-area . . . [The Service] does not adequately justify this additional restriction and that the impacts to the recreational area would be significant . . . The reported events do not support the existence of a safety concern.”

□ 2340

On April 12, 2016, the Service announced a draft recreational boating compatibility determination and the agency’s intent to pursue even more boating restrictions on Lake Havasu. Due to significant opposition, which included more 1,000 concerned citizens showing up at a public meeting, the Service suspended the agency’s pursuit of the April 12 proposed restrictions.

While this action was welcomed, the Service still has not reopened the area closed on May 20, 2015, that started this very controversy. These temporary restrictions have now been in effect more than a year.

In addition to being arbitrary, unsafe, and unsafe, the action by the Fish and Wildlife Service was also unlawful. The agency violated the law by not going through the regular NEPA process and soliciting public comment from stakeholders.

Such irresponsible action by Federal bureaucrats should alarm not only the visitors to Lake Havasu, but Americans who value the rule of law and a government accountable to the people it serves.

This bipartisan amendment is endorsed by more than 20 local and national organizations, including Americans for Limited Government, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, Concerned Citizens for America Arizona Chapter, the Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, the Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, New Mexico Federal Lands Council, and many, many more.

My amendment is about government accountability. It simply prohibits a press release from closing an area on Lake Havasu that has been utilized by recreational enthusiasts for decades. The Service should solicit public comments and go through the normal scoping process before making major changes that impact users on Lake Havasu.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time and for their goodwill on this bill.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, just so I can make a comment and share a concern.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I am from a water State. I am from Minnesota. And I know that sometimes boating becomes an issue where it hasn’t been an issue before because of popularity and the number of people coming to an area.

So sometimes our State DNR or sometimes, in our State, it is actually municipalities that oversee some of the waterways, or we have a park board that oversees it. Sometimes we have to go back and we have to reexamine what is going on because of the way that something has just caught on with people coming. And the more people that are in an area in water, whether it is swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, sometimes it becomes that, all of a sudden, this resource where there was plenty of room and opportunity for everybody to do what they wanted to do, now we finding people are on top of each other. And then you add the fact that this is a body of water—and I have pictures up here—where you also have wildlife habitat.

So I hear clearly what you are saying, that it doesn’t appear that the people in the area who have recreated in this wildlife refuge felt they were given much advanced notice or much input on in this.

Here is the concern that I have about us taking a vote here on this. I think you raise legitimate concerns. I think we need to make sure that it is addressed. But I don’t want to start having every refuge start being managed by Members of Congress.

I think you show that you have a lot of people in support of what you are doing. It is bipartisan in nature. The way that it appears that the Fish and Wildlife Service handled it wasn’t in an

open process where people either understood what they were doing or could comment on what they are doing. But when we come to the floor here and legislate this, I think it sets kind of a bad precedent.

So the question I have to the gentleman: Do you really feel you need to pass an amendment to legislate this? I am willing to work with you on this. Is there a way that we can get the achieved goal and objective that you are seeking and making sure visitors’ safety and recreational use is preserved but preserved in a way that is safe and enjoyable for everyone? A part of this is that there is multiple use with more people coming in a confined area.

I understand your frustration. That is why you are here on the floor. But I am wondering if there is a better way you can accomplish the goal.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The issue is very interesting, because we actually issued a FOIA request for emails. This was done egregiously by two people complaining.

If you look at the map, what ends up happening by closing this area where families and young kids learn how to water-ski, it forces them into the main channel of the Lake Havasu area, where boats go 50 to 70 to 75 miles an hour. People are going to get hurt.

So my point is if the Fish and Wildlife Service doesn’t want us to continue to do this, then do their job right. Follow the law. That is the key here.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, and this is why I think it becomes a little cumbersome. When you have people swimming and fishing and water-skiing all in the same area, there is more and more pressure on it. So I just rose in opposition to have a discussion to understand this issue better.

With that, I withdraw my opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the dialogue back and forth. Once again, let’s follow the rule of law. If the agency doesn’t want to have incidents like this and have their hands slapped publicly, then do their job and do it right and do it well. This is about safety, but it is in the reverse fashion. With that, I appreciate the work of the gentlewoman and the chairman.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 120 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a very simple and commonsense amendment to H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior and EPA appropriations bill.

This amendment passed by a voice vote last year, and I hope all Members can support it again today—or should I say tonight.

America's job creators have faced an onslaught of regulations from the EPA, Mr. Chairman, even as Congress has consistently reduced the Agency's budget year after year. The EPA has proposed lower national ozone standards, regulations on new and existing power plants, regulations on waters of the United States, just to name a few.

All of these regulations are based on questionable scientific data and will lead to higher energy prices for hard-working families and small businesses and, without a doubt, will negatively impact American jobs.

The Agency has cited its authority under the Clean Air Act as the basis for many of its regulatory actions. However, when it comes to evaluating how its regulations impact American jobs, the Agency has failed to follow the law.

Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act clearly states: "The Administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss of shifts of employment . . . including, where appropriate, investigating threatened plant closures or reductions in employment allegedly resulting from such administration or enforcement."

Mr. Chairman, the EPA is even now involved in ongoing litigation for its failure to comply with this provision, and Congress has repeatedly heard testimony reinforcing EPA's failure to comply with section 321(a).

In response to questions for the record during her Senate confirmation hearing, Administrator McCarthy said that the "EPA has not interpreted section 321(a) to require EPA to conduct employment investigations in taking regulatory actions."

□ 1150

Mr. Chairman, Congress put this provision into the Clean Air Act for a reason: to provide a necessary check on the regulatory powers of unelected bureaucrats at the EPA. In response to the EPA's refusal to follow the law, Congress must act to ensure that the true impact of regulations on jobs are disclosed to inform the public and Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I was trying to figure out exactly what this amendment does. So, under the Clean Air Act, the EPA is required to evaluate potential loss or shifts of employment as a result of air pollution regulation. No one is disputing that requirement.

So this would tell the EPA that they are not allowed to spend any funds in the course of not doing any analysis. It is just illogical to prohibit the agency from spending money not to do something, but it is also pointless.

The employment impact analyses are already required under the Clean Air Act. The agency regularly undertakes them as part of rulemaking.

Mr. Chairman, why I look baffled is this amendment is impractical, and it is unnecessary. So it appears to me it is just another attempt to come to the floor and undermine the EPA's efforts to make sure that they are able to do their job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. She actually raised a good argument for the amendment. I mean, we are telling the EPA that they need to do their job. No money can be spent in contravention of section 321(a). They can't go after a company, for example, if they haven't done the job analysis, and that is exactly what this amendment says.

So I simply want to reiterate what I said. The law says the administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss of shifts employment. I don't understand what the administrator does not understand about "shall."

So it is a commonsense amendment. It actually reins in the EPA and keeps them from destroying more jobs as they seem wont—have the habit—to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGOS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a graz-

ing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will reaffirm Congress' support for the enforcement of grazing fees on public lands.

Grazing on public lands is a privilege, not a right. Ranchers who use these lands should abide by the law and pay their fair share. My amendment simply confirms that grazing permits or leases should not be issued to anyone who does not comply with BLM regulations.

Mr. Chairman, revenues from grazing fees go toward the management, maintenance, and improvement of public range land. The mass majority of ranchers are upstanding, responsible Americans. They understand the importance of these efforts and pay their fees on time.

But some ranchers are outright refusing to pay their grazing fees. That is completely unacceptable.

To be clear, my amendment does not penalize people for forgetting to repair a fence or neglecting to make a payment once or twice. Instead, this amendment will ensure that egregious violations of grazing regulations are not financed by the American taxpayer.

One particular rancher, who is well known to the media, continues to be more than \$1 million in arrears. He has ignored the executive and judicial branches of our government, expanding his herds further on to Federal lands.

While continuing to violate the law, he put the lives of local and Federal officials at stake during a dangerous standoff, for which he was indicted by a grand jury on charges including assaulting and threatening Federal officers. We are only now beginning to see the full extent of the damage he has caused to public lands as a result of this confrontation and his unauthorized grazing.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about upholding the law, yet they responded with silence, or even support, when this particular rancher and others brazenly broke our laws and put the lives of BLM officers at risk in an armed standoff.

Mr. Chairman, I can't help but notice a double standard in Republicans' support for ranchers who refuse to pay their fair share and Republican criticism of Americans who refuse to accept injustice in their communities.

This amendment offers my Republican friends the opportunity to stand up against those who have broken our laws with impunity. It sends a clear signal that egregious violations of grazing regulations will not be financed by the American taxpayer, and

it projects a clear message of support to the BLM officers who demonstrated discretion and restraint in the handling of the ranchers' protests.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this amendment and uphold the basic principle that our laws should be applied fairly to everyone who lives in this country and uses its public lands.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEG0. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I certainly agree with the gentleman that permit holders should meet all their existing requirements in order to renew their permits, and I would accept this amendment.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

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

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule under the 113th and 114th Congresses and, in the last few weeks, under a structural rule. If it is accepted, I will not ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I like the gentleman's amendment. Criminals shouldn't get contracts. I accept the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 130 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Land Management to study or test the feasibility of, or implement, any sterilization program for wild horse and burro management with surgical sterilization.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, wild free-roaming horses and burros are a living symbol of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West, like in my home State of Colorado.

□ 0000

My amendment will help to prevent the Bureau of Land Management from destroying this iconic symbol using funds allocated in this bill to be used for surgical sterilization of horses.

What distinguishes America's wild horses from their domestic counterparts is their natural behaviors and their complex social organizations. Surgical sterilization will take the wild out of wild horses by removing the horse's ability to utilize the reproductive organs that drive their natural behavior and changing their hormonal structure. It turns them into little more than pasture horses, destroying their complex social organizations and inalterably changing the free-roaming behaviors that Congress sought to protect when we passed the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971.

The way surgical sterilization of our horses is conducted under the guise of population control is simply cruel. A 2013 National Academy of Sciences study report identifies many strategies for fertility control and supports the use of PZP, or immunocontraception, which has been underutilized.

Rather than using taxpayer funds and do expensive roundups and expensive operations, we have effective dart-delivered birth control that is a fraction of the cost and is more humane and preserves the wild character of the herds. The National Academy of Sciences notes that sterilization is the least recommended of the approaches. There is not good data, it is untested in wild horses, and the risks associated are simply unnecessary.

BLM noted that fertility control is viable if used appropriately. It is important to maintain the population size of these herds. Of course, we can agree that some form of fertility control is needed.

Sterilization affects both male and female wild horses. In both cases experts have flat out said they are bad ideas. Ovariectomies, tubal ligations, and laser ablation are planned techniques to be used on wild horse mares. Two of the three techniques have never been performed on horses, let alone wild mares and fillies.

The National Academy of Sciences, once again, stated clearly that castrating stallions will cause loss of testosterone and consequential reduction in or complete loss of male type of behaviors necessary for maintenance of social organization, band integrity, and expression of a natural behavior repertoire. Scientists believe this mass sterilization program could essentially lead to the end of wild horses and burros in the West.

Luckily, BLM does have a better and cheaper tool. The PZP birth control vaccine is an example. It is deliverable by a remote dart. It is relatively cheap—\$25 a dose. The surgical interventions cost far more.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the cost effectiveness and efficacy of this vaccine in managing wild horse populations. But instead of expanding its use, the BLM has incorrectly reduced it over the last several years. Contraception alternatives have been available since the 1980s. But BLM, unfortunately, continues to ignore this approach despite the National Academy of Sciences report indicating these vaccines are the most promising fertility control methods to help limit the population growth for wild horses and burros.

Examples of successful use of PZP has been noted in the McCullough Peak herds in Wyoming and Assateague herds in Virginia and Maryland.

Look, these kinds of procedures destroy the wild nature of horses. They are a waste of taxpayer money, and they are inhumane. The National Academy of Sciences advised against the surgical removal of ovaries, warning

the possibility that ovariectomies may be followed by prolonged bleeding or infection makes it inadvisable for field application.

The final point I want to make is that this proposal by BLM has raised overwhelming opposition by the general public for whom our wild horses and burros are very popular. Over 20,000 citizens submitted comments in opposition to this plan. The public wants its wild horses protected, and, of course, we need to control the population, but we should not surgically mutilate our wild horses.

I would like to ask for the ranking member and chairman to work with me to make sure the BLM spends our taxpayer money more wisely and protects the iconic symbol of the American West.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I do so for the purpose of speaking to this problem we have.

I certainly thank my colleague from Colorado for his willingness to work with the subcommittee in agreeing to withdraw the amendment later in this discussion. I fully understand his concerns regarding the Bureau of Land Management's research program for wild horses and burros.

I value wild horses and burros. They are certainly, as you mentioned, an iconic part of our history in the West. But we have a problem, and I think we can agree to that. Right now we are spending \$80 million a year.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, obviously not to speak in opposition, but to speak for the purpose of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, right now we are spending \$80 million a year in this appropriation bill. It will double to \$160 million in 4 years to store horses that we are presently doing. Also, as the gentleman is aware, we are concerned not just about the health of the herds—some of these herds are in very poor health—but also about the health of the range. Some areas are way overutilized.

So we need to work with the gentleman to find out a way to deal with this problem because we just can't continue to ignore this issue. It is a growing problem.

I was just over in Death Valley. We have in some cases irreversible environmental damage that is being done by wild burros in Death Valley. So I look forward to working with the gentleman to resolve this problem.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to work with us protecting wild horses.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 131 will not be offered.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEARCE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of representing constituents in business outside of Washington, D.C.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 12, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4372. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

H.R. 1777. To amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4960. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the "Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building".

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 9 a.m.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign travel during the second quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SILVERBERG, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 4 AND APR. 8, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel Silverberg .....	04/04	04/08	India .....		1155.00		13505.00				14660.00
Committee total .....					1155.00		13505.00				14660.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SILVERBERG, June 15, 2016.

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ALBANIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Mike Turner .....	05/27	05/30	Albania .....		831.00		7055.00				7886.00
Hon. Tom Marino .....	05/27	05/31	Albania .....		1108.00		13196.00				14304.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner .....	05/27	05/30	Albania .....		831.00		15222.00				16053.00

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ALBANIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 31, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Rob Bishop .....	05/27	05/31	Albania .....		1108.00		13264.00				14372.00
Jessica Calio .....	05/26	05/30	Albania .....		1108.00		7664.00				8772.00
Janice Robinson .....	05/26	05/31	Albania .....		1385.00		13196.00				14581.00
Ed Rice .....	05/26	05/31	Albania .....		1385.00		13196.00				14581.00
Committee total .....					7756.00		82793.00				90549.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, June 22, 2016.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Tom Price .....	3/31	4/2	Philippines .....		605.84		( <sup>3</sup> )				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia .....		1,631.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,631.00
Hon. Ted Lieu .....	5/29	6/2	Taiwan .....								
	6/2	6/5	South Korea .....		842.14		2838.66				3,680.80
Committee total .....					3,078.98		2,838.66				5,917.64

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. TOM PRICE, Chairman, June 28, 2016.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6023. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-552; Mississippi [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5573; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 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.

6024. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31074; Amdt. No.: 3694] received June 30, 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.

6025. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31073; Amdt. No.: 3693] received June 30, 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.

6026. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Capital Region International Airport, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4452; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 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.

6027. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Taos, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0526; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-3] received June 30, 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.

6028. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following South Dakota Towns; Belle Fourche, SD; Madison, SD; Mobridge, SD; and Vermillion, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0525; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-1] received June 30, 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.

6029. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Billings Logan International Airport, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0149; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 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.

6030. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ash Flat, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4235; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-6] received June 30, 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.

6031. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lisbon, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5800; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-21] received June 30, 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.

6032. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-6602A, R-6602B, and R-6602C; Fort Pickett, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7005; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AEA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 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.

6033. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Harlan, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3108; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-16] received June 30, 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.

6034. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Charlottesville, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8304; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-15] received July 12, 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.

6035. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Walla Walla, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3675; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-19] received June 30, 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.

6036. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Tennessee Towns; Jackson, TN; Tri-Cities, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0735; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-2] received June 30, 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.

6037. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E

Airspace; Ogden-Hinckley, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0021; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-1] received July 12, 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.

6038. 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-2015-5811; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-158-AD; Amendment 39-18489; AD 2016-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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.

6039. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Little Rock, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3085; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-2] received July 12, 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.

6040. 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-2015-3990; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-255-AD; Amendment 39-18478; AD 2016-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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.

6041. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3982; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-18503; AD 2016-09-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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.

6042. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6147; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-18506; AD 2016-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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.

6043. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Orlando, FL; and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gainesville, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0071; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-1] received July 12, 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.

6044. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Destin, FL; Duke Field, Eglin AFB, FL; Revocation of Class D Airspace; Eglin AF Aux No 3 Duke Field, FL; and Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Eglin Air Force Base, FL; Eglin Hurlburt Field, FL; and Crestview, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7203; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-14] received July 12, 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.

6045. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7490; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-18500; AD 2016-09-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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.

6046. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lisbon, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5800; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-21] received July 12, 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.

6047. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EVEKTOR, spol. s.r.o. Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4230; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-18539; AD 2016-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6048. 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-2015-4813; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-18532; AD 2016-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6049. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31077; Amdt. No.: 3696] received July 12, 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.

6050. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment Part Number 119003-11 [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2134; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-012-AD; Amendment 39-18547; AD 2016-11-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6051. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8138; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-18522; AD 2016-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6052. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31080;

Amdt. No.: 3699] received July 12, 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.

6053. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS AIRCRAFT LTD. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5284; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-18550; AD 2016-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6054. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31076; Amdt. No.: 3695] received July 12, 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.

6055. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with BRP Powertrain GmbH and Co KG 912 A Series Engine [Docket No. FAA-2016-4878; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-18551; AD 2016-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6056. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BLANIK LIMITED Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4233; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-18540; AD 2016-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6057. 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-2016-6899; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-18558; AD 2016-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6058. 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-2016-6900; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-18559; AD 2016-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6059. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3987; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-18544; AD 2016-11-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6060. 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-2015-3635; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-037-AD; Amendment 39-18553; AD 2016-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6061. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB Aircraft AG Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7057; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-017-AD; Amendment 39-18557; AD 2016-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6062. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8130; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-18534; AD 2016-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6063. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0150; Amdt. Nos.: 21-99, 43-48, 61-137, 91-343, 101-9, 107-1, 119-18, 133-15, and 183-16] (RIN: 2120-AJ60) received June 30, 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.

6064. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2958; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-18545; AD 2016-11-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6065. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8466; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-045-AD; Amendment 39-18542; AD 2016-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6066. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5810; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-18526; AD 2016-10-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6067. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0464; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-046-AD; Amendment 39-18549; AD

2016-11-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6068. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EVEKTOR, spol. S.r.o. Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4232; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-18538; AD 2016-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6069. 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-2015-7533; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-080-AD; Amendment 39-18528; AD 2016-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6070. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8137; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-18561; AD 2016-12-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6071. 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-2015-7491; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-18569; AD 2016-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

6072. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co KG Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-2042; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-18568; AD 2016-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 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.

## 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on certain trading transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr.

BEYER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KEATING, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FARR, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5746. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit wellness programs from sharing personally identifiable information related to individuals' use of or prescriptions for contraceptives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5747. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve solvency and stability for future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, 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. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEAL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5748. A bill to establish the Adams Memorial Commission to carry out the provisions of Public Law 107-62, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 5749. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to create offenses for the interstate coercion of sexual acts, sexual contact, or sexually explicit visual depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5750. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to limit the use of centralized mail delivery for certain residential housing units, to prevent the taking of private property from homeowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ZINKE, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 5751. A bill to provide that any State whose wildlife agency has determined that a portion of the State is within the current range of the Shiras Moose may take management actions on certain Federal lands within that State to stem decline of that species' population in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HARDY, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5752. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land management, and provide for sensible development in Pershing County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5753. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to State and local law enforcement agencies for research, training, and acquiring non-lethal force methods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 5755. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to provide students with annual estimates of student loan borrowing costs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5756. A bill to establish Federal-State higher education financing partnerships to drive down the cost of tuition for millions of American students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 5757. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5758. A bill to maximize land management efficiencies, promote land conservation, generate education funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5759. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title I of the United States Code to establish the style for amending laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5760. A bill to require all bills, resolutions, and other documents of Congress to be created, transmitted, and published in searchable electronic formats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. BERA (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit penalty-free in-service retirement distributions for employees serving as mentors; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5762. A bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 5763. A bill to clarify the treatment of certain DNA Specimen Provenance Assay

tests as reasonable and necessary for the diagnosis or treatment of illness for coverage under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5764. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude Federal Pell Grants from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 5765. A bill to amend and reauthorize the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 5766. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide citizenship for certain children of United States servicemen born overseas during the Vietnam and Korean Wars; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5767. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit hospitals in all-urban States to be considered Medicare dependent hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5768. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into intergovernmental agreements to provide for health screenings in communities near formerly used defense sites that have been identified by the Secretary as sources of perfluorooctanesulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 5769. A bill to require each owner of a dwelling unit assisted under the section 8 rental assistance voucher program to remain current with respect to local property and school taxes and to authorize a public housing agency to use such rental assistance amounts to pay such tax debt of such an owner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Miss RICE of NEW YORK:

H.R. 5770. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 5771. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Judiciary, 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. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 5772. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a system to educate individuals approaching Medicare

eligibility, to simplify and modernize the eligibility enrollment process, and to provide for additional assistance for complaints and requests of Medicare beneficiaries that relate to their enrollment in the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLON (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 5773. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include certain insular areas of the United States in the definition of State for the purposes of chapter 114, relating to trafficking in contraband cigarettes and smokeless tobacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5774. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow small business concerns, homeowners, or nonprofit entities to use certain Superstorm Sandy grant funds or other disaster assistance received to repay certain disaster assistance provided by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5775. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5776. A bill to reauthorize and amend the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue and Response Grant Program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5777. A bill to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 5778. A bill to designate Alex Diekmann Peak in Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania

(for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the American Tree Farm System; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SABLON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program and recognizing the significant contributions of Albert Einstein Fellows; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCHENRY,

Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution expressing support for fostering closer economic and commercial ties between the United States and the United Kingdom following the decision of the people of the United Kingdom to withdraw from the European Union; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H. Res. 825. A resolution recognizing the increased risk of sleep apnea among soldiers returning from active duty and the benefits of continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) therapy on treating obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in soldiers suffering from Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD); to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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 Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 826. A resolution electing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YOHIO, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROSS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. GIBSON):

H. Res. 827. A resolution condemning the terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub, honoring the memory of the victims of the attack, offering condolences to and expressing support for their families and friends and all those affected, and applauding the dedication and bravery of law enforcement, emergency response, and counterterrorism officials in responding to the attack; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Homeland Security, 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. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H. Res. 828. A resolution impeaching John Andrew Koskinen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. MARINO):

H. Res. 829. A resolution expressing support for completion of President Obama's Export Control Reform Initiative, which will fundamentally reform the United States export control system and enhance United States

national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H. Res. 830. A resolution calling for all parties to respect the arbitral tribunal ruling with regard to the South China Sea and to express United States policy on freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Res. 831. A resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encourage collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### 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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I, Section 8, of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 5746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 5747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one grants Congress authority over taxation

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 & Article I, Section 1, Clause 1

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 5751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment—United States Constitution

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper

for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 5753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 5754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 5758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment, United States Constitution

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 5759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." It is both "necessary and proper [for Congress to make laws] for carrying into Execution" this Power (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18), including setting standards for the format and content of legislation proposed to be considered by Congress.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 5760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." It is both "necessary and proper [for Congress to make laws] for carrying into Execution" this Power (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18), including setting standards for documents produced by Congress.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 5761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 5763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:  
H.R. 5764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 5766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 5767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 5768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 5769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 5770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 5773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execu-

tion the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

“The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 5778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 430: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
H.R. 446: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
H.R. 525: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 556: Mr. CULBERSON.  
H.R. 664: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 670: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 793: Mr. GIBSON.  
H.R. 879: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
H.R. 915: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 921: Mr. KEATING, Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 923: Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 1095: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 1205: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 1284: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1310: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 1460: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 1516: Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
H.R. 1559: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 1728: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 1781: Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 1854: Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 1943: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 2016: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2058: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.  
H.R. 2096: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2132: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 2140: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 2173: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIND, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 2302: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 2350: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.  
H.R. 2403: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H.R. 2446: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 2477: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 2493: Mr. NADLER and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 2694: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 2726: Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ZINKE,

Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BRAT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2737: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2799: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2849: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2889: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 2903: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2948: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3011: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 3012: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3229: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3238: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3308: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3323: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3411: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3445: Mr. FARR and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3455: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3546: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3582: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3673: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 3687: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3713: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3742: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LONG, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3765: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 3815: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3882: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3886: Ms. NORTON and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3892: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3929: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4005: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4019: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4043: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4165: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 4177: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 4385: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4463: Mr. REED, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 4479: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 4488: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4514: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 4526: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4542: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4603: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 4614: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4621: Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 4622: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 4625: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4626: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 4681: Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4715: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 4816: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4893: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 4927: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4938: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4954: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. Cartwright.

H.R. 4998: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 5007: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5008: Ms. MOORE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5015: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 5025: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 5095: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 5101: Mr. BRAT.  
H.R. 5102: Mr. BRAT.  
H.R. 5103: Mr. BRAT.  
H.R. 5108: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 5122: Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLEMING.  
H.R. 5133: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
H.R. 5149: Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 5167: Mr. GUINTA.  
H.R. 5177: Mr. GIBSON.  
H.R. 5180: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 5182: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 5187: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H.R. 5204: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 5265: Mr. POCAN and Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 5272: Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 5295: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 5334: Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 5369: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 5373: Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 5392: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FARR, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 5396: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 5409: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. PITTENGER.  
H.R. 5457: Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. TURNER.  
H.R. 5474: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 5488: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. YARMUTH.  
H.R. 5500: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 5506: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 5515: Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 5561: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 5573: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
H.R. 5578: Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 5584: Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 5587: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 5591: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. VELA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BABIN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 5593: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H.R. 5619: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H.R. 5620: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LANCE.  
H.R. 5624: Mr. NOLAN.  
H.R. 5625: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
H.R. 5628: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
H.R. 5646: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
H.R. 5650: Mr. FORTENBERRY.  
H.R. 5654: Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. WENSTRUP.  
H.R. 5659: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.  
H.R. 5675: Mr. CRENSHAW.  
H.R. 5682: Mr. TAKAI and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 5683: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. DENHAM.  
H.R. 5685: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 5689: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 5691: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 5697: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
H.R. 5715: Mr. ZELDIN.  
H.R. 5720: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.  
H.R. 5722: Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 5727: Mr. BABIN.  
H.R. 5732: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. CICILLINE.  
H.R. 5734: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mrs. LUMMIS.  
H.R. 5739: Mr. HIMES.  
H. J. Res. 22: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. VARGAS.  
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. COOPER.  
H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. GRIFFITH.  
H. Res. 14: Mr. ZELDIN.  
H. Res. 94: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
H. Res. 110: Mr. KNIGHT.  
H. Res. 112: Mr. DEFazio.  
H. Res. 130: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H. Res. 220: Mr. REICHERT.  
H. Res. 334: Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
H. Res. 467: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
H. Res. 590: Mr. FOSTER.  
H. Res. 617: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H. Res. 631: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H. Res. 670: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
H. Res. 683: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H. Res. 686: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. PAYNE.  
H. Res. 754: Mr. KILDEE.  
H. Res. 784: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. BONAMICI.  
H. Res. 795: Ms. GABBARD.  
H. Res. 808: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H. Res. 810: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ROSKAM.  
H. Res. 811: Mr. NADLER.  
H. Res. 813: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.  
H. Res. 817: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. PITTENGER.  
H. Res. 824: Mr. CONYERS.