



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

No. 143

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 21, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE 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.

MASS IMMIGRATION AND FUTURE PROSPERITY

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if not for the massive immigration wave of the last 40 years, America's population would have stabilized or had very modest growth. Instead, America's population has exploded to 321 million people, due primarily to 62 million foreign-born people, plus their minor children.

As an aside, illegal aliens are estimated to account for roughly 25 per-

cent of that growth. Overall, America's foreign-born population grew from 4.7 percent of total population in 1970 to over 13 percent of population in 2015.

Consistent with the above, the Census Bureau estimates that, within 7 years, America's population will have the highest percentage of foreign-born people since the Revolutionary War, adding another 74 million people to America's population over the next 45 years.

Although Americans are supportive or tolerant of legal immigration, they are showing a growing unease in the face of this record-breaking immigration tidal wave that drives up welfare costs, overcrowds schools and hospitals, and increasingly subjects American citizens to growing crime and terrorist attack risks.

Consistent with this growing concern, a recent poll found that 61 percent of Americans believe "continued immigration into the country jeopardizes the United States." Notwithstanding America's concern, America's wealthy elite use their campaign contributions, political influence, and popular media to glorify legal and illegal immigration to ensure their continuance.

Puppet-like politicians expand visa programs, ignore laws that protect Americans from illegal aliens, and seek to legalize those illegal aliens who have broken into our homes. Left-wing media, Democrats, and even some Republicans brand as racist and small-minded the working-class Americans who object to massive immigration and label concerned politicians as paranoid isolationists.

What drives the craving by America's wealthy elite for more foreign workers?

Follow the money. Throughout history, from lords to merchant princes, elite have acquired great wealth by exploiting cheap slave or low-cost foreign labor.

Even here, America's two great immigration waves depressed incomes of

working citizens as large numbers of immigrants blew up the labor supply while also competing for and taking jobs from American citizens.

On the plus side, back when America had seemingly unlimited natural resources and great spaces of open land, immigrants were self-sufficient, were not a financial burden on other Americans, and grew America's wealth and gross domestic product.

In Ecclesiastes in the Bible, a very wise man, Solomon, once said: "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the Heaven."

Times have changed. America's natural resources are limited. We must import metals and energy to sustain our economy. Great spaces of usable land are long gone. Further, technological advances in the intelligent machine age are dramatically changing labor markets. Rather than just more productive tools that must still have a human in the operational loop, intelligent machines produce value independently with minimal to no labor requirements. No longer is massive population growth essential to grow America's gross domestic product.

America must recognize our challenges and opportunities. While over 5 billion foreigners want to migrate to America, in part, because they earn only \$10 a day in their own countries, America has enough citizens and technology to assure our common defense and economic advancement.

Each foreigner imported consumes space and resources, neither of which is infinite. Hence, we must be more selective in our immigration policies to ensure incoming immigrants are both self-sufficient and able and willing to be properly absorbed into American society. If we aren't, America's population will explode and America will lose its special place in history.

□ 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.

H5715

FREE OSCAR LOPEZ RIVERA

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I visited four cities in four States to meet with Puerto Rican elected officials, leaders, and members of the Puerto Rican diaspora about a very important campaign.

I was in Hartford, Connecticut; Springfield and Holyoke, Massachusetts; New York, New York; and Newark, New Jersey, for activities, parades, and discussions that were very successful. This week, I will be back in Chicago with my fellow Puerto Ricans at the National Museum of Puerto Rican Arts and Culture to honor the organization and to recognize the talent and cultural contributions of Antonio Martorell and Lin-Manuel Miranda, who make us all proud.

But I am not traveling on a campaign for President or for a political candidate. Rather, I am meeting with people all over about a campaign for the current President to take action before he leaves office in January to free Oscar Lopez Rivera, the last political prisoner from Puerto Rico, who has been held for 35 years in an American prison.

No one disputes that the President of the United States has the power to grant pardons, commute sentences, and grant clemency. It is a power the President alone possesses as our chief executive. Congress and the courts can do nothing to override him in this case.

Puerto Ricans and allies all over the world are asking the President to grant clemency to Oscar Lopez Rivera. He was not convicted of committing a violent crime. Rather, he was convicted of seditious conspiracy, espousing the belief that the people of Puerto Rico are capable of, entitled to, and have the right to self-determination and freedom.

This man, Oscar Lopez Rivera, who is now in his seventies and has spent half of his life in prison, is no threat to the United States or Puerto Rico. He harbors no nefarious plot to harm anyone. He is simply a man who served an inordinate sentence for the crime for which he was convicted. And now Puerto Ricans want their elder statesman to live out his days in Puerto Rico. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there are few issues that unite the Puerto Rican people more than the united front that is assembling to call for the release of Oscar Lopez Rivera.

Hundreds have already pledged to join us on October 9 in Lafayette Park in Washington, D.C., to make our unity and our commitment known. I know from my own experience that all too often Puerto Ricans are divided from each other along so many lines of politics, class, and geography. But in this case, in this cause, in the united call, Puerto Ricans are united as never before.

The House and the Senate of the island's legislature, all the candidates

for Governor and major office, current and past elected officials, city councils and municipal governments across the island, from San Juan to the smallest villages, support the release of Oscar Lopez Rivera—across party lines, across lines that often separate statehood advocates and independence and commonwealth advocates. Practically every bishop, every denomination, every congregation, parish, and church—almost the entire faith community on the island—has called for Oscar's release.

It is not just a Puerto Rican thing, Mr. Speaker. It is a movement that has sparked followers across the United States as well. The AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, Communications Workers of America, and other allies in the labor movement are standing up for justice and standing up for the release of Oscar Lopez Rivera.

The ACLU, the Hispanic National Bar Association, and religious leaders of all stripes are onboard. The City Council of New York City and the Newark, New Jersey Municipal Council passed resolutions. My friends and colleagues on the Congressional Hispanic Caucus here in Congress have joined us in the call for Oscar Lopez Rivera to be released. I thank the members of the Hispanic Caucus.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Oscar Lopez Rivera's case and the call for him to be released has received international attention and validation. Presidents, Nobel laureates, leaders, artists, activists, and the world over, know it is time to let Oscar return in peace to his island.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Archbishop Emeritus of the Anglican Church in Cape Town, a true champion of justice across the globe, has expressed his unwavering support for the release of this prisoner.

Mr. Speaker, based on the merits of this case, the outpouring of support, and the moral obligation and power that has been placed in his hands, I join freedom fighters, justice lovers, Puerto Ricans, and individuals across the globe in asking President Obama to use his pen to free Oscar Lopez Rivera.

Please join us in Washington, D.C., on October 9 in Lafayette Park and let your voice be heard.

COMMEMORATING THE NICKLAUS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL SCHOOL LIAISON PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the efforts of my former staff member, Janelle Perez, and her partner, Monica Ruiz, in helping the School Liaison Program for Nicklaus Children's Hospital, located in my congressional district.

Having both been affected by cancer in different life-altering ways, Janelle and Monica collaborated with the

Miami Children's Health Foundation on methods that could have the largest and most profound impact on the lives of so many children who are undergoing treatment at the Nicklaus Children's Hospital.

Through Janelle and Monica's passion for children and education, the School Liaison Program was born. The program is designed to provide guidance and advocacy to patients and their families in order to continue academic growth while undergoing clinical treatment.

The program aids in recovery by bringing a sense of normalcy and confidence to these children, instilling in them the hope that they will recover and soon return to the normal day-to-day activities they enjoyed before becoming ill.

Congratulations to Janelle and Monica for helping sick children through the Nicklaus Children's Hospital School Liaison Program.

COMMEMORATING THE MIAMI CHILDRENS THEATER ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Miami Children's Theater on its 20th anniversary as an invaluable education center for children and young adults in our south Florida community. I would like to recognize its outstanding leadership team, including their executive producing director and founder, Angela Ardolino.

Originally an after-school program at the Coral Gables Youth Center, located in my congressional district, it was Angela's efforts and strategic vision that transformed this prominent center into what it is today.

Miami Children's Theater was the first children's theater in the Nation to be granted rights to the student edition of *Les Misérables*.

More importantly, children and young adults from all over the community are given the opportunity to explore the arts and expand on their creativity both on stage and in classes.

It is my honor and privilege to recognize the Miami Children's Theater and wish all of the members the best as they work toward the next 20 years of service to our south Florida community.

HONORING THE EPILEPSY FOUNDATION OF FLORIDA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Epilepsy Foundation of Florida as it celebrates its 45th anniversary.

From support groups to case management and medical services, the Epilepsy Foundation offers diverse programs and resources and serves as a pillar of support to the over 400,000 Floridians living with this condition.

Mr. Speaker, this neurological disorder is in need of greater public attention. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, people with epilepsy experience health and social disparities, such as a worse health-related quality of life and low socioeconomic status.

Organizations like the Epilepsy Foundation of Florida are stepping up to the challenge and informing communities in Florida and across our Nation about these issues, advocating for better public policies and working every day to improve the lives of individuals afflicted with this difficult disease through research and education. Epilepsy can affect anyone, children and adults alike, and it is crucial to inform communities on how to respond in an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my south Florida community to join and celebrate this wonderful organization at the annual Unmasking Epilepsy Masquerade on October 13 in the Coral Gables Museum, located in my congressional district.

Thank you to the Epilepsy Foundation of Florida for all that it continues to do.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Susan Dean, who will be retiring from this esteemed institution at the end of October, after 19 years of invaluable service to so many women Members who have made their marks in the Halls of Congress.

Susan has been in charge of the magnificent Lindy Claiborne Boggs Congressional Women's Reading Room with professionalism, efficiency, and care, while keeping the historical room so immaculately preserved.

From changes in leadership, to the enactment of landmark legislation, to the inauguration of the Capitol Visitor Center, to the unveiling of a myriad of statues and portraits and innumerable nights where votes have run past midnight, much has transpired during Susan's tenure in the House.

Since I met Susan in 1997, I have heard her recount the magnificence of the Lindy Boggs suite, and it truly never ceases to amaze me. Susan has provided a great service to our constituents by graciously offering them a personalized tour of this hidden gem.

The people's House will suffer a great loss with Susan's departure, and she will be deeply missed by her many friends here in this Chamber.

Please join me in wishing Susan Dean all the best as she enjoys her first few months of retirement traveling across our country visiting family and friends.

Godspeed, Susan Dean, mi amiga.

REPUBLICAN CRUSADE AGAINST THE IRS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, currently, in the House Judiciary Committee, there is an unusual spectacle unfolding. Now, a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made it a crusade to war against the IRS. They have cut staff, budgets,

refused to help it collect money that is due and owed. They have made it easier for cheats to avoid their obligations. But this assault on the IRS Commissioner takes that war to a new low.

I would invite anybody listening to this presentation right now to go to the internal channel in the House, number 42, or go to cspan.org to be able to watch it yourself. Walk down to Room 2237 Rayburn and watch this play out.

I have had a chance to get to know John Koskinen, the IRS Commissioner, over the course of this last year, and I have come to respect and admire him. I would suggest to anybody trying to put this in context, trying to understand the give-and-take, google Mr. Koskinen, and then google some of his fiercest critics who are going to be on display at the Judiciary Committee today.

Which of his critics would you imagine to be entrusted with being the chair of the board of trustees for their prestigious university, should they have attended one? Mr. Koskinen was.

Which of them would have been successful in business as a turnaround artist in some of the most difficult and challenging commercial transactions? Mr. Koskinen was. And then walk away from material and business success to volunteer for some of the most challenging jobs in Government? Mr. Koskinen did.

Which of these members of the Judiciary Committee that are attacking Mr. Koskinen would have been picked by a President of their own party to take some of the most challenging and difficult and important tasks? Mr. Koskinen was. The Y2K czar, when we were concerned about what would happen in the year 2000 and the integrity of computer systems; Mr. Koskinen was administrator for the District of Columbia when that city was turned around.

Which of them would have been asked by a President of the other party to step in and handle a major systemic challenge? The IRS Commissioner, a Democrat, was asked by the Bush administration to step in and right the ship of Freddie Mac during the near meltdown of the global economy.

And he came back, volunteering for one of the most difficult tasks in government, to deal with an IRS that has been underfunded, understaffed, while Congress makes its job almost impossible by making the Tax Code more complex each and every year. John Koskinen did.

Google the people who are attacking him and see if any of them have accomplishments that are remotely equal to what this distinguished American did and has done and continues to do.

This is a shameful display. This gentleman is being attacked for things that predated his tenure, not high crimes and misdemeanors and corruption, but because they don't like what went on there, and they are trying to find somebody to blame other than themselves.

Look at what is going on in the Judiciary Committee. Google these people; evaluate for yourselves.

The American people deserve better than what is going on now, and certainly, Mr. Koskinen does.

CONGRATULATING CLEARWATER POLICE OFFICER JONATHAN WALSER

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has served our country and his community as a U.S. Marine, a sheriff's deputy, and as a police detective.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my very dear friend and American patriot, a man of deep and abiding Christian faith, Mr. Jonathan Walser, on his retirement from the Clearwater Florida Police Department.

After serving his country in the United States Marine Corps for 6 years, Officer Walser opted to continue serving his community by joining the Pasco County Sheriff's Department in 1994 as a detention deputy. Two years later, Walser joined the Clearwater Police Department and began a career that has made an incredible impact on our entire Clearwater community.

Early on, Officer Walser demonstrated remarkable commitment and leadership, earning a highly successful rating at the conclusion of his new-hire probationary period.

Officer Walser would serve in several specialty assignments during his career. He served as a field training officer and a member of the emergency response team.

He also served for more than a decade on the Clearwater Police Department honor guard team. As an honor guard member, Officer Walser has represented the department at hundreds of funerals and memorial services and, in particular, has honored the families of fallen officers, a duty most personal to him.

Officer Walser served as a community police officer on Clearwater's Wood Valley Community policing team in 2001 and 2002.

In June 2002, Officer Walser was assigned to serve on the traffic enforcement team motorcycle unit, a role in which he focused on traffic safety, intoxicated driving, and crash investigations. Jonathan most compassionately used his department motorcycle as a tool to connect with the community, frequently posing for photos with kids sitting on the motorcycle.

In August 2011, Officer Walser transferred to the criminal investigations division burglary unit to serve as a detective. During his time as a detective, he was continually lauded for his superior investigative abilities and report-writing skills, in addition to his passion for being actively engaged in the community and volunteering at local events.

In 2015, Officer Walser returned to the traffic enforcement team motorcycle unit, where he served until his recent retirement.

Officer Walser also serves as an active board member with the Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 10. He has served as the president of Lodge 10 for an incredible 12 years, and has been selected 11 times as the FOP Lodge 10 Member of the Year.

Officer Walser is not only highly respected by FOP members, but also by his fellow Clearwater Police Department colleagues, City of Clearwater leadership, and a broad base of community leaders. Because of his exceptional service, Officer Walser has received the Chief's Unit Citation for his service with the honor guard team and the burglary unit.

When asked about Officer Walser, Clearwater Police Chief Dan Slaughter said:

Officer Walser proves that you don't need to be a supervisor to be a remarkable leader. I have never met a person more dedicated to the officers, their families, and the entire community.

I couldn't agree more with Chief Slaughter.

Mr. Speaker, John Walser is a dear friend of mine. He is a dear friend of so many in the Clearwater community, a constant source of faith-based counsel, a compassionate leader, a man who deeply loves his family, deeply loves his community, and deeply loves the God in whom he daily puts his trust.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking a remarkable person, Officer Jonathan Walser, for his years of service to our country and to our community in Florida. We wish him the very best in his retirement.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, the rich history, the culture, and the traditions of the Latino communities throughout our Nation and the world.

The United States of America is a nation of immigrants past and present, and the stories of the Latino communities who live in California's San Joaquin Valley are similar to the millions of stories of other immigrant families who have come to our country striving for the American Dream. They have come to our country from around the world.

Working together, we can ensure that policies that benefit our economy and keep families together, like the expanded DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, and DAPA, the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans, as well as comprehensive immigration reform, are enacted. This is important to fix a broken immigration system in America today.

These policies would move our country forward and provide a path to earned citizenship—not amnesty, but earned citizenship—so that individuals who only know the United States as their home can achieve the American Dream, the American Dream which is still a shining light around the world for people that are oppressed. Let us never forget what the American Dream embodies not just in our country, but for people around the world.

Please join me in celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month and the values, the dedications, and the rich diversity of immigrant families, of which my family was one and the majority of families in our country at some time or another were the proud immigrants from some other part of the world, that make this United States the greatest country in the world today.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to join in celebrating the 25th anniversary of Armenia. Twenty-five years ago today, Armenia declared its independence from the Soviet Union and, once again, the Republic of Armenia was established.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to visit Armenia for the first time, and it truly felt like coming home. Why? Well, because it felt so much like the San Joaquin Valley that I proudly represent, where so many Armenians have settled for generations since their diaspora and as a result of the Armenian genocide.

Like so many other ethnic groups throughout the world, the people of Armenia are friendly. They are warm and proud of their traditions, culture, and religion.

I had the opportunity as a young person to grow up with so many of our good friends and neighbors—the Kezerians, the Abrahamians, the Koligians—whose Armenian heritage I learned as a young person and has added so much not only to the community of the San Joaquin Valley, but to our Nation as a whole.

It is an honor to recognize Armenia's 25th anniversary and the Armenian people in the San Joaquin Valley and the communities throughout the Nation and the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in this recognition if I did not take this opportunity to urge Congress and the President of the United States to go on record as recognizing the Armenian genocide and the devastating violence committed against the Armenian people over 100 years ago, the first genocide recorded and recognized by historians in the 20th century.

□ 1030

Of course, we know from that genocide came the later followed by the Holocaust, and sadly generations have suffered. I want to thank my colleagues for joining in recognizing Armenia's 25th anniversary.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Delegate John Overington, and the West Virginia State Legislature for passing the balanced budget amendment resolution in March.

West Virginia has joined 27 other States in calling for a constitutional convention under Article V to force the Federal Government to add a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution for one simple reason: the Federal Government has a spending problem. America has run up a debt of over \$19 trillion, largely to fund past and present expenditures using money that should belong to future American generations.

West Virginia families and businesses have to operate on balanced budgets, and I believe the Federal Government should also have to operate within its means. America cannot afford to continue spending like it has been. That is why I cosponsored H.J. Res. 2, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I encourage my colleagues in the House and Senate to cosponsor this important joint resolution.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO CORPORAL HERSHEL "WOODY" WILLIAMS

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say happy birthday to a true American hero, Corporal Hershel "Woody" Williams.

Woody is one of the last two surviving United States Marine Corps Medal of Honor recipients of World War II and the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from the Battle of Iwo Jima.

Born on October 2, 1923, Woody Williams grew up on a dairy farm in Fairmont, West Virginia. He enlisted in the United States Marine Corps Reserve in Charleston, West Virginia, on May 26, 1943.

Woody completed 2 years of service and was trained to use both tanks and flamethrowers. Williams, a corporal, landed in Iwo Jima in 1945. American tanks were trying to open a lane for the infantry when they encountered a network of reinforced Japanese concrete pillboxes, buried mines, and black volcanic sands.

Corporal Williams went forward with his 70-pound flamethrower in an attempt to reduce the devastating machine gun fire from the fortified enemy positions. Covered by only four riflemen, he continued this arduous task for 4 hours under heavy enemy small-arms fire.

He resupplied and returned to the front lines time and again to wipe out one enemy pillbox after another. On one of these returns, to the point of the spear of the battle, a wisp of smoke alerted him to an air vent of a Japanese bunker. He approached this heavily fortified position close enough to put the nozzle of his flamethrower

through the vent, killing all the occupants inside.

On another occasion, he was charged by multiple enemy riflemen who attempted to kill him with fixed bayonets. Woody was too quick, and he used his flamethrower to send them to their makers. These actions occurred on the same day as the raising of the U.S. flag on the island's Mount Suribachi. Woody fought through the remainder of the 5-week long battle and was wounded on March 6, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart.

President Truman awarded him the Medal of Honor in 1945. In 2013, the Hershel "Woody" Williams Medal of Honor Foundation was launched to carry out Woody's vision of recognizing and honoring Gold Star families around the country. The goal of the foundation is to establish at least one Gold Star family memorial monument in every State over the next 5 years to honor families who have sacrificed a loved one in service of their country.

Woody spends his time traveling the country supporting the military families and reminding all of us that freedom has not been and is not free.

Upcoming memorial dedications are in Fort Knox, Kentucky, on September 23; Fall River, Massachusetts, and Port St. Lucie, Florida, on September 25; Palmetto Bay, Florida, on October 15; Barboursville, West Virginia, on October 30; Annapolis, Maryland, on November 11; and Medina, Ohio, on November 12.

Woody's passion and love of his country and fellow man has never ceased. We can all learn how to be better Americans from Woody, and I wish him a happy upcoming 93rd birthday.

DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE ADVOCACY

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, the Standing Rock Sioux and all tribes have the right to self-determination and a say in decisions that impact their health, land, and cultural preservation. It is not just a matter of justice, it is the law. Don't we all, as Americans, have that right? Isn't that the whole premise of our democracy?

Being able to have a voice in decisions that affect our lives is the cornerstone of our American democracy. It thrives when we stand up, speak up, and voice our concerns on matters vital to our existence as humans, like our health, clean drinking water, and cultural survival.

That is why I stand with the Standing Rock Sioux and hundreds of tribes throughout our Nation to demand that the Army Corps of Engineers comply with their legal trust responsibilities to protect tribal lands, cancel the Dakota Access Pipeline permit, conduct meaningful consultation with the tribes, and do a complete environmental impact statement.

The Standing Rock Sioux and neighboring tribes are rightfully concerned that the pipeline will destroy sacred sites and that an oil spill would cause devastating and irreversible harm to their land, health, and drinking water. The proposed pipeline is over 1,000 miles long, transporting up to 16,000 gallons of crude oil a minute, upstream from the tribes' water source, near the reservation, and on tribal land. A leak would be devastating. It was already determined to be too risky to construct near the city of Bismarck's water sources.

The Army Corps has granted construction permits, despite legal and noncompliance warnings by other Federal agencies. That is why, on September 8, I called for a systemwide GAO investigative report on Federal agencies' compliance with meaningful tribal consultation policies. On September 9, the Departments of the Interior, Justice, and the Army announced a pause in construction to review their compliance with Federal policies. I welcome this review.

Tribes have rights under law. The Federal Government has a moral and legally enforceable obligation to protect tribal treaties, land, and resources under the Federal trust responsibility. Tribes have the right to regular and meaningful consultation under executive order 13175. Under the Historic Preservation Act, Federal agencies are required to be responsible stewards of our Nation's historic resources and consult with Indian tribes when their actions may impact sacred sites.

Furthermore, the Army Corps, under the Clean Water Act, must protect our Nation's waters from contamination by conducting accurate environmental assessments to determine if construction permits should be granted. Unfortunately, the Army Corps granted a permit based on flawed assessments, incomplete information, and a willful disregard for the serious concerns raised by the tribe and other Federal agencies.

Chairman David Achambault from the Standing Rock Sioux reported that they were not meaningfully consulted and didn't even know about the Corps' assessment until it was made public. He has serious concerns about the pipeline's harm to the tribe's health, water source, and sacred sites.

Letters from the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to the Army Corps list their serious concerns. They mention the potential of a devastating oil spill, lack of emergency response plans, desecration of sacred sites, noncompliance with Federal policies and laws, and even disagreed with the Corps' environmental assessment.

They recommended a full environmental impact study, an expanded environmental justice analysis, consideration of all sacred sites along the path of the pipeline, and meaningful tribal consultation prior to any decisions.

Moving forward, all Federal agencies must conduct meaningful tribal consultation and address concerns regarding risks to drinking water and desecration of sacred sites. The Corps must cancel their faulty permit near tribal land and complete a full environmental impact statement. Only then can the President make an informed decision to permanently stop construction of the pipeline on Federal property near tribal land. You have the authority and moral imperative to do what is right.

Time after time, tribes have seen their treaties broken, their lands taken, and sacred sites desecrated. I visited with the Standing Rock Sioux and witnessed Native Americans from hundreds of other tribes standing together in peace and prayer to protect their water and ancestral sacred sites. I have witnessed their dignity and their resolve. They stand in solidarity for their full rights under Federal law and for their voices to be heard. They stand in unity, and I stand with them.

WISHING HERSHEL "WOODY" WILLIAMS A HAPPY 93RD BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman representing West Virginia's Third Congressional District, I am proud to call Hershel "Woody" Williams a constituent.

I first met Woody more than 18 years ago when I was first elected to the State legislature, and he has been a constituent of mine for the past two decades. But I am just as proud to call Woody my friend.

Over the years, at countless legislative committee hearings, veterans' recognition and appreciation events, Veterans Day, and Memorial Day commemorations, Woody has been there fighting for our veterans. Woody always has a kind word, a friendly smile, and an optimistic outlook.

I have two sons that became Eagle Scouts. Very often our local Scout council gets the newly awarded Eagles all together, and Woody is invited to come in and spend a little time with the boys and share a few thoughts. I can't tell you the power of the impact it had on my boys when Woody shook their hand, looked them in the eye, and challenged them to conduct their life according to the Scout oath and motto—to do their duty to God and country.

Woody truly embodies that motto. Throughout West Virginia and the Nation, Woody is best known for his brave efforts in the Pacific theater during World War II. At a critical point in the Battle of Iwo Jima, and with minimal backup, Corporal Williams heard the call and acted. He disregarded his personal safety. He thought not of the seemingly monumental task in front of him. He did not stop to calculate the odds of success—or the odds of failure.

He acted. He picked up his flame-thrower, and he ran towards those trying to take him out; and he did it again and again and again. He did so because he believed in something greater than himself, because his country asked him, and he answered. He was there in that place and at that time when his country—our country—needed him the most.

Woody is the last surviving Medal of Honor recipient from the Battle of Iwo Jima, and he is celebrating his 93rd birthday on October 2. I join my State and a grateful Nation in thanking Woody Williams for his service and in wishing him a wonderful birthday.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to another bad trade deal that could soon be forced upon us. It is possible that the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, could be brought before this body for a final vote before the end of the year and end of this Congress.

We have seen time and again what bad trade deals do to our communities and to working families across this Nation. You see, when NAFTA was under consideration, American workers were told that the trade benefits would mean more jobs and economic opportunities.

What actually happened? We saw a net loss of 700,000 jobs thanks to NAFTA. So if history is any guide, we know what to expect from TPP. But in many ways, this agreement is even more harmful than NAFTA. In fact, the core of this deal is allowing foreign corporations to sue the U.S. Government over regulations they simply do not like.

□ 1045

Imagine, any time there is an environmental regulation or worker safety regulation that a company does not care for, they can sue.

These cases will not go through the regular legal process. Instead, TPP creates a special tribunal of three corporate lawyers to evaluate the case. And if a company convinces these three lawyers that a law or regulation violates their TPP rights, well, then the American taxpayer has to pay these corporations enormous compensation.

Let's be clear. There is no appeal process. There is no way to reverse these decisions. The TPP could put the taxpayer on the hook for almost unlimited sums of money.

It is no wonder that this agreement was negotiated in private. While corporations were given plenty of opportunity to comment on how they wanted the agreement to look, the public and workers were not given a seat in the room—or even the chance to review the text before it was finalized.

The end result, unsurprisingly, is an agreement that is bad for the American people and would affect their daily lives in countless ways. American workers would find themselves competing for jobs against workers in places like Vietnam, who make 65 cents an hour—65 cents an hour.

It is no wonder that this agreement would require the U.S. to import food that does not meet our own safety standards. It would mean more expensive prescription drugs for our seniors, and it would curtail policies meant to fight climate change.

Mr. Speaker, the TPP is 6,000 pages long. It is too big and covers too much. It has too many unintended consequences. There should be no rush to push this agreement through the House before the end of the year.

However, if this agreement is put on the floor this year, I will vote “no,” and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same. Protect working families. Protect the American consumer. Protect our environment. Vote “no” on the TPP.

CONGRESS MUST ACT AFFIRMATIVELY TO PROTECT THE INTERNET

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, unless the Congress acts affirmatively by the end of next week, the Obama administration will turn over the core functions of the Internet to an international body. We cannot allow this to happen.

Look at the consequences. Using domain names, we have control over the protection of free speech on the Internet. One of the real positive things of the development of this type of technology over the last 45 or 50 years has been that people have been able to express themselves the way they want to on the Internet and be able to get a huge worldwide audience. Now, I recognize that there is no truth meter on the Internet, but people who make ridiculous statements on the Internet end up getting denigrated in the court of public opinion anyhow.

Free speech is at stake here, but also the national security of our country is at stake. The core functions of the Internet, including control over domain names, should not be turned over to countries that do not have America's best interests or values at heart, like China or Russia or Iran. They have no protections for free speech, they have no value for free speech, and they will do what they want to to put censorship on the Internet, particularly as a way of controlling their own population within their country. If we don't act, that is going to be something that happens, and I think we can guarantee it.

Stopping this move by the Obama administration will also ensure that the

United States Government would maintain ownership and control over the dot-gov and dot-mil domain names. That is necessary to protect our national security.

Just think of what would happen if a hostile power like Iran would be able to get control of both the dot-gov and dot-mil domain names. They would be easier able to hack, they would be easier able to spread around propaganda and disinformation, and unwitting people would think that this is coming from the United States Government. How denigrating will that be? It will be huge, and I think we all know the answer to that.

Now, who is best able to protect a free and open Internet? It is the United States of America, with the protections that we have in our Bill of Rights. Those are protections that have made the Internet grow and flourish.

I tell the administration, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. The Internet ain't broke, but it will become broken if we have countries that do not have our values and stick their nose into the governance of the core functions of the Internet. It is kind of like a termite. You don't see the danger right when the termite starts eating away, but if you allow it to start eating away and don't send the exterminator out, sooner or later there is going to be a big-time problem. Let's keep the termite of hostile powers who don't share our values out of getting into the Internet.

Congress must act affirmatively. We have to stop this from happening, and we don't have much time to do it.

FIND A SOLUTION SO ALL AMERICANS CAN HAVE CONTINUED ACCESS TO AN OPEN AND FREE INTERNET

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, America is a compassionate country. We are a very giving country. America gives a lot. But I am not sure we need to be giving away a free and open Internet.

If Congress does not act soon, our free and open Internet is going to be handed over by our President to a global bureaucratic body, a body that may not respect the freedom of information and speech that we experience today, a body that may sensor what Americans have to say or how journalists can receive information and cover certain stories on governments, on current events.

What does handing the Internet over to a global bureaucracy mean for privacy? for freedom of information? commerce? national security? The question is really: What is the need to do this, to hand over the administration of a working, free, and open Internet to a global bureaucracy? And why the rush?

Now, my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and we

just heard from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), are supporters of a great bill Mr. DUFFY introduced called the Protecting Internet Freedom Act, H.R. 5418. It has many sponsors on it. There are efforts in the Senate as well to do the same thing to protect the Internet.

In 2014, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, the NTIA, announced its intention to relinquish, to give away, its procedural authority over Internet domain and functions to the global Internet stakeholder community. Many of the Iowans I represent, and I know many others around the country, are incredibly concerned about this—and rightly so—about shifting U.S. oversight and giving authority to regimes that have repeatedly censored the Internet.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have worked with my colleagues to try to block funding for the administration's appeal to do this, this bogus plan, and I am hopeful U.S. Internet protections will remain in any final spending bill coming up. Mr. Speaker, the proper place for debate over important issues like this, like the integrity of the Internet, is here in Congress, not behind closed doors at the NTIA, a Federal agency, with these unilateral actions.

I urge my colleagues and I urge my fellow Americans to reach out to the Members of Congress and tell them and ask them and plead with them to protect the Internet, to make sure it is free and it is open, and to find a solution so that Iowans and all Americans have continued access to an open and free Internet, uncensored, where information can flourish and speech can flourish.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WILL GIVE UP CONTROL OF THE INTERNET IN 9 DAYS

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great concern that in a mere 9 days the United States Government is going to give up control of the Internet. This is one of those issues that I don't think many Americans know about. This is not on the front page above the fold of your paper. It is not splashed across your nightly news. You are not seeing it everywhere on the Internet. So Americans aren't really aware of it 9 days before this transfer is about to take place.

Now, as the Speaker knows, there are many things in this House both parties don't always agree on—that might be an understatement. The President just transferred \$1.7 billion to Iran; \$400 million, arguably, was Iranian money, but \$1.3 billion was American money, U.S. taxpayer money, transferred to Iran, the lead sponsor of Tehran cash. I disagree with that. Some of my colleagues on the other side might ap-

plaud that and think that is a great idea. I would disagree.

Or the fact that we are releasing prisoners from Guantanamo Bay. Folks who helped craft the 9/11 attack are being released from GTMO back to areas where they can do America more harm. I disagree with that. My friends across the aisle might agree with those releases. Those are some big items that this Chamber does not agree on.

But the transfer of control of the core functions of the Internet is something that many Members of this Chamber and many Americans agree with. It is going to transfer those core functions to an international foreign body that will include Russia and China and Iran and even Europe, transferring that control.

And let's make no mistake; the Internet was made in America. The Internet was paid for by American taxpayers at its point of invention, and the Internet has revolutionized the world, revolutionized the form in which we communicate. Not only is it great technology, but it embodies the American idea of freedom of speech. It is all open. Put out your ideas; some are good, some are bad, some are true, some are false, but it is free, just like that American idea of free speech. We have exported that freedom of speech idea to the rest of the world on the Internet, radically transformed the way people around the world communicate, and it was made in America with the American idea of free speech.

Now, 9 days from now, we are on the cusp of transferring its control to a foreign body that doesn't share that same idea of freedom of speech. We all know Russia doesn't share that idea, China doesn't share that idea, and Iran doesn't share that idea. But you might say, my friends, Europe, they share that idea, don't they? Not necessarily, they don't. They have rules in the European Union that will delineate hate speech and offensive speech that has to be taken off the Internet—not an American idea. That is a European idea of free speech.

But when you talk about offensive speech, offensive to whom? I could say, well, Catholics or Christians might hold certain positions and put certain things on the Internet that another group finds offensive, or the LGBT community might put something on the Internet that another group finds offensive. I am sorry. In a debate of ideas where you have a free flow, people can get offended, and that is okay.

□ 1100

But, to shut down speech that is offensive, even in the European model, frankly, to me, is offensive.

I think what we have to do in this body is to prevent the transfer. The Internet, I would argue, is U.S. Government property; and if the President is you-know-what-bent on transferring its control, it should come to this House and to the Senate. We should vote. We should have hearings and a debate.

In the end, the American people should see how their Senators and their House Members vote on the transfer of the core functions of the Internet. They should have a say. They should be able to petition their elected Representatives to say: I love the idea that you are going to transfer control to a global body that doesn't share our ideas, or, my goodness, stop the transfer.

Petition your elected Representatives, and let's have them take a vote. That is not going to happen. It is going to be transferred by the President—without a vote. I would ask all Americans to stand up, to push back, to fight back, and to make sure we maintain the great idea of the American and now global Internet.

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 1 minute 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 Clarence A. Williams, Greater Mt. Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church, St. Petersburg, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we are grateful for this Nation, its vastness, its beauty. Truly, we live in a land of milk and honey. Help us, we pray, to protect and preserve it so that its grandeur and fullness always remains.

We are grateful for our people. A Nation of many cultures, from many different cultures, from many different races, many different religions, help us to love each other.

We are grateful for our history, a rich, gleaming heritage, a heritage born from a spirit to be free; one moment defending freedom, at other times struggling to find it. Forgive us for the times that we have missed the mark.

We are grateful for our leaders. Lord, bless the Members of this Chamber and the leadership of our great Nation. Help these Members own our country's problems and work to find solutions.

Finally, we are grateful for our future. Lord, bless the United States of America to be Your champion of righteousness that, supported by Thy powerful hand, we will establish Thy justice among nations and among men.

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 Nevada (Mr. HARDY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARDY 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 CLARENCE A. WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome my friend and fellow Floridian, Reverend Clarence A. Williams to the House floor as our guest chaplain.

Pastor Williams is a lifelong public servant and trailblazing leader in the Tampa Bay community. He serves as the senior pastor of the Greater Mt. Zion AME Church in St. Petersburg, Florida, which I have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

Pastor Williams is a man of great wisdom and he is a man of action. In 2013, Pastor Williams formed Cross and Anvil Human Services, Inc., a nonprofit organization which works to close the educational, digital, and wealth gap for our neighbors in Tampa Bay. He is a founding member of Men in the Making, a youth mentoring organization; Life member of the NAACP; and board member of the Community Health Centers of Pinellas County.

His unwavering commitment to the St. Petersburg community is displayed daily in his advocacy for education, civil rights, and equal opportunity for all of our neighbors.

He is a native of Bartow, Florida, where he attended Bartow High School, and later Knoxville College in Knoxville, Tennessee. He is married to Mrs. Andrea P. Williams, and they have two lovely daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everyone to join me in thanking Pastor Williams for leading today's opening prayer, and I thank him for his outstanding service to the St. Petersburg community.

HELPING REFUGEES REBUILD—INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on International Day of Peace, to applaud the efforts of Connect2Peace, the Peace Coalition the Rock River Valley, to draw attention to the plight of children and refugees whose lives have been forever disrupted by war.

Tonight, Rockford University and Connect2Peace will host a conversation on "How to Help Refugees Rebuild their World," featuring Melissa Fleming, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

As chief spokesperson, Ms. Fleming speaks around the world on behalf of the more than 65 million vulnerable and voiceless people, half of which are children who are displaced from their homes by war, conflict, and persecution.

Helping refugees rebuild amid war and poverty is difficult and complicated, but there is hope. Groups like Kids Around the World in Rockford have stepped in to feed children and help them enjoy their disrupted childhood through donated playground sets.

People like Denny Johnson, founder of Kids Around the World, and U.N. Commissioner Melissa Fleming work tirelessly to bring hope into seemingly hopeless situations.

As an executive committee member for the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, today I urge us to pray and act for peace in our world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The Chair will entertain up to 14 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, every year, from September 15 to October 15, our Nation marks Hispanic Heritage Month to celebrate the enduring contribution of Latinos throughout our country's history.

I am proud to represent a district that has been shaped and bolstered by generations of Hispanic Americans as well as recent Latin American immigrants.

Los Angeles County is home to great Hispanic leaders, like Long Beach Mayor Robert Garcia, L.A. County Supervisor Hilda Solis, and State Senator Ricardo Lara. For the first time in history, our California State Legislature is led by two Latino lawmakers, Senate Pro Tem Kevin de Leon and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon.

California is proof that diversity is a strength and something we must recommit to and celebrate. That is why we must, as a nation, condemn attempts to demonize, marginalize, and scapegoat immigrant families. We are better than that as a country.

We need to stop playing politics with people's lives and finally do our jobs and pass comprehensive immigration reform that fixes our broken immigration system and lives up to our American values.

We can be better. Let us recommit to these values while we mark this year's Hispanic Heritage Month.

CONGRESSMAN JEFF MILLER HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that in my service I began as a member of the unique class of 2001. These were Members elected in special elections that year, including now-U.S. Senator JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas, along with chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, JEFF MILLER of Florida, and chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, RANDY FORBES of Virginia, both of whom are now concluding their House service.

Since being elected to the House, Chairman JEFF MILLER has demonstrated his remarkable leadership as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Chairman MILLER has been a dedicated advocate for troops, veterans, and military families. He has also worked tirelessly to hold the Department of Veterans Affairs accountable to ensure our servicemembers receive the best care. A Trump administration would have an excellent Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

I appreciate Chairman MILLER, his wife, Vicki, and his family for honorably serving the people of the First Congressional District of Florida. Roxanne and I will always treasure them as champions for American families.

Godspeed, JEFF and Vicki.

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

AMERICAN ECONOMY IS STRONGER UNDER DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTS

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, let's bury a myth, the persistent claim that Republicans are better at managing the economy than Democrats.

Under President Obama, we have come a long way since the dark days of the Bush-era Great Recession. And whether you look at the past 7½ years under President Obama or the past 70 years since Truman, the Democratic

record on the economy is very strong; the strong Democrat blue vs. red for the Republicans.

A recent study by Princeton University economists Alan Blinder and Mark Watson underscores this point. It shows that, since World War II, the economy has performed better under Democratic Presidents over Republican Presidents.

Blinder and Watson say it this way: "The U.S. economy has performed better when the President of the United States is a Democrat rather than a Republican, almost regardless of how one measures performance."

But Republicans still make the questionable claim that they do better at managing the economy. Let's put an end to that myth. Let's move to a more evidence-based discussion and bury the myth that Republicans are better at managing the economy.

The facts and the metrics speak for themselves; the strong blue Democratic record under Democratic Presidents managing the economy.

CONFRONTING THE ZIKA THREAT TO SOUTH FLORIDA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or CDC, lowered the travel warning for Zika in the Wynwood area to a cautionary travel guidance, which is consistent with the rest of the Miami-Dade County mainland. After comprehensive eradication efforts, there is no longer any evidence of active Zika transmissions in the area of Wynwood.

Though the situation in Wynwood has improved, the Zika zone has nearly tripled in Miami Beach, however. The CDC has now expanded the active Zika transmission warning zone for Miami Beach to a 4.5-square-mile area covering most of the city.

Mr. Speaker, even as we make significant progress in the fight against Zika, the threat remains persistent in south Florida. Congress must fund anti-Zika efforts now with no policy riders and without any more delay. This is an epidemic that we must eliminate once and for all.

South Florida families deserve better and they should not have to wait any longer for Federal funding. Let's pass a Zika funding bill now.

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 125th anniversary of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

If you come into Bremerton, Washington, by ferry, you see a big yellow

and blue slogan painted on the side of the shipyard's Building 460, and it says: "Puget Sound Naval Shipyard: Building on a Proud Tradition."

That proud tradition is based on the hard work of men and women who, for 125 years, have invested in their trades, shown up each day and gotten the job done for this country, and the uniformed personnel who have carried out the mission there.

Our shipyard workers serve our Nation and help keep our sailors and submariners safe. And through its long history, the shipyard has been central in building up our fleet during World War I, and repairing damaged ships during World War II, and throughout other wartime efforts. Today, they get our ships ready so the Navy can continue to provide strategic deterrence and peacekeeping all across the globe.

We live in a dangerous world where threats exist, and I have such admiration and respect for the role the shipyard and its workers play in protecting our servicemembers and protecting our Nation.

The future looks bright for this institution under the leadership of Captain Howard Markle. Recently I had the honor of speaking at the shipyard's apprenticeship graduation, and I can tell you that these folks are ready to carry on that proud tradition at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

SUPPORT OUR NORTH COUNTRY APPLE FARMERS

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, do you like apples?

Because I rise today to speak about that great time of year when days grow crisp and leaves start to change, apple season.

Agriculture is the backbone of our economy in the North Country, and New York State is the second largest-producing State in the country where we export our delicious products across the globe.

For most families, a trip apple picking is a great annual tradition this time of year. I have had the pleasure of touring apple orchards across my district, from Applejacks Orchards in Plattsburgh, to Forrence and Everett Orchards in Peru, to Kaneb Orchards in Massena.

Every year, during apple season, these orchards and many others in the North Country produce bushels and bushels of apples for eating as fresh fruit, to be made into juice and cider, and even to fill delicious apple pies.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand on the House floor today to support our North Country apple farmers.

□ 1215

FLINT, MICHIGAN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in the next week or so, we will pass a spending bill to fund the government for the next 10 weeks, and it is absolutely critical that we include in that legislation funding to help my hometown of Flint recover from the terrible water crisis that it is facing. That should be included in the continuing resolution.

A city of 100,000 people, for 2 years, can't drink their water and are still dealing with the effects of lead poisoning. Hearings have been held in Congress, multiple committees, lots of sympathy, and Members asking me: What can I do? It is real simple. The Senate passed legislation that would provide relief for the people of Flint, 95-3, bipartisan legislation, paid for—let me emphasize—paid for. We have an offset.

Yet, House negotiators, on the continuing resolution, continue to take the position that we will consider relief for all sorts of issues, and we will get a spending bill, but nothing for Flint.

Take yes for an answer. When you asked us to come up with an offset to deal with this terrible public health crisis, we came up with an offset.

So to my colleagues, my God, at long last, do the right thing. Help this community that is struggling. We have come up with a way to get it done. There is no excuse for not getting it done. It has to happen now.

RECOGNIZING FIREBALL RUN ADVENTURE RALLY'S VISIT TO CURWENSVILLE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an event in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District—and across New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—raising awareness for missing children across our Nation.

Fireball Run is an 8-day, 2,000-mile road rally competition starting this Friday and running through Saturday, October 1. This Sunday, I will be joining the teams in Curwensville, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

While I have been told that the race itself is a lot of fun, what really impresses me about the Fireball Run is the effort made to raise awareness for missing children across the United States of America.

Every driving team is assigned a child missing from their home area, in addition to being provided 1,000 missing child flyers to distribute along their 2,000-mile journey. Since the start of Fireball Run 10 years ago, the campaign has aided in the recovery of 44 missing children.

I commend everyone involved in Fireball Run for their selfless efforts in raising awareness for this important issue, and I wish them the best of luck and safety as their journey begins on Friday.

COMMEMORATING 100TH BIRTHDAY OF EASTERN STATES EXPOSITION

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Eastern States Exposition held annually in West Springfield, Massachusetts. Founded in 1916, the Eastern States Exposition, more affectionately known as "The Big E," for a century has been a showcase for what all six New England States have to offer. Starting last Friday and running for a total of 17 days, this celebration will play host to hundreds of agricultural and livestock displays, thousands of food and craft vendors, and will welcome over 1 million visitors through its duration.

Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that The Big E is woven into the culture of western Massachusetts. Furthermore, it is a driving force behind the regional tourism economy.

I wish to congratulate Eastern States Chairman Donald Chase, President Eugene Cassidy, and the many staff and volunteers on the work done in preparation for this centennial celebration. May this year stand as a testament to the next 100 years. Congratulations from the United States of America.

NATIONAL ESTUARY WEEK

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we recognize National Estuary Week, a week dedicated to raising awareness of the importance of our Nation's estuaries.

The Eighth District of Florida is home to the Indian River Lagoon, one of the most diverse estuaries in North America and the world. Stretching 156 miles along Florida's east coast, our lagoon is a sanctuary for nearly 4,000 species of wildlife, an economic engine for our community, and an invaluable recreational and educational resource for residents and visitors. Since estuaries are places where freshwater mixes with saltwater, preserving the delicate balance is as critical as it can be difficult.

Many estuaries, including our lagoon, are experiencing challenges like harmful algae blooms, declines in sea grass, and invasive species. These threats require our immediate attention.

This week, millions of Americans will show their commitment to our estuaries through volunteer efforts. We all have a role to play in caring for our

environment. It is a matter of awareness and of action.

CONDEMNING RESTRICTIVE VOTING LAWS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to go home for the most important event in any democracy: the November 8 elections. We will leave a cloud over our democracy in failing to update the 1965 Voting Rights Act, recommended by the Supreme Court, when it struck down section 4 requiring Federal preclearance of State laws with a history of discrimination.

My resolution, H. Res. 846, condemning restrictive voting laws, documents that no sooner was preclearance overturned than States galloped to pass new onerous voting restrictions. So unconstitutional were these laws that not only in southern States but also, even without the preclearance process, they have been struck down in four States: Texas, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Ohio.

Seldom has Congress had so much real-time evidence of the need to renew legislation. The evidence is a virtual mandate for Congress to make history again and update our democracy by updating the Voting Rights Act.

UNSUSTAINABLE OVERTIME RULE

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from countless small businesses, colleges and universities, nonprofits, and the public sector that the recent Department of Labor's overtime rule change is not sustainable.

In a few short months, employers will be forced to accept a 100 percent increase in the salary threshold. This rule has the potential to result in the unintended consequences that impact an employee's hours being reduced, employees being switched to hourly status and thus a reduction in benefits, or worse.

This change has the potential to devastate many businesses and their employers. With our country still slogging through a recovery, such a dramatic increase is misguided and ill-advised.

Mr. Speaker, the House has held multiple hearings, we have authored various letters, and legislation has been drafted on the rule. It must not go into effect as planned this year.

RECOGNIZING LIFE AND LEGACY OF JAMES O'NEILL

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of the late James O'Neill. James was a giant in the law enforcement community in my home district in the Hudson Valley. We lost him suddenly on Sunday, July 17, at the age of 59, of an apparent heart attack. On that day, though, we didn't just lose a friend but we also lost a father, a husband, and an icon in the New York City and Putnam County police communities.

Jimmy was born and raised in the Bronx. He was a graduate of Visitation School and of Cardinal Hayes High School. He joined the NYPD in 1979. He lived a life devoted to service and dedicated nearly 30 years to the New York Police Department before retiring as a detective and squad supervisor in 1999. He went on to become a founding member of the New York Shields and president of the Fraternal Order of Police in Putnam County.

He was an outspoken leader whose efforts involved working with officers suffering from mental and emotional effects of serving in the force. He was an icon in the police community, and he was the consummate cop's cop. He not only devoted his own career as a police officer and a detective to serving others but, even after his retirement, he devoted himself in so many ways to helping other officers and their families in times of need.

I want to send my personal condolences to Jimmy's wife, Kathy, and his son, James, along with their dear friends, Joanne Viola, Henry Primus, John McCardle, and Paul Curtin, all of whom have joined us here today. We are honored by your presence.

The law enforcement community, Hudson Valley, and New York have lost one of their finest, and he will be sorely missed. The beauty of Jimmy's life can be summed up by this: he loved his family beyond all measure, gave all to his friends and community, and was the most humble and decent man anyone can say they ever knew. His absence is a chasm that we will never fill.

STARBUCKS UPSTANDERS

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Starbucks and their new program called the Upstanders series for recognizing Baldwin Community Schools and the Baldwin Promise.

The Upstanders series was created by Starbucks to showcase uplifting American stories. I believe that Starbucks found a uniquely inspiring story to tell when they highlighted Baldwin, Michigan.

Baldwin Community Schools was designated as a Michigan Promise Zone in 2009, meaning that every child who attended school in Baldwin has a tuition-free path to a college education. Earning this designation took commitment

and sacrifice from the entire Baldwin community. In order to be designated, the village of Baldwin had to privately fundraise over \$100,000.

Baldwin looked within for those donations, even though it is located in Lake County, the 22nd poorest county in the Nation, where more than 24 percent of the residents live below the poverty level. They not only hit their goal, but they exceeded their goal. In fact, they raised more than \$160,000 than what the goal had been.

The people of Baldwin and their commitment to their community, one another, and, more importantly, future generations truly is exemplified by this story.

I would like to thank Starbucks again for what they have done to highlight that. This is really what community in west Michigan is all about. I want to thank them again for creating this series and then recognizing Baldwin and sharing that story with the Nation.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION'S NEW FRONTIERS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the development of new frontiers in the area of seismology and the study of the Earth's interior. Most studies of seismic waves have been limited to surface-based exploration due to ease of installation. But the NSF recently funded a dense, underground, three-dimensional array of 13 high-sensitivity broadband seismometers at the Homestake mine in South Dakota.

This ambitious project will give rise to new seismic data analysis techniques and aid in the design of future underground gravitational-wave detectors, which will lead to breakthroughs in seismic noise tomography. These discoveries will have a broad range of applications, ranging from medical diagnoses, detection of mineral and oil deposits, and homeland security.

I commend the National Science Foundation in their efforts to keep the United States at the forefront of technical advancement and scientific breakthroughs through its projects.

HONORING TEXAS TECH BASEBALL

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2016 Texas Tech Red Raider baseball team. The Red Raiders, led by Big 12 coach of year, Tim Tadlock, capped off a tremendous season in which they won the Big 12 title and advanced to the College World Series for the second time in the past 3 years. This trip, they earned the

program's first-ever win in Omaha. This team's hard work was evident as I watched their impressive run.

I want to highlight the contributions of the senior class, a group who led Tech to 149 wins since 2013. Several of these players have moved on to professional baseball careers, and we wish all of them the best in their future endeavors. This team ended the year ranked number 4 nationally, Tech's highest ranking in school history. I am especially proud of the way these young men carried themselves in victory and defeat.

Under the guidance of Coach Tadlock and his staff, next year's team should be well positioned to carry on Tech's recent baseball success.

Red Raider nation and I thank you for the way you represented the university.

□ 1230

VETERAN SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Veteran Suicide Prevention Month.

Today, after more than a decade of war, a new generation of veterans is facing real challenges. No man or woman who has sacrificed so much for our country should return home feeling alone or feeling like there is nowhere to turn. Far too often, that is the reality in which our veterans live. In fact, every single day, 20 veterans commit suicide.

During the last decade, nearly a third of veterans treated at VA medical centers had been diagnosed with PTSD. We have to do better. That is why I was proud to be a cosponsor of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention Act last year to increase resources for veterans and improve oversight of the VA.

I am working closely with veterans service organizations in our district to ensure that all veterans receive the high-quality care that they have earned and deserve. This month, it is my hope that our awareness can finally turn into meaningful action for our veterans.

MISGUIDED OVERTIME RULE

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Department of Labor's misguided overtime rule because it will undoubtedly harm Hoosier small businesses, nonprofits, universities, and the jobs they support.

We all agree our Nation's overtime rules should be updated; however, this administration has proposed a rule that will stifle job growth, limit oppor-

tunity, and lead to less hours and flexibility for Hoosier workers.

The director of an Indiana-based nonprofit that aids individuals with physical and mental disabilities recently said the new rule will have dire consequences for the organization's workers. That is why I am proud to support H.R. 4773 and H.J. Res. 95, to stop implementation of this rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

LET'S PASS A CLEAN ZIKA FUNDING BILL

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, 19,000 and counting, that is the number of people with confirmed cases of Zika in America so far; 1,800 and counting, the number of pregnant women in the U.S. with confirmed cases of Zika so far; 17 and counting, the number of babies born with birth defects related to the Zika virus so far; 6 months and counting, that is how long ago President Obama asked Congress to do its job and provide supplemental funding to combat the virus.

Mr. Speaker, how many more Americans must suffer before the House Republicans realize that the health of our families matters more than politics? How many more pregnant women must receive the devastating news they have contracted the virus before the GOP leadership stops playing games with American lives?

Instead of heeding the pleas of the CDC, public health experts, and the medical community, House Republicans revealed their true priorities when they decided to hold Zika funding hostage over women's health care and the Confederate flag.

That is just wrong, Mr. Speaker. Let's protect pregnant women. Let's save vulnerable infants. Let's pass a clean Zika funding bill.

THERE IS A MASS KILLING

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is witness to a silent mass killing every day this year. This year, more than 250,000 Americans have lost their lives so far, but the public never knew it. It has never been on the front page of The New York Times or The Washington Post, and it is not discussed on CNN or FOX.

Tomorrow, this mass killing will continue. And every day we allow it, over 900 more will die. With 100 days left this year, nearly 100,000 American lives are on the line unless we take immediate action.

As we sit and watch this tragedy from our comfortable offices, I wonder if my colleagues have statements prepared for the thousands of parents and siblings and friends who lost or will

lose a loved one in this mass killing back home. I wonder how we will look families in the eye when we leave Washington and say, there wasn't enough time, we wanted to go home, and yet those who died will never go home.

Mr. Speaker, there is time if we act today. I ask the Senate to stop the tragedy and please call up and pass H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because where there is help, there is hope.

HELPING FLORIDA'S ORANGE AND CITRUS FARMERS

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Florida is well known for the best tasting orange juice that I am fortunate to have grown up drinking, and we sell that orange juice across our great country. But today, our citrus farmers and orange industry are experiencing a crisis unparalleled to anything we have seen in the last century.

Citrus greening—an invasive disease that ravages citrus plants—has steadily taken its toll on Florida citrus, and it is spreading to other States, too. That is why I am proud to support the Emergency Citrus Disease Response Act, which would allow citrus growers to deduct the cost of replacing lost or damaged citrus plants from their taxes.

This Congress must work together across party lines to do all we can to help Florida's orange and citrus farmers. This legislation will help them afford the new trees they need to restore our citrus crop so we can all keep drinking the best orange juice ever.

TREATING INDIVIDUALS FACING SERIOUS DISEASE OR DISABILITY EQUALLY UNDER THE LAW

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 670, the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act, which I have cosponsored. This bill would allow non-elderly individuals with a disability to create a special needs trust for themselves, as opposed to needing a relative or guardian to create such a trust for them.

Importantly, these trusts would also be exempt from being considered as an asset when an individual applies for eligibility for Medicaid benefits, meaning the individual with the special needs trust can still be eligible for Medicaid benefits.

This legislation would make a straightforward correction in Federal law that would ensure all individuals facing serious disease or disability are treated equally under the law and are able to manage their lives with independence.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for acting to advance this bill.

HONORING A MINNESOTA HERO

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank a true American hero, Jason Falconer, for his bravery during a time of grave crisis in Minnesota.

This past weekend, terror struck our community when an attacker, whom the Islamic State took responsibility for, stepped into the Crossroads Center mall in St. Cloud with an evil intention: to kill innocent Minnesotans. The targets of this malicious plan were parents and their children, college students taking a break from their studies, and mall employees, all of whom found themselves suddenly trapped in a horrible nightmare.

This cowardly attacker had already stabbed 10 victims and may have succeeded in taking life if it were not for the heroic actions of an off-duty Avon police officer, Jason Falconer, who confronted and shot the attacker-terrorist before he could do more harm.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot adequately express the gratitude those of us in my State have for Jason Falconer. He stepped in when he was needed most and protected those around him without even the slightest hesitation or concern for his own safety. During such troubling times, it is a comfort to know that there are true heroes like Jason Falconer among us.

Thank you, Jason, and God bless you.

SPACE TANGO

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a cutting-edge space technology company located in the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky. Space Tango has an innovative business model that utilizes the unique environment of microgravity to commercialize new discoveries in exomedicine for various applications on Earth.

Space Tango established a test center called TangoLab1, a reconfigurable experiment ecosystem designed for microgravity research aboard the International Space Station. The company, ably led by CEO Twyman Clements and Chairman Kris Kimel, leases this space and provides technical assistance for research across several scientific fields. Space Tango provides realtime data and commanding capabilities using an end-to-end cloud-based portal as well as environmental telemetry and power consumption.

I recently had the privilege of visiting the offices of Space Tango in my hometown of Lexington, Kentucky, and learned firsthand from Twyman and Kris and their entire team about the

innovative work of this impressive company. I am convinced that, with this technology, we will find the next lifesaving, life-improving medical breakthroughs, and it will happen somewhere other than on planet Earth.

I am proud to say that Space Tango and many other aerospace companies call the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky home, and I am excited to see what innovations and groundbreaking discoveries they will make in the future, both on Earth and beyond.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 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 September 21, 2016 at 9:10 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5252.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2615.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5937.

That the Senate passed S. 3076.

Appointment:

Public Interest Declassification Board.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5461, IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 876 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 876

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No

amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to the Reading Clerk read through the rule, it sounded a little restrictive. Today, I went back and referenced my notes just to make sure that I was right. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 876 is a structured rule, but it provides for the consideration of absolutely every amendment submitted to the Rules Committee on H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act. Every single amendment that was submitted by this body to the Rules Committee for approval was approved and will be made in order by this rule.

The underlying bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to Congress and make that report available online in its nonclassified parts—obviously, the classified parts would be restricted to Members of Congress—that estimates the total assets under direct or indirect control of senior Iranian leaders, including those with ties to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is well-documented that many of Iran's political and military leaders have amassed substantial personal wealth on the backs of the citizens of Iran. It gives them control over all sorts of sectors of the Iranian economy. In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Research Serv-

ice estimates that one-third of the Iranian economy—that includes telecommunications; it includes construction; it includes airports; it includes seaports—is controlled by leaders personally in the government—these political and military elites—through what they will call personal foundations.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—that is what most of America knows as the Iran deal, signed by President Obama—has allowed many Iranian entities that are tied to government corruption to be removed from the list of entities that American businesses are prohibited from doing business with—those businesses sanctioned by the U.S. Government. Given the large agreement that we have in this Chamber that the Iranian Government is embracing corruption at every level, it is clear that much of the foreign investment from U.S. companies should be limited but is not under the current regime. What is more, U.S. businesses today that are able to invest in Iran are doing so without any of the knowledge of whom they are supporting and what kinds of corruption may be involved. That is bad news for America. It is bad news for American national security, and it is bad news for the American economy.

H.R. 5461 will shine a light on that internal Iranian corruption, and it will allow American businesses the information they need to determine whom and whom not to do business with. We may hear today in the underlying bill, Mr. Speaker, that these requirements are too burdensome. I tell you that that is nonsense. It is simply a request that the Department of the Treasury, using existing resources—public resources—as well as our classified resources, make this report to Congress. We are talking about only 80 folks. We are talking about the Supreme Leader of Iran; we are talking about the President of Iran; we are talking about members of the Council of Guardians in Iran; we are talking about the Expediency Council and about two dozen Revolutionary Guard Corps leaders.

In the war on terror, in the quest for transparency, I am certain that the United States Government, through the Department of the Treasury, can provide this information. We may hear in the underlying debate that such information will expose our intelligence sources overseas—again, nonsense. There is not a single Member of this Chamber, from left to right, who wants to do that. No one wants to do that. Anything that is in a classified setting that needs to remain in a classified setting will, in fact, remain in a classified setting.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any of those concerns—in fact, if any Member of this Chamber has any of those concerns—I invite him to support this rule. Again, with the passage of this rule, we will move to the underlying bill. We will have a full-fledged debate on that underlying bill, including a debate over every single amendment offered for consideration in this body.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for the customary 30 minutes.

With all that we have to do, I can't believe we are here doing this; nonetheless, here we are today, considering H.R. 5461, the so-called Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress and post online the estimated total assets under the direct or indirect control of certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, along with a description of how these assets were acquired and are employed, regardless of whether said figures are subject to U.S. sanctions.

The fact is that this bill—and let's be clear about it—is nothing more than another attempt by Republicans to undermine the historic agreement the United States worked so hard to achieve to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons is a big deal. I am sorry my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't share that view, but it is a big deal. The world will be safer with a nuclear-free Iran.

Last July, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, Germany—the P5+1—and Iran agreed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which required Iran to abandon its nuclear program in exchange for U.S., EU, and U.N. sanctions being lifted. The agreement officially came into effect on October 18, 2015. U.S. nuclear-related sanctions were lifted on January 16, 2016, after the International Atomic Energy Agency verified that Iran implemented its key nuclear-related measures described in the agreement and the Secretary of State confirmed the IAEA's verification.

Since the implementation of the agreement, Republicans have repeatedly tried to create the impression of numerous scandals surrounding Iran and of supposed violations of the agreement; but the reality is that the agreement has, so far, prevented Iran from developing a nuclear arsenal. While we will continue to counter Iran's hostile activities in the region, we will not undermine the JCPOA.

H.R. 5461 would absolutely do nothing to increase transparency within the Iranian financial industry. Rather, this bill would cause confusion regarding compliance obligations, deter non-U.S. banks from reengaging with legitimate Iranian business, and undermine the letter and spirit of the nuclear agreement the United States worked so hard to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy, which basically ends with this statement, that if the President were presented with this bill, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5461—IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT—REP. POLIQUIN, R-ME, AND ONE COSPONSOR

The Administration shares the Congress' goals of increasing transparency and bringing Iran into compliance with international standards in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering. However, this bill would be counterproductive toward those shared goals.

The bill requires the U.S. Government to publicly report all assets held by some of Iran's highest leaders and to describe how these assets are acquired and used. Rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would incentivize those involved to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran's banking sector to demonstrate transparency. These onerous reporting requirements also would take critical resources away from the U.S. Department of the Treasury's important work to identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct. Producing this information could also compromise intelligence sources and methods.

One of our best tools for impeding destabilizing Iranian activities has been to identify Iranian companies that are controlled by the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) or other Iranians on the list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List) to non-U.S. businesses, so that they can block assets or stop material transfers. This process is labor-intensive and requires the judicious use of our national intelligence assets. Redirecting these assets to preparing this onerous public report would be counterproductive and will not reduce institutional corruption or promote transparency within Iran's system.

In addition, this bill's required public postings also may be perceived by Iran and likely our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitments to our closest allies.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region. The United States should retain all of the tools needed to counter this activity, ranging from powerful sanctions to our efforts to disrupt and interdict illicit shipments of weapons and proliferation-sensitive technologies. This bill would adversely affect the U.S. Government's ability to wield these tools, would undermine the very goals it purports to achieve, and could even endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is going nowhere. Quite frankly, I think it is an insult to the American people that we are bringing up more and more bills that are going nowhere when we have so much here to do. Congress has roughly a week before we recess again, and instead of focusing on passing a bipartisan bill to actually fund the government, House Republicans are wasting more time with partisan bills like this, and it really is quite unfortunate.

But, since Republicans want to talk about transparency so much, let's talk about the transparency—or the total lack of transparency—of their Presidential nominee, Donald Trump. I have got to tell you that I have been doing this a long time, and I think it is safe to say that Donald Trump's lack of transparency would make Richard Nixon blush.

For 40 years, America's major party nominees have publicly released their tax returns, a simple and basic disclosure made to the American people to help them choose which candidate is best fit to be our next President. Donald Trump, the nominee of the party that is telling us today that they care so much about transparency, has repeatedly refused to release his tax returns. This comes even after he promised in 2014 that he "absolutely"—and I say that in quotes—would release them if he ran for President.

Let's be honest. In this House of Representatives, if Hillary Clinton refused to release her tax returns, there would be an outcry like you have never heard from my Republican friends. There would be calls for hearings and resolutions and probably even a vote to impeach her retroactively once she was elected. We all know that. But, on Donald Trump's lack of transparency—the guy who wants to be President of the United States—they are silent.

The secrecy and the lack of transparency doesn't stop with Donald Trump's tax returns. This month, Newsweek reported on how Donald Trump's extensive financial dealings overseas would pose an unprecedented conflict of interest that could threaten our national security and global interests.

In the article, they write:

Never before has a business posed such a threat to the United States. If Donald Trump wins this election and his company is not immediately shut down or forever severed from the entire Trump family, the foreign policy of the United States of America could well be for sale.

The Trump Organization has hundreds of business dealings involving more than a dozen countries on five continents, including Russia, India, Turkey, Libya, China, and South Korea. Newsweek warns that, as long as The Trump Organization remains open, foreign governments and businesses would be able to funnel money directly into the pockets of Trump and his family. That means American foreign policy would be literally for sale.

It is a situation unlike anything we have ever seen in American history.

For example, Trump's business deals could motivate him to abandon NATO allies like Turkey and important Asian allies like South Korea. His deals in Azerbaijan could force him to alter his position on Iran or undermine U.S. relations with Armenia. His deals in India could influence his position over longstanding conflicts with Pakistan—in a volatile subcontinent where both nations have nuclear weapons.

When it comes to Russia, there are concerns about Trump's heaping praise and praise and praise on an increasingly hostile foreign leader, Russian President Vladimir Putin, at the same time his company is seeking business opportunities in Russia and how that conflict of interest could evolve if Trump were President of the United States.

Newsweek also reports that the friction caused by Trump's business dealings could jeopardize relationships with our allies like Turkey in the fight against ISIS. Additionally, one of Trump's business partners is a South Korean company that is involved in nuclear energy, which makes you wonder if that is why he suggested South Korea should have nuclear weapons.

So, if you want to talk about transparency and if you are worried about conflicts of interest and corruption, you ought to demand that the nominee of your party come clean with the American people. You ought to demand that he release his tax returns, that he make it clear that he would end all of his business ties if, God forbid, he would become President of the United States, which is something that, I hope, we never, ever get close to.

The bottom line is that that is something that is real and is right before us, and, quite frankly, we ought to be doing more about it. We shouldn't be wasting the American people's time with more partisan messaging bills that claim to be about transparency—bills that are going absolutely nowhere. We should focus on passing a bipartisan funding bill that keeps this government open and that takes real action to combat the very real Zika virus and other public health crises that Americans are actually confronting.

I urge the Members of both parties to defeat this rule and get back to work on real issues that actually matter in the lives of the people whom we represent.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just inform the gentleman that we have one additional speaker who says he is on his way.

Mr. WOODALL. I tell the gentleman I, too, have a rumored speaker who is on his way, so we are in the same boat in that space.

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

I read further from the Statement of Administration Policy, the veto threat that the gentleman from Massachusetts noted earlier.

□ 1300

He did read the section that said: If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

There is more on this page, Mr. Speaker. He also says: “. . . the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran’s support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, what he is referencing, no doubt, ties into the report that the State Department released over the summer, naming Iran the number one international sponsor of terrorism.

Now, what this bill asks is: If you know you have a corrupt government—again, in the administration’s words, Iran’s support for terrorism, its ballistic program, its human rights abuses, and its destabilizing activity in the region—if you know that you have a dangerous government and if you know that corrupt leaders of that government are hiding their resources in foundations across the nation, if you know that those foundations are controlling a third of the Iranian economy, continuing to keep its foot on the voice of the Iranian people, if you know that this is true, why won’t you stand up and be counted?

My friend from Massachusetts says we shouldn’t waste our time on this because it is going nowhere. Candidly, I believe leadership is taking those things that folks believe are going nowhere and making them a reality. That is what the President did with this Iran deal.

When I go back and think about the polling that was going on across the Nation while the President was pushing this deal around the globe, there was no more unpopular agreement with the American people. The American people were livid that we would be making a deal to perpetuate the power and control structure in Iran, but the President led on that. He forced that through. I don’t believe we ever got a majority of the American people behind it, but he got a majority of the Congress to support him in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is about information. This is about information on a known sponsor of global terrorism. This is about providing information not just to American citizens, but to Iranian citizens. If you live in the nation of Iran, if you have that average annual income of \$15,000, Mr. Speaker, you might be interested to know how the other half lives. You might be interested to know, when your leaders are talking about the Great Satan on national television, where it is they are stuffing their pockets. You might be

interested to know, when folks are talking about you rising up to fight the Great Satan, where those folks have their relatives working, where their millions are growing, what parts of the economy they are controlling. That is all this bill is going to ask for.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule today. The rule makes it in order to consider the underlying bill as well as every single amendment that has been offered by both sides of the aisle to perfect the underlying bill.

Again, I urge my colleagues to be enthusiastic in their support of the underlying bill and of the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just respond to the gentleman that the reason why the administration wants to veto this bill has nothing to do with the fact that they aren’t concerned about Iran’s role in promoting terrorist organizations around the world or being involved in very bad behavior.

I think they are opposed to this bill because they don’t think it is worth anything; that it is not going to work. In fact, rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would actually incentivize those affected to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran’s banking sector to demonstrate transparency.

Look, we are all talking about this like this is all on the level. The real deal is that my friends on the other side are upset that the President of the United States negotiated a deal with Iran that prevents them from getting a nuclear weapon. So we see a multitude of bills like this coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would expand the Department of Homeland Security’s presence overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would strengthen DHS’s operations by authorizing and expanding Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement programs that vet and screen individuals before they enter the United States. It would add an additional 2,000 Customs and Border Protection officers for overseas and domestic operations.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for allowing me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question so we can bring up my bill, H.R. 5256, the Expanding DHS Overseas Passenger Security Screening and Vetting Operations Act.

Mr. Speaker, everybody we have talked to within the Homeland Security arena says that, as Americans, we are safer if we can push our borders out. So the notion that we should wait on the bad guys to get here is a notion that obviously would put us in harm’s way.

So what we are proposing with this bill is enhancing the ability for us to push our borders out. We have had examples of this. They have all been successful. So this is another effort to resource the opportunity to make sure that our borders not only are just safe, but as safe from American soil as possible.

So 15 years ago, Mr. Speaker, foreign terrorists carried out the most deadly and costly terrorist act on U.S. soil. We committed ourselves to creating the Department of Homeland Security. We resourced it. We put a number of agencies together. We are on a day-to-day basis tracking bad people all over the world, preventing bad people from getting into the United States. To the credit of our men and women, they are doing a good job, but we are only as good as the resources that we put to fight terrorism.

So this, again, is one of the tools in the toolkit that we have identified that we have to have, which is to push our borders out so that we can not only keep Americans safe, but we can, through our enhanced vetting process, keep bad people out.

So as the 9/11 Commission reported, the terrorists that carried out this heinous act on 9/11 were able to exploit legitimate channels of travel to the U.S. from countries around the globe. There is no question about that. To prevent terrorist travel, the Department of Homeland Security has made significant efforts to expand its presence and partnerships around the world to vet passengers well in advance of their arrival to the U.S.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there are over 200 airports around the world. The last-point-of-departure airports, to speak of, where unless we can vet all those individuals who are trying to come here, they can’t get on the plane. So what we are trying to do is continue to enhance that effort and others to make sure that anyone trying to get to this country—and we can identify that they are bad people—that we will keep them away.

My legislation, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5256, will strengthen these operations to deal with evolving terrorist threats, including the threats posed by individuals traveling without visas from European and other countries with visa waiver agreements with the U.S.

Now, to prevent these terrorists and other dangerous people from entering the U.S., Mr. Speaker, this legislation directs DHS to strategically expand its program that vets and screens travelers. It specifically authorizes key DHS vetting and screening programs. It also provides for an additional 2,000 Customs and Border Protection officers for not only overseas operations, but also to address domestic shortages, particularly at U.S. international airports.

Mr. Speaker, even as we absorb the events of this weekend where Americans carried out terrorist attacks in Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey, we must do all we can to prevent foreign terrorists, including an estimated 3,000 Europeans trained as foreign fighters by ISIL, from entering the United States.

Defeating the previous question, Mr. Speaker, will allow Members to consider my bill, H.R. 5256, that will do just that. Again, Mr. Speaker, we are only as good as we resource the Department to fight terrorism.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), one of the great leaders of this conference.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for the great work that he does on the Rules Committee. Once again, he has done yeoman's work on this legislation before us.

Frankly, I have some reservations about the underlying bill, but I do respect the goal of this legislation. I also respect the gentleman from Mississippi in his efforts to come up with some legislation so that we can have enhanced interrogation of certain people wanting to come into this country. I think almost everyone on this side of the aisle believes in more detailed vetting of people wanting to come here, especially from countries that we deem as dangerous.

I rise at this time, though, just to make the point that—in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), who spent almost his entire time talking about this bill, talking about the transparency of the Republican nominee for President, I also, though, might make the point that the Democratic nominee, Secretary Clinton, has refused for many months to release the transcripts or copies of her many speeches that she gave to Wall Street firms for really what most people would consider to be small fortunes. In addition to that, she has refused to give out details of the approximately 60 percent of the people she met with while Secretary of State who had contributed to the Clinton Foundation, in some cases, very large amounts of money from foreign countries, which really is possibly more closely related to this legislation than is the tax return of the Republican nominee.

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

I would ask my colleagues respectfully to support us in our effort to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the legislation that Mr. THOMPSON mentioned, legislation that would strengthen the Department of Homeland Security's overseas screening and vetting programs.

I would like to think that even though Democrats and Republicans don't always agree on everything, we can agree on something and that this is something that we ought to be able to agree on, and hopefully we will be able to have a vote on it.

Again, I regret that we are bringing up a bill that, again, is another attempt to try to undermine the deal that we have brokered with other nations around the world to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power, but here we are yet with another bill. The President is going to veto it. We can continue to debate the merits, but it is kind of a waste of time.

Again, I would hope my colleagues would vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the bill if we are presented with it.

I would just say one final thing to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), who I have a great deal of respect for: The deal is that Mr. Trump is the first nominee, I think, that I can recall, who has not released his taxes. Secretary Clinton has released years and years and years of her taxes. We know more about Secretary Clinton than we know about any other nominee, I think, in history.

I have always kind of wondered why Mr. Trump says some of the things he says, which, quite frankly, I sometimes find unbelievable, some of the comments on foreign policy. But when you look at his financial interests and his investments in these various countries, you can kind of understand why he defends dictators, why he never mentions the words "human rights," why he says some of the things he says about urging other countries to become nuclear powers when we should all be talking about how we control nuclear weapons in this country.

□ 1315

If we are worried about transparency and you are worried about conflicts of interest, and if we are truly worried about corruption, now is the time, I would urge my friends on the other side of the aisle, to tell the nominee of your party to come clean. There are so many tangled webs in The Trump Organization, so many financial ties to things that, quite frankly, should give every one of us concern. I don't know what the problem is about a little sunshine.

Like I said in the beginning, if Secretary Clinton did not release her tax returns, there would be calls for hearings and resolutions and there would be Special Orders, and it would go on and on and on; yet, with regard to their

nominee, it is okay for him to withhold all this information from the American people. I think that is unfortunate.

So if we are talking about transparency here today and if we are worried about corruption and if we are worried about conflicts of interest, there is that old saying, "Physician, heal thyself." I would urge my Republican colleagues to hold their nominee, hold their standard-bearer to a higher standard when it comes to transparency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward nominees for the Office of the President.

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

I appreciate you issuing that reminder. I don't particularly enjoy this time of year on the House floor because we do have important business that needs to occur here, and we often get off base.

I don't think this is the right time to talk about the FBI investigation into Secretary Clinton. I don't think this is the right time to talk about the pay to play investigation going on with the Clinton Foundation. I don't think this is the right time to talk about all of her employees who have been questioned about her behavior and are pleading the Fifth, one right after the other, and are refusing to answer those questions. I don't think this is the right place for that. This is the right place to talk about something that brings us together, which is the defeat of a corrupt Iranian regime.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who do not like the agreement that the President made with the Iranians. In fact, there are many on that side of the aisle who do not like the agreement that the President made with the Iranians, and you need go no further than this debate today to understand why.

I will read again from the President's own veto statement of this bill. It says: "This bill's required public postings"—these are the public postings of the assets and the corrupt arrangements that are involved in these top high officials of the Iranian regime. "This bill's required public postings . . . may be perceived by Iran and likely our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon."

I will say it again, Mr. Speaker, the President's concern is that, by making information public to the American people and the Iranian people—and this information would be published in four languages so that it would be available

to the Iranian people as well—by making information public about the corrupt business dealings of Iranian leaders, we will be violating the agreement the President signed with Iran.

How could this Nation possibly have signed an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that trades away our opportunity to shine sunlight on corrupt practices? I don't believe that we have. But my friend from Massachusetts said, Mr. Speaker: It undermines the letter and the intent of the agreement. To shine sunlight on corrupt practices.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the American people were concerned about the Iranian agreement. This is why we continue to be concerned about the Iranian agreement; but more importantly, this bill is not about that agreement.

The chairman of the Committee on Financial Services testified in front of the Committee on Rules last night, Mr. Speaker, and he said he just can't imagine why it is controversial for us to publish a list of officials and their holdings online. I agree.

It is baffling to me that the disclosure of what is, in many cases, publicly known information but that has not been compiled in a particular place could be a threat to preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons. In fact, I would argue shining sunlight on the corrupt regime will empower the Iranian citizens to perhaps help us in this cause.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a controversial piece of legislation. This is, in fact, a transparency piece of legislation. The motion to recommit that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) discussed, candidly, most of what he said I agree with. I don't believe a motion to recommit is the right place to do it. He was not in front of the Committee on Rules last night. The bill he offers as a bipartisan, common-sense compromise has absolutely no Republicans on it whatsoever; but I do believe that pushing out our borders, pushing out our vetting process is exactly the right idea for this country. This happens to be a bill from the Committee on Financial Services. The gentleman from Mississippi happens to be the ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security. I hope the Committee on Homeland Security will get about that business. I support it 100 percent.

But what I ask of my colleagues here today, Mr. Speaker, is to support this rule so we can debate this bill. Folks on both sides of the aisle like it, don't like it. Debating the bill is the right place to expose it. Transparency is good for the Iranians, and it is good for us as well. If we support this rule, we will also consider every amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules. Every alternative idea, every perfecting idea, every improvement that this body came up with and brought to the Committee on Rules last night, Mr. Speaker, we are going

to make in order for debate here on the floor.

This is a tough time of year. Politics don't often bring out the best of policy, but we have got a good shot at it today. We have got a good shot at it with this rule. We have a rule here that I think everybody can be proud to vote for; and, as my friend from Tennessee said earlier, then we will debate the merits of the underlying bill and have the House work its will.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 876 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5256) to enhance the overseas operations of the Department of Homeland Security aimed at preventing terrorist threats from reaching the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5256.

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 of-

ferred a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair once again will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the nominees for the Office of the President.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3438, REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5719, EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES THROUGH STOCK OWNERSHIP ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 875 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 875

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as

amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 22, 2016, or September 23, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 875, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act, or the REVIEW Act, and H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act.

For H.R. 3438, the rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and also provides for a motion to recommit. The rule also provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 5719 and provides a motion, also, to recommit.

The rule makes in order two amendments to H.R. 3438, representing ideas from my colleagues across the aisle. Yesterday the Committee on Rules received testimony from the chairman and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as testimony from Congressman ERIK PAULSEN and Congressman JOE CROWLEY from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

MARINO), went through regular order and enjoyed a thorough discussion at both the subcommittee and full committee level. In November of 2015, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, of which I am a member, held a legislative hearing on the bill. The bill was marked up by the Committee on the Judiciary on September 8, 2016. Several amendments were considered.

The Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act also went through regular order. It was passed by voice vote through the Committee on Ways and Means on September 14. This bill, which has bipartisan support, would promote employee ownership at startup companies by addressing the tax treatment of restricted stock issued to employees.

Both bills represent good governance and provide relief for American workers and companies. The REVIEW Act is supported by numerous organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Builders and Contractors, Forestry Resource Association, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and dozens more.

□ 1330

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation because it ensures that American businesses won't have to waste billions of dollars if legally flawed new rules are thrown out by the courts. The bill is just plain common sense.

This legislation came about in response to a very real problem. In Michigan v. EPA, the court held that the EPA's Utility MACT rule was legally infirm because the EPA decided costs were irrelevant to its decision to promulgate the rule. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

It seems that something like this would not be true. Unfortunately, it is. The EPA issued a rule estimated to cost more than \$9 billion per year, even though the rule was expected to achieve benefits in airborne mercury emissions of \$4 million to \$6 million per year. The rule costs more than 10 times to implement than it brought in benefits.

Even away from the government perspective, there were questions concerning the actual other benefits as well. You wonder why people are angry at the Federal Government. Rules like this are a good example. Even worse, while the court found the rule legally infirm, it failed to set aside the rule which required businesses to continue to incur compliance costs, pending remand to the court of appeals.

This rule was not stayed by the courts during a multiyear legal battle

to challenge the rule, meaning the whole time the courts were deliberating, businesses were forced to start implementing the rule and bear the costs. This is a huge blow to businesses that had to pour time and money into compliance only to later be told it was a wasted effort because the legal challenge to the rule was ultimately successful.

To be sure, the successful legal challenge was a victory, but businesses shouldn't have had to go through years of uncertainty and billions of wasted dollars while the challenge was pending in the courts.

The REVIEW Act makes sense. It prevents needless expenditures like the ones businesses were forced to make while the Utility MACT case was winding its way through the courts.

You see, the fix is simple. The REVIEW Act requires that, when agencies promulgate new rules, the rules won't become legally effective until after the conclusion of litigation challenging them if the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines the rules would impose \$1 billion or more in costs to the economy. Litigants would have up to 60 days after the rule was published to bring litigation, unless specified otherwise by the particular law the agency rule pertains to.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. We aren't talking about this kind of change for every rule. We are not talking about this kind of change even for every major rule. We are talking about making this commonsense amendment for rules that cost over \$1 billion to the economy.

Businesses shouldn't be forced to deal with these enormous compliance costs while it is unclear if the rule will ever even actually come to fruition. The time and money businesses are currently forced to spend complying with these rules is time and money taken away from building the businesses, investing in the community, and creating jobs.

Now, I will admit these billion-dollar rules have been issued by administrations of both parties in recent years. That is another reason why Members on both sides of the aisle should support this legislation.

According to the American Action Forum, in fact, from 2006 to 2008, the Nation averaged two of these rules annually; and from 2009 to present, the figure has actually increased to roughly three times per year. This increase in billion-dollar rules should be troubling to all of us, and businesses run by Republicans and Democrats are suffering from the effects of complying with these rules even as litigation is ongoing. Under this administration alone, these billion-dollar rules are estimated to have imposed total annual costs of \$65.1 billion. According to the American Action Forum, the related paperwork burden comes out to be about 19.5 million hours.

Since 2005, there have been at least 34 billion-dollar rules, with 24 of those

promulgated under the current administration. Thirty-four may not seem like a large number over the last 11 years, but we have to remember the extremely high cost of these results and the impact those costs can have on businesses and the economy.

There may be arguments from those on the other side that affected parties could receive a stay from the court during litigation, but stays are hard to obtain and the consequences of not obtaining one can be very costly.

During a Judiciary Committee hearing on the REVIEW Act, Paul Noe of the American Forest and Paper Association provided an enlightening example of the consequences of courts failing to issue stays as the billion-dollar rule goes forward.

He said in his testimony: "In 2007, about \$2 million in compliance investments were stranded in the paper and wood products industry when a court struck down the 2004 Boiler MACT rule just 3 months before the compliance deadline. When the rules were reissued in 2013, the new standards had changed significantly, and previous investments proved to be the wrong approaches to achieve compliance. Wasting limited capital undermines the competitiveness of U.S. businesses and impedes growth and job creation."

Mr. Noe's example is another real-life circumstance of the reason this bill, the REVIEW Act, is necessary. The last thing we should be doing is impeding growth and job creation. Instead, we should be looking to stimulate the economy and getting Americans working.

I know in northeast Georgia, many businesses are struggling due to the crushing costs of regulations. Many of these are small businesses that aren't able to employ attorneys and consultants to keep them up-to-date with the latest edicts from Washington. Instead, they are forced to spend time and resources figuring out how to deal with the onslaught of red tape; and that doesn't even take into account the massive burdens of these billion-dollar regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that not all regulation is bad. Regulations can help protect public health and safety and ensure needed worker protections; but regulation that does not make sense, regulation that has compliance costs that far exceed the benefits, simply doesn't make sense.

Importantly, in this bill, we aren't trying to prevent more regulation. We are simply saying that, for rules over a billion dollars, they shouldn't go into effect until litigation has concluded. That is common sense. Businesses shouldn't have to waste resources complying with a huge, new burden for something that might not ever even come into effect.

This is a narrowly written but important change to the Administrative Procedure Act that will prevent waste and, hopefully, encourage agencies to rethink issuing billion-dollar rules.

This is a bill that had plenty of hearing in the Judiciary Committee, both sides expressing their desires on these issues, and had full debate and markup.

Both the REVIEW Act and the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act are smart changes to current law that deserve full and fair consideration before this House.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to be in session for 7 days before yet another 6-week-long recess. Instead of addressing the most pressing issues facing our communities, we are on this floor with yet another Republican messaging bill to undermine the Federal rulemaking process.

With all that needs to be done, with all the crises we are facing, this is what they bring to the floor—a bill, by the way, that is not going anywhere. It is going nowhere. The President is going to send up a veto message. The Senate is not even going to take it up.

So what we are spending our time doing, what we are spinning our wheels about right now is something that, basically, I guess my friends can use in a press release, but this is not real legislating. And I get it. Attacking Federal regulations has become a favorite sound bite for my friends on the other side of the aisle. They are always quick to remind us of the costs associated with these regulations, but completely dismiss the very real and typically much larger benefits of protecting consumers, the environment, public health, and safety.

I am against duplicative regulation. I am against warrantless regulation or needless regulation. It would be nice if we could actually function in a bipartisan way to identify where we have common ground and where there is agreement so that we can make some progress, but that is not the MO of the Republican leadership in this House. It is their way or the highway.

H.R. 3438 automatically freezes any covered rule when any lawsuit is filed, regardless of how frivolous that lawsuit may be, instead of relying on the discretion and expertise of the courts.

Now, let's be honest with ourselves, Mr. Speaker. This isn't about good governance and it isn't about ensuring high-impact regulations pass legal muster. This is yet another election year giveaway to Republican special interests, and it is that time of year—lots of fundraisers, lots of political activity. People go home and say they voted for this bill that is going nowhere. Therefore, vote for them.

This is just yet another Republican effort to indefinitely delay regulations

that they don't like—regulations that protect consumers, regulations that protect public health and that protect our environment.

In fact, one of the most troubling aspects of this bill is that it fails to include any exceptions for rules responding to public health emergencies.

Can you believe that?

I am disappointed that the Republicans in the Judiciary Committee rejected Democratic amendments to the bill that would have ensured lawsuits could not tie up responses to public health emergencies.

Why would anybody be against that?

This is especially troubling as we face major health crises, like the Zika virus, and rely on our government to protect our public health. We should be doing everything in our power to find a solution to this terrible emergency, not passing legislation that can make finding that solution even harder.

I strongly oppose this misguided and unnecessary legislation, which does nothing to promote an efficient regulatory process, but delays regulations needed to protect our public health and safety.

This week the House is also set to consider H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act. By allowing rank-and-file employees of private companies to defer payments on their stock options for 7 years, this bill makes it easier for these employees—often lower-income earners—to receive equity as part of their compensation.

Our economy is recovering, but not for everyone. More and more wealth is becoming concentrated in the top 1 percent and income inequality is at its highest levels since the Great Depression. Meanwhile, working families struggle to make ends meet, often needing several jobs just to get by.

So I support efforts to allow rank-and-file employees to truly share in the long-term success of their companies and our greater innovation economy. I think the majority of us share in that belief. But I do share the concerns that have been expressed by my Democratic colleagues during the Ways and Means Committee markup and in the Rules Committee last night that this bill isn't paid for and adds \$1.03 billion to the deficit. This bill not being paid for adds over a billion dollars to our deficit.

The Republican leadership in this House routinely refuses to bring up funding legislation that adequately addresses public health crises. They demand offsets anytime there is an emergency. When it comes to increases in our social safety net, we can't do it because we have to find offsets. But when it comes to tax breaks, there are no limits. They don't require offsets.

Just last week this House passed an unpaid-for tax cut that, if enacted, would add almost \$33 billion to the deficit. The Ways and Means Committee has marked up nearly \$54 billion worth of unpaid-for tax cuts just this year.

There was a time when caring about the deficit and the debt was something my Republican friends would talk about, but I guess that is no longer the case. So when my Republican friends talk about their commitment to fiscal responsibility, I have to ask: Why the double standard?

We can't help the people of Flint, Michigan, but we can pass tax breaks and tax cuts and not have to pay for them. By the way, the vast majority of tax cuts that my Republican friends support go to the wealthiest people in this country, not to the middle class.

We are told we have to fully offset emergency responses, as I said, to the water crisis in Flint, Michigan; the opioid epidemic; flooding disasters; and the growing threat of the Zika virus, but yet we don't have to pay for tax cuts. I just don't quite get it.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, my friends and colleagues, JOE CROWLEY and ANNA ESHOO, Democratic cosponsors of this bill, offered an amendment to offset the over \$1 billion cost by increasing a tax on oil barrels by two cents. That is just two cents that they would increase the cost. But what is important for people to remember is that what that means for the consumer is five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas.

□ 1345

So in order to offset something that we think is a good benefit, and to pay for it, it would cost consumers five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas. Most people that I talk to I don't believe think that that is an unreasonable thing, the choice between adding to the deficit, which, by the way, we all pay for anyway, or basically paying for things as we go. And so five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas, in order to offset the cost of this bill, I don't think, is unreasonable.

Now, this amendment was not made in order for consideration on the House floor because my Republican colleagues insisted that the offset was not germane to the bill.

But the House Rules Committee has the power to waive germaneness and other rules, and frequently does so, when it suits the needs of the majority. And during this Congress alone, Republicans on the Rules Committee have granted 245 waivers; 242, or 98 percent of them, have been for Republican initiatives. So they do it all the time when they want to.

So, Mr. Speaker, we had the ability to move the Crowley-Eshoo amendment to the floor for consideration, but Republicans in the Rules Committee blocked our efforts to responsibly pay for the costs associated with this change in tax law.

Now, I appreciate the work of my colleagues in promoting employee ownership among all of a company's workers, not just those at the top. But I do have some serious concerns about this majority's insistence that emergency re-

lief and other priorities be offset while tax cuts are able to sail through this House without a second thought and not be paid for. That is the wrong approach.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to make one comment, and then I think my friend from Massachusetts and I can look around. Nobody is beating our door down for time here.

There are no billion-dollar public health issues that were brought up that this—it doesn't waive for a billion-dollar public health emergency. In fact, probably if we did have over-a-billion-dollar health emergency, we could handle it better through statutory change than through a regulatory agency doing this. So it is an argument, but it is not a valid argument, I believe, in this case.

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

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

I am going to urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation that would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. There have been more than 10,000 gun-related deaths in this country this year alone. The country cannot tolerate the indifference on this issue any longer.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, we have only a few days left here before there is another recess, and we have incredible challenges before us. We have an opioid crisis in this country. We passed legislation that said all the right things, but the funding to fund all those nice things wasn't following.

We are confronted with a Zika virus crisis, and the American people are expecting us to do something, and this House has been twiddling its thumbs for far too long. The time for action is now.

We have a water crisis in Flint, Michigan; can't seem to get anything done in this House. Yet, those poor people can't drink the water out of their faucets and have been poisoned for years as a result of the indifference on that situation.

On the issue of gun violence, I mean, every day somebody gets killed in gun violence. We have tried to bring up a bill that would require universal background checks. I don't care what your position on guns is, I think we all should be able to agree that there ought to be universal background checks.

Right now, if you go into a licensed gun dealer, you have to go through a background check. But you get around that if you go to a gun show or buy a gun online.

I think everybody, I don't care what your philosophy is, should want to keep guns out of the hands of violent criminals and people who are dangerously mentally ill. I don't know why that is such a controversy in this House of Representatives. Yet, we can't even get the leadership to allow us to bring that bill to the floor.

On the issue that the previous question is about, which is the no fly, no buy list, I don't think there is anybody in this country who can understand why we think it is okay to, on one hand, say to somebody who is on an FBI terrorist watch list: we are concerned about you so much that you can't fly on an airplane. But, at the same time, say: well, okay, but you can go out and buy a gun; you can buy an assault weapon; and you can go out and buy a weapon of war.

That doesn't make any sense. People can't quite get why we can't come together on that. But even if you don't want to vote for that, you ought to let us have that debate and that vote.

These are the kinds of issues that we should be talking about. Yet, we are doing message bills that are going nowhere, again, not just because the President wants to veto them, it is because the Senate won't even take some of these things up.

So in these few days we have left, let's do something radical. Let's actually do the people's business. Let's do something that is going to help people in this country and improve their quality of life and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think we have made our case for the rule. I think it needs to be passed—also the underlying bills. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 875 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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 875 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 875, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 876; adopting House Resolution 876, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing the following bills: H.R. 3957, H.R. 5659, H.R. 5713, and H.R. 5613.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fleming
Aderholt	Coffman	Flores
Allen	Cole	Forbes
Amash	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Fox
Babin	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Cook	Garrett
Barton	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Benishek	Cramer	Gibson
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Black	Culberson	Gosar
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Blum	Davidson	Granger
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Brat	DesJarlais	Griffith
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brooks (AL)	Dold	Guinta
Buchanan	Donovan	Guthrie
Buck	Duffy	Hanna
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Hardy
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Byrne	Ellmers (NC)	Harris
Calvert	Emmer (MN)	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Heck (NV)
Carter (TX)	Fincher	Hensarling
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Chaffetz	Fleischmann	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)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

McSally
Meadows
Messers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
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
Russell

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—171

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummins
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Blumenauer
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
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)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Bishop (UT)
Brooks (IN)
Capuano
Clarke (NY)
Dent
Deutch
Farr
Garamendi

Grijalva
Higgins
Larson (CT)
Marchant
Meehan
Moore
Neugebauer
Perlmutter

Poe (TX)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

□ 1413

Mses. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, GRAHAM, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. BONAMICI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for: Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 524, I was at an Ethics Committee hearing. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 524, I was unavoidably detained at an Ethics Committee meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against: Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted rollcall No. 524, “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 181, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
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
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
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy

Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
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.
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
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino

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
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
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
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
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)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummins
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier

DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell

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

NOT VOTING—11

Grijalva Poe (TX) Tiberi
 Hill Rush Walters, Mimi
 Lynch Sanchez, Loretta Westmoreland
 Moore Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1420

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. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5461, IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 876) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, 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 is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—242

Abraham Boustany Coffman
 Aderholt Brady (TX) Cole
 Allen Brat Collins (GA)
 Amash Bridenstine Collins (NY)
 Amodei Brooks (AL) Comstock
 Babin Brooks (IN) Conaway
 Barletta Buchanan Cook
 Barr Buck Costello (PA)
 Barton Bucshon Cramer
 Benishek Burgess Crawford
 Bilirakis Byrne Crenshaw
 Bishop (MI) Calvert Culberson
 Bishop (UT) Carter (GA) Curbelo (FL)
 Black Carter (TX) Davidson
 Blackburn Chabot Davis, Rodney
 Blum Chaffetz Denham
 Bost Clawson (FL) Dent

DeSantis Kelly (MS) Ribble
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)
 Diaz-Balart King (IA) Rigell
 Dold King (NY) Roby
 Donovan Kinzinger (IL) Roe (TN)
 Duffy Kline Rogers (AL)
 Duncan (SC) Knight Rogers (KY)
 Duncan (TN) Labrador Rohrabacher
 Ellmers (NC) LaHood Rokita
 Emmer (MN) LaMalfa Rooney (FL)
 Farenthold Lamborn Ros-Lehtinen
 Fincher Lance Roskam
 Fitzpatrick Latta Ross
 Fleischmann LoBiondo Rothfus
 Fleming Long Rouzer
 Flores Loudermilk Royce
 Forbes Love Russell
 Fortenberry Lucas Salmon
 Franks (AZ) Luettkemeyer Sanford
 Frelinghuysen Lummis Scalise
 Garrett MacArthur Schweikert
 Gibbs Marchant Scott, Austin
 Gibson Marino Sensenbrenner
 Gohmert Massie Sessions
 Goodlatte McCaul Shimkus
 Gosar McClinton Shuster
 Gowdy McHenry Simpson
 Granger McKinley Smith (MO)
 Graves (GA) McMorris Smith (NE)
 Graves (LA) Rodgers Smith (NJ)
 Graves (MO) Smith (TX) Stefanik
 Griffith Meadows Stewart
 Grothman Meehan Stivers
 Guinta Messer Stutzman
 Guthrie Mica Thompson (PA)
 Hanna Miller (FL) Thornberry
 Hardy Miller (MI) Tipton
 Harper Moolenaar Trott
 Harris Mooney (WV) Turner
 Hartzler Mullin Upton
 Heck (NV) Mulvaney Valadao
 Hensarling Murphy (PA) Wagner
 Herrera Beutler Neugebauer
 Hice, Jody B. Newhouse
 Hill Noem
 Holding Nugent
 Hudson Nunes
 Huelskamp Olson
 Huizenga (MI) Palazzo
 Hultgren Palmer
 Hunter Paulsen
 Hurd (TX) Pearce
 Hurt (VA) Perry
 Issa Pittenger
 Jenkins (KS) Pitts
 Jenkins (WV) Poliquin
 Johnson (OH) Pompeo
 Johnson, Sam Posey
 Jolly Price, Tom
 Jones Ratcliffe
 Jordan Reed
 Joyce Reichert
 Katko Renacci

NAYS—181

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

Lawrence Nolan
 Lee Norcross
 Levin O'Rourke
 Lewis Pallone
 Lieu, Ted Pascarell
 Lipinski Payne
 Loeb sack Pelosi
 Lofgren Perlmutter
 Lowenthal Swallow (CA)
 Lowey Peters
 Lujan Grisham Peterson
 (NM) Pingree
 Luján, Ben Ray Pocan
 (NM) Polis
 Price (NC) Price (NC)
 Lynch Quigley
 Maloney Rangel
 Carolyn Rice (NY)
 Maloney, Sean Richmond
 Matsui Roybal-Allard
 McCollum Ruiz
 McDermott Ruppertsberger
 McGovern Ryan (OH)
 McNerney Sánchez, Linda
 Meeks T.
 Meng Sarbanes
 Moulton Schakowsky
 Murphy (FL) Schiff
 Nadler Scott (VA)
 Napolitano Scott, David
 Neal Serrano

NOT VOTING—8

Grijalva Rush Tiberi
 Moore Sanchez, Loretta Walters, Mimi
 Poe (TX) Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1426

So the previous question was ordered.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.
 The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 174, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—247

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

Walorski Wenstrup Yoder
Walz Westerman Yoho
Wasserman Westmoreland Young (AK)
Schultz Williams Young (IA)
Waters, Maxine Wilson (FL) Young (IN)
Watson Coleman Wilson (SC) Zeldin
Weber (TX) Womack Zinke
Webster (FL) Woodall
Welch Yarmuth

NAYS—20

Amash Labrador Rokita
Brat Lummis Sanford
Bridenstine McDermott Smith (WA)
Griffith Mulvaney Speier
Grothman Palmer Swalwell (CA)
Huelskamp Polis Wittman
Jones Ribble

NOT VOTING—11

Duncan (SC) Poe (TX) Tiberi
Grijalva Rush Walker
Joyce Sanchez, Loretta Walters, Mimi
Moore Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1439

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, regarding the question considered earlier today on passage of H.R. 3957, the Emergency Citrus Disease Response Act of 2016 (Rollcall No. 528), I am recorded as voting "no." I intended to vote "yes."

EXPANDING SENIORS RECEIVING DIALYSIS CHOICE ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5659) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to expanding Medicare Advantage coverage for individuals with end-stage renal disease (ESRD), as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—423

Abraham Bera Brady (TX)
Adams Beyer Brat
Aderholt Bilirakis Bridenstine
Aguilar Bishop (GA) Brooks (AL)
Allen Bishop (MI) Brooks (IN)
Amash Bishop (UT) Brown (FL)
Amodoi Black Brownley (CA)
Ashford Blackburn Buchanan
Babin Blum Buck
Barletta Blumenauer Bucshon
Barr Bonamici Burgess
Barton Bost Bustos
Bass Boustany Butterfield
Beatty Boyle, Brendan Byrne
Becerra F. Calvert
Benishek Brady (PA) Capps

Capuano Graham Luján, Ben Ray
Cárdenas Granger (NM)
Carney Graves (GA) Lummis
Carson (IN) Graves (LA) Lynch
Carter (GA) Graves (MO) MacArthur
Carter (TX) Grayson Maloney,
Cartwright Green, Al Carolyn
Castor (FL) Green, Gene Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX) Griffith Marchant
Chabot Grothman Mariner
Chaffetz Guinta Massie
Chu, Judy Guthrie Matsui
Ciilline Gutiérrez McCarthy
Clark (MA) Hahn McCaul
Clarke (NY) Hanna McClintock
Clawson (FL) Hardy McCollum
Clay Harper McDermott
Cleaver Harris McGovern
Clyburn Hartzler McHenry
Coffman Hastings McKinley
Cohen Heck (NV) McMorris
Cole Heck (WA) Rodgers
Collins (GA) Hensarling McNeerney
Collins (NY) Herrera Beutler McSally
Comstock Hice, Jody B. Meadows
Conaway Meehan Meadows
Conolly Meeks Meehan
Conyers Hill Meng
Cook Himes Messer
Cooper Hinojosa Holding
Costa Holding Miller (FL)
Costello (PA) Honda Miller (MI)
Courtney Hoyer Moolenaar
Cramer Hudson Mooney (WV)
Crawford Huelskamp Moulton
Crenshaw Huffman Mullin
Crowley Huizenga (MI) Mullin
Cuellar Hultgren Mulvaney
Culberson Hunter Murphy (FL)
Cummings Hurd (TX) Murphy (PA)
Curbelo (FL) Hurt (VA) Nadler
Davidson Israel Napolitano
Davis (CA) Issa Neal
Davis, Danny Neugebauer
Davis, Rodney Newhouse
DeFazio Noem
DeGette Nolan
Delaney Norcross
DeLauro Nugent
DelBene Nunes
Denham Johnson, E. B.
Dent Johnson, Sam O'Rourke
DeSantis Jolly Olson
DeSaulnier Jones Palazzo
DesJarlais Jordan Pallone
Deutch Joyce Palmer
Diaz-Balart Kaptur Pascrell
Dingell Katko Paulsen
Doggett Keating Payne
Dold Kelly (IL) Pearce
Donovan Kelly (MS) Pelosi
Doyle, Michael Kelly (PA) Perlmutter
F. Kennedy Peters
Duckworth Kildee Peterson
Duffy Kind Pingree
Duncan (SC) King (IA) Pittenger
Duncan (TN) King (NY) Pitts
Edwards Kinzinger (IL) Pocan
Ellison Kirkpatrick Poliquin
Ellmers (NC) Kline Polis
Emmer (MN) Knight Pompeo
Engel Kuster Posey
Eshoo Labrador Price (NC)
Esty LaHood Price, Tom
Farenthold LaMalfa Quigley
Farr Lamborn Rangel
Fincher Lance Ratcliffe
Fitzpatrick Langevin Reed
Fleischmann Larsen (WA) Reichert
Fleming Larson (CT) Renacci
Flores Latta Ribble
Forbes Lawrence Rice (NY)
Fortenberry Lee Rice (SC)
Foster Levin Richmond
Foxy Lewis Rigell
Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted Roby
Franks (AZ) Lipinski Rogers (AL)
Frelinghuysen LoBiondo Rogers (KY)
Fudge Loebach Rohrabacher
Gabbard Lofgren Rokita
Gallego Long Rooney (FL)
Garamendi Loudermilk Ros-Lehtinen
Garrett Love Roskam
Gibbs Lowenthal Ross
Gibson Lowey Rothfus
Gohmert Lucas Rouzer
Goodlatte Luetkemeyer Roybal-Allard
Gosar Lujan Grisham Royce
Gowdy (NM) Ruiz

Ruppersberger Smith (TX)
Russell Smith (WA)
Ryan (OH) Speler
Salmon Stefanik
Sánchez, Linda Stewart
T. Stivers
Sanford Stutzman
Sarbanes Swalwell (CA)
Scalise Takano
Schakowsky Thompson (CA)
Schiff Thompson (MS)
Schweikert Thompson (PA)
Scott (VA) Thornberry
Scott, Austin Tipton
Scott, David Titus
Sensenbrenner Tonko
Serrano Torres
Sessions Trott
Sewell (AL) Tsongas
Sherman Turner
Shimkus Upton
Shuster Valadao
Simpson Van Hollen
Sinema Vargas
Sires Veasey
Slaughter Vela
Smith (MO) Velázquez
Smith (NE) Visclosky
Smith (NJ) Wagner Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Grijalva Rush Tiberi
Moore Sanchez, Loretta Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX) Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1445

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSTAINING HEALTHCARE INTEGRITY AND FAIR TREATMENT ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5713) to provide for the extension of certain long-term care hospital Medicare payment rules, clarify the application of rules on the calculation of hospital length of stay to certain moratorium-excepted long-term care hospitals, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 3, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

YEAS—420

Abraham Barton Bishop (UT)
Adams Bass Black
Aderholt Beatty Blackburn
Aguilar Becerra Blum
Allen Benishek Blumenauer
Amodoi Bera Bonamici
Ashford Beyer Bost
Babin Bilirakis Boustany
Barletta Bishop (GA) Boyle, Brendan
Barr Bishop (MI) F.

Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Lewis	Roby	Shimkus	Vela	Bera	Ellison	Kline
Brady (TX)	Foster	Lieu, Ted	Roe (TN)	Shuster	Velázquez	Beyer	Ellmers (NC)	Knight
Brat	Fox	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Visclosky	Bilirakis	Emmer (MN)	Kuster
Bridenstine	Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Sinema	Wagner	Bishop (GA)	Engel	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	Loebach	Rohrabacher	Sires	Walberg	Bishop (MI)	Eshoo	LaHood
Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Loftgren	Rokita	Slaughter	Walden	Bishop (UT)	Esty	LaMalfa
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Long	Rooney (FL)	Smith (MO)	Walker	Black	Farenthold	Lamborn
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Walorski	Blackburn	Farr	Lance
Buchanan	Gallego	Love	Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Walz	Blum	Fincher	Langevin
Buck	Garamendi	Lowenthal	Ross	Smith (TX)	Wasserman	Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Bucshon	Garrett	Lowe	Rothfus	Smith (WA)	Schultz	Bonamici	Fleischmann	Larson (CT)
Burgess	Gibbs	Lucas	Rouzer	Speier	Waters, Maxine	Bost	Fleming	Latta
Bustos	Gibson	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Stefanik	Watson Coleman	Boustany	Flores	Lawrence
Butterfield	Gohmert	Lujan Grisham	Royce	Stewart	Weber (TX)	Boyle, Brendan	Forbes	Lee
Byrne	Goodlatte	(NM)	Ruiz	Stivers	Webster (FL)	F.	Fortenberry	Levin
Calvert	Gosar	Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppertsberger	Stutzman	Welch	Brady (PA)	Foster	Lewis
Capps	Gowdy	(NM)	Russell	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup	Brady (TX)	Fox	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Graham	Lummis	Ryan (OH)	Takano	Westerman	Brat	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Cardenas	Granger	Lynch	Salmon	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland	Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Carney	Graves (GA)	MacArthur	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)	Williams	Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Loebach
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	Maloney,	T.	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (FL)	Brooks (IN)	Fudge	Loftgren
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Carolyn	Sarbanes	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)	Gabbard	Brown (FL)	Long
Carter (TX)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean	Scalise	Tipton	Wittman	Brownley (CA)	Gallego	Loudermilk
Cartwright	Green, Al	Marchant	Schakowsky	Titus	Womack	Buchanan	Garamendi	Love
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	Marino	Schiff	Torres	Woodall	Buck	Garrett	Lowenthal
Castro (TX)	Griffith	Massie	Schweikert	Tonko	Yarmuth	Bucshon	Gibbs	Lowe
Chabot	Grothman	Matsui	Scott (VA)	Trott	Yoder	Burgess	Gibson	Lucas
Chaffetz	Guinta	McCarthy	Scott, Austin	Tsongas	Yoho	Bustos	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Chu, Judy	Guthrie	McCaul	Scott, David	Turner	Young (AK)	Butterfield	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham
Ciilline	Gutiérrez	McClintock	Sensenbrenner	Upton	Young (IA)	Byrne	Gosar	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Hahn	McCollum	Serrano	Valadao	Young (IN)	Calvert	Gowdy	Luján, Ben Ray
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	McDermott	Sessions	Van Hollen	Zeldin	Capps	Graham	(NM)
Clawson (FL)	Hardy	McGovern	Sewell (AL)	Vargas	Zinke	Capuano	Granger	Lummis
Clay	Harper	McHenry	Sherman	Veasey		Cardenas	Graves (GA)	Lynch
Cleaver	Harris	McKinley				Carney	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Clyburn	Hartzler	McMorris	Amash	Jones	Sanford	Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Coffman	Hastings	Rodgers				Carter (GA)	Grayson	Carolyn
Cohen	Heck (NV)	McNerney				Carter (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Cole	Heck (WA)	McSally				Cartwright	Green, Gene	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Meadows	Grijalva	Rush	Tiberi	Castor (FL)	Griffith	Marino
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi	Castro (TX)	Grothman	Massie
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Meeks	Poe (TX)	Schrader		Chabot	Guinta	Matsui
Conaway	Higgins	Meng				Chaffetz	Guthrie	McCarthy
Connolly	Hill	Messer				Chu, Judy	Gutiérrez	McCaul
Conyers	Himes	Mica				Ciilline	Hahn	McClintock
Cook	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)				Clark (MA)	Hanna	McCollum
Cooper	Holding	Miller (MI)				Clarke (NY)	Hardy	McDermott
Costa	Honda	Moolenaar				Clawson (FL)	Harper	McGovern
Costello (PA)	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)				Clay	Harris	McHenry
Courtney	Hudson	Moulton				Cleaver	Hartzler	McKinley
Cramer	Huelskamp	Mullin				Clyburn	Hastings	McMorris
Crawford	Huffman	Mulvaney				Coffman	Heck (NV)	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)				Cohen	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Crowley	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)				Cole	Hensarling	McSally
Cuellar	Hunter	Nadler				Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Culberson	Hurd (TX)	Napolitano				Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan
Cummings	Hurt (VA)	Neal				Comstock	Higgins	Meeks
Curbelo (FL)	Israel	Neugebauer				Conaway	Hill	Meng
Davidson	Issa	Newhouse				Connolly	Himes	Messer
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Noem				Conyers	Hinojosa	Mica
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Nolan				Cook	Holding	Miller (FL)
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Norcross				Cooper	Honda	Miller (MI)
DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)	Nugent				Cooper	Hoyer	Moolenaar
DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Nunes				Costa	Hudson	Mooney (WV)
Delaney	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke				Costello (PA)	Hudson	Moulton
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Olson				Courtney	Huelskamp	Mullin
DelBene	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo				Cramer	Huffman	Mulvaney
Denham	Jolly	Pallone				Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)
Dent	Jordan	Palmer				Crenshaw	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
DeSantis	Joyce	Pascarell				Crowley	Hunter	Nadler
DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Paulsen				Cuellar	Hurd (TX)	Napolitano
DesJarlais	Katko	Payne				Culberson	Hurt (VA)	Neal
Deutch	Keating	Pearce				Cummings	Israel	Neugebauer
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi				Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Newhouse
Dingell	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter				Davidson	Jackson Lee	Noem
Doggett	Kelly (PA)	Perry				Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Nolan
Dold	Kennedy	Peters				Davis, Danny	Jenkins (KS)	Norcross
Donovan	Kildee	Peterson				Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (WV)	Nugent
Doyle, Michael	Kilmer	Pingree				DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
F.	Kind	Pittenger				DeGette	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke
Duckworth	King (IA)	Pitts				Delaney	Johnson, E. B.	Olson
Duffy	King (NY)	Pocan				DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Olson
Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin				DelBene	Jolly	Palazzo
Duncan (TN)	Kirkpatrick	Polis				Denham	Jones	Pallone
Edwards	Kline	Pompeo				Dent	Jordan	Palmer
Ellison	Knight	Posey				DeSantis	Joyce	Pascarell
Ellmers (NC)	Kuster	Price (NC)				DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Paulsen
Emmer (MN)	Labrador	Price, Tom				DesJarlais	Katko	Payne
Engel	LaHood	Quigley				Deutch	Keating	Pearce
Eshoo	LaMalfa	Rangel				Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
Esty	Lamborn	Ratcliffe				Dingell	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter
Farenthold	Lance	Reed				Doggett	Kelly (PA)	Perry
Farr	Langevin	Reichert				Dold	Kennedy	Peters
Fincher	Larsen (WA)	Renacci				Donovan	Kildee	Peterson
Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Ribble				Doyle, Michael	Kilmer	Pingree
Fleischmann	Latta	Rice (NY)				F.	Kind	Pittenger
Fleming	Lawrence	Rice (SC)				Duckworth	King (IA)	Pitts
Flores	Lee	Richmond				Duffy	King (NY)	Pocan
Forbes	Levin	Rigell				Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin
						Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Polis

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1452

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING ACCESS TO HOSPITALS ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5613) to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—420

Abraham	Amash	Barr
Adams	Amodei	Bass
Aderholt	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Babin	Becerra
Allen	Barletta	Benishke

Pompeo	Schakowsky	Turner
Posey	Schiff	Upton
Price (NC)	Schweikert	Valadao
Price, Tom	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Quigley	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Rangel	Scott, David	Veasey
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Velázquez
Reed	Serrano	Visclosky
Reichert	Sessions	Wagner
Renacci	Sewell (AL)	Walberg
Ribble	Sherman	Walden
Rice (NY)	Shimkus	Walker
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Walorski
Richmond	Simpson	Walz
Rigell	Sinema	Wasserman
Roby	Sires	Schultz
Roe (TN)	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Watson Coleman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Welch
Rooney (FL)	Smith (WA)	Wenstrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Speier	Westerman
Roskam	Stefanik	Westmoreland
Ross	Stewart	Williams
Rothfus	Stivers	Wilson (FL)
Rouzer	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Wittman
Royce	Takano	Womack
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Woodall
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Ryan (OH)	Thornberry	Yoho
Salmon	Titus	Young (AK)
Sánchez, Linda	Tonko	Young (IA)
T.	Torres	Young (IN)
Sanford	Trott	Zeldin
Sarbanes	Tsongas	Zinke
Scalise		

NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Rush	Vela
Grijalva	Sánchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi
Moore	Schradler	

□ 1458

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 528 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 3957), 529 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5659), 530 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5713) and 531 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5613), I did not cast my votes due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on all of the votes.

KOREAN WAR VETERANS MEMORIAL WALL OF REMEMBRANCE ACT OF 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1475) to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Korean War Veterans Memorial Wall of Remembrance Act”.

SEC. 2. WALL OF REMEMBRANCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 8908(c) of title 40, United States Code, the Korean War Veterans Memorial Foundation, Inc., may construct a Wall of Remembrance at the site of the Korean War Veterans Memorial.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Wall of Remembrance shall include a list of names of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in the Korean War, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) CRITERIA; SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(i) establish eligibility criteria for the inclusion of names on the Wall of Remembrance under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) provide to the Secretary of the Interior a final list of names for inclusion on the Wall of Remembrance under subparagraph (A) that meet the criteria established under clause (i).

(3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The Wall of Remembrance may include other information about the Korean War, including the number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the Korean Augmentation to the United States Army, the Republic of Korea Armed Forces, and the other nations of the United Nations Command who, in regards to the Korean War—

(A) were killed in action;

(B) were wounded in action;

(C) are listed as missing in action; or

(D) were prisoners of war.

(b) COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—Except as provided in subsection (a)(1), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”), shall apply.

(c) NO FEDERAL FUNDS.—No Federal funds may be used to construct the Wall of Remembrance.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL ANTI-POACHING ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 2494) to support global anti-poaching efforts, strengthen the capacity of partner countries to counter wildlife trafficking, designate major wildlife trafficking countries, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—PURPOSES AND POLICY

Sec. 101. Purposes.

Sec. 102. Statement of United States policy.

TITLE II—REPORT ON MAJOR WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING COUNTRIES

Sec. 201. Report.

TITLE III—FRAMEWORK FOR INTERAGENCY RESPONSE

Sec. 301. Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking.

TITLE IV—PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS THE ESCALATING WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING CRISIS

Sec. 401. Anti-poaching programs.

Sec. 402. Anti-trafficking programs.

Sec. 403. Engagement of United States diplomatic missions.

Sec. 404. Community conservation.

TITLE V—OTHER ACTIONS RELATING TO WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS

Sec. 501. Amendments to Fisherman’s Protective Act of 1967.

Sec. 502. Wildlife trafficking violations as predicate offenses under money laundering statute.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CO-CHAIRS OF THE TASK FORCE.—The term “Co-Chairs of the Task Force” means the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney General, as established pursuant to Executive Order 13648.

(3) COMMUNITY CONSERVATION.—The term “community conservation” means an approach to conservation that recognizes the rights of local people to manage, or benefit directly and indirectly from wildlife and other natural resources in a long-term biologically viable manner and includes—

(A) devolving management and governance to local communities to create positive conditions for resource use that takes into account current and future ecological requirements; and

(B) building the capacity of communities for conservation and natural resource management.

(4) COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term “country of concern” refers to a foreign country specially designated by the Secretary of State pursuant to subsection (b) of section 201 as a major source of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, a major transit point of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, or a major consumer of wildlife trafficking products, in which the government has actively engaged in or knowingly profited from the trafficking of endangered or threatened species.

(5) FOCUS COUNTRY.—The term “focus country” refers to a foreign country determined by the Secretary of State to be a major source of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, a major transit point of wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives, or a major consumer of wildlife trafficking products.

(6) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE; SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT; TRAINING.—The terms “defense article”, “defense service”, “significant military equipment”, and “training” have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(7) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—The term “Implementation Plan” means the Implementation

Plan for the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking released on February 11, 2015, a modification of that plan, or a successor plan.

(8) NATIONAL STRATEGY.—The term “National Strategy” means the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking published on February 11, 2014, a modification of that strategy, or a successor strategy.

(9) NATIONAL WILDLIFE SERVICES.—The term “national wildlife services” refers to the ministries and government bodies designated to manage matters pertaining to wildlife management, including poaching or trafficking, in a focus country.

(10) SECURITY FORCE.—The term “security force” means a military, law enforcement, gendarmerie, park ranger, or any other security force with a responsibility for protecting wildlife and natural habitats.

(11) TASK FORCE.—The term “Task Force” means the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking, as established by Executive Order 13648 (78 Fed. Reg. 40621) and modified by section 201.

(12) WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING.—The term “wildlife trafficking” refers to the poaching or other illegal taking of protected or managed species and the illegal trade in wildlife and their related parts and products.

TITLE I—PURPOSES AND POLICY

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to support a collaborative, interagency approach to address wildlife trafficking;

(2) to protect and conserve the remaining populations of wild elephants, rhinoceroses, and other species threatened by poaching and the illegal wildlife trade;

(3) to disrupt regional and global transnational organized criminal networks and to prevent the illegal wildlife trade from being used as a source of financing for criminal groups that undermine United States and global security interests;

(4) to prevent wildlife poaching and trafficking from being a means to make a living in focus countries;

(5) to support the efforts of, and collaborate with, individuals, communities, local organizations, and foreign governments to combat poaching and wildlife trafficking;

(6) to assist focus countries in implementation of national wildlife anti-trafficking and poaching laws; and

(7) to ensure that United States assistance to prevent and suppress illicit wildlife trafficking is carefully planned and coordinated, and that it is systematically and rationally prioritized on the basis of detailed analysis of the nature and severity of threats to wildlife and the willingness and ability of foreign partners to cooperate effectively toward these ends.

SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to take immediate actions to stop the illegal global trade in wildlife and wildlife products and associated transnational organized crime;

(2) to provide technical and other forms of assistance to help focus countries halt the poaching of elephants, rhinoceroses, and other imperiled species and end the illegal trade in wildlife and wildlife products, including by providing training and assistance in—

(A) wildlife protection and management of wildlife populations;

(B) anti-poaching and effective management of protected areas including community managed and privately-owned lands;

(C) local engagement of security forces in anti-poaching responsibilities, where appropriate;

(D) wildlife trafficking investigative techniques, including forensic tools;

(E) transparency and corruption issues;

(F) management, tracking, and inventory of confiscated wildlife contraband;

(G) demand reduction strategies in countries that lack the means and resources to conduct them; and

(H) bilateral and multilateral agreements and cooperation;

(3) to employ appropriate assets and resources of the United States Government in a coordinated manner to curtail poaching and disrupt and dismantle illegal wildlife trade networks and the financing of those networks in a manner appropriate for each focus country;

(4) to build upon the National Strategy and Implementation Plan to further combat wildlife trafficking in a holistic manner and guide the response of the United States Government to ensure progress in the fight against wildlife trafficking; and

(5) to recognize the ties of wildlife trafficking to broader forms of transnational organized criminal activities, including trafficking, and where applicable, to focus on those crimes in a coordinated, cross-cutting manner.

TITLE II—REPORT ON MAJOR WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING COUNTRIES

SEC. 201. REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, shall submit to Congress a report that lists each country determined by the Secretary of State to be a focus country within the meaning of this Act.

(b) SPECIAL DESIGNATION.—In each report required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, shall identify each country of concern listed in the report the government of which has actively engaged in or knowingly profited from the trafficking of endangered or threatened species.

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—FRAMEWORK FOR INTERAGENCY RESPONSE

SEC. 301. PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE ON WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES.—In addition to the functions required by Executive Order 13648 (78 Fed. Reg. 40621), the Task Force shall be informed by the Secretary of State’s annual report required under section 201 and considering all available information, ensure that relevant United States Government agencies—

(1) collaborate, to the greatest extent practicable, with the national wildlife services, or other relevant bodies of each focus country to prepare, not later than 90 days after the date of submission of the report required under section 201(a), a United States mission assessment of the threats to wildlife in that focus country and an assessment of the capacity of that country to address wildlife trafficking;

(2) collaborate, to the greatest extent practicable, with relevant ministries, national wildlife services, or other relevant bodies of each focus country to prepare, not later than 180 days after preparation of the assessment referred to in paragraph (1), a United States mission strategic plan that includes recommendations for addressing wildlife trafficking, taking into account any regional or national strategies for addressing wildlife trafficking in a focus country developed before the preparation of such assessment;

(3) coordinate efforts among United States Federal agencies and non-Federal partners, including missions, domestic and international organizations, the private sector, and other global partners, to implement the strategic plans required by paragraph (2) in each focus country;

(4) not less frequently than annually, consult and coordinate with stakeholders qualified to provide advice, assistance, and information regarding effective support for anti-poaching activities, coordination of regional law enforce-

ment efforts, development of and support for effective legal enforcement mechanisms, and development of strategies to reduce illicit trade and reduce consumer demand for illegally traded wildlife and wildlife products, and other relevant topics under this Act; and

(5) coordinate or carry out other functions as are necessary to implement this Act.

(b) DUPLICATION AND EFFICIENCY.—The Task Force shall—

(1) ensure that the activities of the Federal agencies involved in carrying out efforts under this Act are coordinated and not duplicated; and

(2) encourage efficiencies and coordination among the efforts of Federal agencies and interagency initiatives ongoing as of the date of the enactment of this Act to address trafficking activities, including trafficking of wildlife, humans, weapons, and narcotics, illegal trade, transnational organized crime, or other illegal activities.

(c) CONSISTENCY WITH AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Task Force shall carry out its responsibilities under this Act in a manner consistent with the authorities and responsibilities of agencies represented on the Task Force.

(d) TASK FORCE STRATEGIC REVIEW.—One year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Task Force shall submit a strategic assessment of its work and provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that shall include—

(1) a review and assessment of the Task Force’s implementation of this Act, identifying successes, failures, and gaps in its work, or that of agencies represented on the Task Force, including detailed descriptions of—

(A) what approaches, initiatives, or programs have succeeded best in increasing the willingness and capacity of focus countries to suppress and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking, and what approaches, initiatives, or programs have not succeeded as well as hoped; and

(B) which foreign governments subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 have proven to be the most successful partners in suppressing and preventing illegal wildlife trafficking, which focus countries have not proven to be so, and what factors contributed to these results in each country discussed;

(2) a description of each Task Force member agency’s priorities and objectives for combating wildlife trafficking;

(3) an account of total United States funding each year since fiscal year 2014 for all government agencies and programs involved in countering poaching and wildlife trafficking;

(4) an account of total United States funding since fiscal year 2014 to support the activities of the Task Force, including administrative overhead costs and congressional reporting; and

(5) recommendations for how to improve United States and international efforts to suppress and prevent illegal wildlife trafficking in the future, based upon the Task Force’s experience as of the time of the review.

(e) TERMINATION OF TASK FORCE.—The statutory authorization for the Task Force provided by this Act shall terminate 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act or such earlier date that the President terminates the Task Force by rescinding, superseding, or otherwise modifying relevant portions of Executive Order 13648.

TITLE IV—PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS THE ESCALATING WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING CRISIS

SEC. 401. ANTI-POACHING PROGRAMS.

(a) WILDLIFE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND COORDINATION ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in collaboration with the heads of other relevant United States agencies and nongovernmental partners where appropriate, may provide assistance to focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the

strategic plan required by section 301(a)(2), among other goals, to improve the effectiveness of wildlife law enforcement in regions and countries that have demonstrated capacity, willingness, and need for assistance.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING AND POACHING IN AFRICA.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to provide defense articles (not including significant military equipment), defense services, and related training to appropriate security forces of countries of Africa for the purposes of countering wildlife trafficking and poaching.

SEC. 402. ANTI-TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS.

(a) **INVESTIGATIVE CAPACITY BUILDING.**—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in collaboration with the heads of other relevant United States agencies and communities, regions, and governments in focus countries, may design and implement programs in focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2) among other goals, with clear and measurable targets and indicators of success, to increase the capacity of wildlife law enforcement and customs and border security officers in focus countries.

(b) **TRANSNATIONAL PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in collaboration with other relevant United States agencies, nongovernmental partners, and international bodies, and in collaboration with communities, regions, and governments in focus countries, may design and implement programs, including support for Wildlife Enforcement Networks, in focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2), among other goals, to better understand and combat the transnational trade in illegal wildlife.

SEC. 403. ENGAGEMENT OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS.

As soon as practicable but not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each chief of mission to a focus country should begin to implement the recommendations contained in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2), among other goals, for the country.

SEC. 404. COMMUNITY CONSERVATION.

The Secretary of State, in collaboration with the United States Agency for International Development, heads of other relevant United States agencies, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and other development partners, may provide support in focus countries to carry out the recommendations made in the strategic plan required under section 301(a)(2) as such recommendations relate to the development, scaling, and replication of community wildlife conservancies and community conservation programs in focus countries to assist with rural stability and greater security for people and wildlife, empower and support communities to manage or benefit from their wildlife resources in a long-term biologically viable manner, and reduce the threat of poaching and trafficking, including through—

(1) promoting conservation-based enterprises and incentives, such as eco-tourism and stewardship-oriented agricultural production, that empower communities to manage wildlife, natural resources, and community ventures where appropriate, by ensuring they benefit from well-managed wildlife populations;

(2) helping create alternative livelihoods to poaching by mitigating wildlife trafficking, helping support rural stability, greater security for people and wildlife, responsible economic development, and economic incentives to conserve wildlife populations;

(3) engaging regional businesses and the private sector to develop goods and services to aid in anti-poaching and anti-trafficking measures;

(4) working with communities to develop secure and safe methods of sharing information with enforcement officials;

(5) providing technical assistance to support land use stewardship plans to improve the economic, environmental, and social outcomes in community-owned or -managed lands;

(6) supporting community anti-poaching efforts, including policing and informant networks;

(7) working with community and national governments to develop relevant policy and regulatory frameworks to enable and promote community conservation programs, including supporting law enforcement engagement with wildlife protection authorities to promote information-sharing; and

(8) working with national governments to ensure that communities have timely and effective support from national authorities to mitigate risks that communities may face when engaging in anti-poaching and anti-trafficking activities.

TITLE V—OTHER ACTIONS RELATING TO WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS

SEC. 501. AMENDMENTS TO FISHERMAN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.

Section 8 of the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “Secretary of Commerce”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “Secretary of the Interior”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting “in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “, as appropriate,”;

(D) by redesigning paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior shall each report to Congress each certification to the President made by such Secretary under this subsection, within 15 days after making such certification.”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting “in consultation with the Secretary of State,” after “as the case may be.”.

SEC. 502. WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING VIOLATIONS AS PREDICATE OFFENSES UNDER MONEY LAUNDERING STATUTE.

Section 1956(c)(7) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) any act that is a criminal violation of subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (1) of section 9(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(a)(1)), section 2203 of the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4223), or section 7(a) of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5305a(a)), if the endangered or threatened species of fish or wildlife, products, items, or substances involved in the violation and relevant conduct, as applicable, have a total value of more than \$10,000.”.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING IRAN'S PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHAI MINORITY AND CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 220) condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, 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?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 220

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2013, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated, “The Baha'i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha'is, who number at least 300,000, as ‘heretics’ and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated that “[s]ince 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs” and “[m]ore than 700 Baha'is have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated that the Government of Iran “prohibits Baha'is from teaching and practicing their faith and subjects them to many forms of discrimination not faced by members of other religious groups” and “since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, formally denies Baha'i students access to higher education”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “The government requires Baha'is to register with the police,” and “The government raided Baha'i homes and businesses and confiscated large amounts of private and commercial property, as well as religious materials.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha'is are regularly denied compensation for injury or criminal victimization and the right to inherit property.”;

Whereas, on August 27, 2014, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/69/356), which stated, “The human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran remains of concern. Numerous issues flagged by the General Assembly, the

United Nations human rights mechanisms and the Secretary-General persist, and in some cases appear to have worsened, some recent overtures made by the Administration and the parliament notwithstanding.”;

Whereas, on December 18, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/69/190), which “[e]xpress[ed] deep concern” over “[c]ontinued discrimination, persecution and human rights violations against persons belonging to unrecognized religious minorities, particularly members of the Baha’i [F]aith . . . and the effective criminalization of membership in the Baha’i [F]aith,” and called upon the Government of Iran to “emancipate the Baha’i community . . . and to accord all Baha’is, including those imprisoned because of their beliefs, the due process of law and the rights that they are constitutionally guaranteed”;

Whereas, since May of 2008, the Government of Iran has imprisoned the seven members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha’i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or “friends of Iran”—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals are serving 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any current prisoner of conscience in Iran, on charges including “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth”;

Whereas, beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha’i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, and 12 BIHE educators are now serving 4- or 5-year prison terms;

Whereas scores of Baha’i cemeteries have been attacked, and, in April 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha’i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves;

Whereas the Baha’i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha’i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that, in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha’i articles were appearing every month, and, in 2014, the number of anti-Baha’i articles rose to approximately 401 per month—18 times the previous level;

Whereas there are currently 100 Baha’is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under the Covenants; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on individuals “responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the 7 imprisoned Baha’i leaders, the 12 imprisoned Baha’i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Govern-

ment of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. I have an amendment to the text of the resolution at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the 7 imprisoned Baha’i leaders, the 8 imprisoned Baha’i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to utilize available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas, in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2013, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha’i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha’i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated, “The Baha’i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha’is, who number at least 300,000,

as ‘heretics’ and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2014 Report stated that “[s]ince 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha’i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs” and “[m]ore than 700 Baha’is have been arbitrarily arrested since 2005”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated that the Government of Iran “prohibits Baha’is from teaching and practicing their faith and subjects them to many forms of discrimination not faced by members of other religious groups” and “since the 1979 Islamic Revolution, formally denies Baha’i students access to higher education”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “The government requires Baha’is to register with the police,” and “The government raided Baha’i homes and businesses and confiscated large amounts of private and commercial property, as well as religious materials.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2013 International Religious Freedom Report stated, “Baha’is are regularly denied compensation for injury or criminal victimization and the right to inherit property.”;

Whereas, on August 27, 2014, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran issued a report (A/69/356), which stated, “The human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran remains of concern. Numerous issues flagged by the General Assembly, the United Nations human rights mechanisms and the Secretary-General persist, and in some cases appear to have worsened, some recent overtures made by the Administration and the parliament notwithstanding.”;

Whereas, on December 18, 2014, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/69/190), which “[e]xpress[ed] deep concern” over “[c]ontinued discrimination, persecution and human rights violations against persons belonging to unrecognized religious minorities, particularly members of the Baha’i [F]aith . . . and the effective criminalization of membership in the Baha’i [F]aith,” and called upon the Government of Iran to “emancipate the Baha’i community . . . and to accord all Baha’is, including those imprisoned because of their beliefs, the due process of law and the rights that they are constitutionally guaranteed”;

Whereas, since May of 2008, the Government of Iran has imprisoned the seven members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha’i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or “friends of Iran”—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals are serving 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any current prisoner of conscience in Iran, on charges including “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth”;

Whereas, beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha’i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, and 8 BIHE educators are now serving 4- or 5-year prison terms;

Whereas scores of Baha’i cemeteries have been attacked, and, in April 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha’i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves;

Whereas the Baha'i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha'i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that, in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha'i articles were appearing every month, and, in 2014, the number of anti-Baha'i articles rose to approximately 401 per month—18 times the previous level;

Whereas there are currently 60 Baha'is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under the Covenants; and

Whereas the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) authorizes the President and the Secretary of State to impose sanctions on individuals "responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009": Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GAO CIVILIAN TASK AND DELIVERY ORDER PROTEST AUTHORITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5995) to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code, 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5995

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 "GAO Civilian Task and Delivery Order Protest Authority Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. ORDERS.

Section 4106(f) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

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.

IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 876 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5461.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1505

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, with Mr. MCCLINTOCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Islamic Republic of Iran is identified as both the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism and a country of primary money laundering concern by the United States. So the American people rightfully question the wisdom behind the Obama administration's decision to hand Iran \$1.7 billion in cash as ransom for the release of several hostages earlier this year.

There are a lot of questions the American people still have about this cash payment and a lot of questions the Obama administration has not answered, but there are at least three things that we do already know:

Number one, we know that cash is the preferred currency of terrorists;

Number two, we know the Obama administration's payment to Iran was structured in such a way that it makes it easy for Iran to move that money anywhere it wants for any purpose it wants; and

Three, we know that much of Iran's terror activity is fueled by the vast sums of personal wealth acquired by its senior political and military leaders.

Mr. Chairman, Iran's economy is characterized by high levels of official corruption and substantial involvement of its security forces, particularly the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and that nation's business sector. Many members of Iran's senior political and military leadership have acquired significant personal and institutional wealth by using their positions to secure control over major portions of the Iranian national economy. In fact, it is estimated that Iran's top political and military leaders control one-third—one-third—of Iran's economy through personal foundations in which money from corruption is funneled.

Because of this volatile mix of terrorist financing, corruption, and wealth, it is vitally important for the United States to clearly understand the assets held by Iran's powerful military and political elite. That is the goal of this bipartisan bill that we are discussing today offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

This bill, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act, would require the Treasury Secretary to develop and post online a list estimating the funds and assets held by senior Iranian political and military leaders. Along with this estimate would be a description of how these officials acquired these assets and how these assets are being deployed. The report would be posted on the Treasury Department's Web site in English, but also translated into the three main languages used by the Iranian people so that the people of Iran may better understand the nature of their economy and how corruption is harming their fellow citizens.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill, the report would also be in a form that is easily understandable and accessible to those in the financial or business sector who might be concerned about inadvertently doing business with an Iranian entity still covered by remaining sanctions. The Iranian Government's tolerance of corruption limits realistic opportunities for foreign and domestic investment, particularly given the significant involvement of its Revolutionary Guard in many sectors of the economy. This gives the Revolutionary Guard and its leaders vast amounts of funding to support terrorism at a time when the average Iranian citizen earns about \$15,000 a year.

The report required under the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act would cover about 80 individuals, including Iran's Supreme Leader, President, the 12 members of Iran's Council of Guardians, the 42 members of its Expediency Council, and roughly two dozen senior military leaders. As I mentioned, the bill requires an estimate of the funds and assets held by those individuals, not a precise amount.

Further, the proposal allows Treasury to separately furnish any sensitive information to Congress in a classified

form. Finally, the bill permits the administration to prepare the reports using a wide variety of publicly available and credible information, including commercial databases.

Developing and keeping a current estimate of the funds and assets held by top political and military leaders in Iran will also help financial institutions and private businesses comply with money laundering laws and also help them more carefully choose with whom they do business.

Just last week, the U.S. State Department said it couldn't rule out the possibility that President Obama's nuclear deal has emboldened Iran into becoming more confrontational with the United States. Indeed, as the State Department spokesman admitted last week, there are "disturbing trends" when it comes to Iran.

Since the President's cash ransom was delivered to the ayatollahs, Iran has taken more hostages, Mr. Chairman. It has stepped up its harassment of the U.S. military in the region and has started building a \$10 billion nuclear plant with the help of Russia.

Clearly, we need to know as much as we possibly can about how Iran is financing terrorism. We need to make sure financial institutions and private businesses do not inadvertently become involved in money laundering and sponsorship of terrorism.

Mr. POLIQUIN's bill has attracted bipartisan support in the Committee on Financial Services. It is common sense. Frankly, it should be on the suspension calendar. I am sorry we are having to take up time for it today. This should be common sense for all Members. It is a bill that will, again, help achieve commonsense goals as we fight financing of terrorism. I urge all Members to support the bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5461, the so-called Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

The administration has stated this bill would endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful. Indeed, this harmful bill is the latest in a series of Republican efforts aimed at undermining the landmark nuclear agreement reached last year by Iran and the world's six major powers.

The comprehensive nuclear deal with Iran was intended to address one specific problem, and it has so far been a success. This success should not be underestimated, given how much a nuclear-armed Iran would magnify risk in a turbulent region in a terrible way.

Despite the fact that the nuclear deal so far has delivered on its principal goal of blocking Iran's path to nuclear weapons for an extended period of time, opponents remain committed to undermining the ongoing viability of the deal, chipping away at it piece by

piece, whether by passing legislation to block the sale of aircraft to Iran that was a central component of the agreement or accusing the administration of making extreme concessions to Iran by insisting, for example, that a legitimate legal settlement was an illegal ransom payment of some kind or by spreading rumors of suspected cheating by Iran. Republicans are intent on spreading this false narrative and dismantling the agreement.

So here we are, considering this bill, which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the total estimated funds or assets under direct or indirect control of as many as 80 senior Iranian leaders, along with a description of how the funds were acquired and employed. The report would not be tied to any specific prohibition or legal action against Iran and clearly plays into the hands of critics who are seeking to gin up prospects of reputational risks for companies that might seek to do business with Iran.

Moreover, the lack of a tie to any specific prohibition or legal action against the listed individuals will likely increase confusion regarding compliance obligations rather than make remaining sanctions more easily understood.

□ 1515

Undoubtedly, the report would be seized upon by Iran as an intentional effort to discourage international investment, which Iran would view as a violation of the express U.S. commitment under the nuclear deal not to interfere with the full realization of the relief provided under the accord. The major world powers that joined us in this agreement would also likely view the legislation as bad faith.

By denying Iran the economic benefits it was promised in exchange for dismantling critical elements of this nuclear program, this bill would remove the critical incentive for Iran to hold up its end of the bargain.

As the Statement of Administration Policy notes: "If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitment to our closest allies."

In addition to my central concern that this bill destabilizes the Iran nuclear deal, I also share the administration's concerns that producing the report that is required under this bill would divert massive resources away from investigations and the targeting of sanctions on Iran related to terrorism, human rights violations, and ballistic missiles.

Meeting the requirements of this bill would place a very real strain on the Treasury Department and intelligence community. We need to think carefully about the national security implications of diverting resources away from

the Treasury investigators who are tasked with implementing current sanctions on Iran and uncovering illicit conduct across the globe.

Proponents of this legislation have also underscored the importance of the need to show the people of Iran the corrupt practices in which their leaders are engaged. However, this bill would not accomplish that goal.

There is a profound trust gap between the United States and Iran, and any findings in this report would be met with a high degree of skepticism among the Iranian people and their leaders. Therefore, to the extent any portion of this report could actually be made public, since much of the most important facts would likely be classified anyway, it would do little to enlighten the people of Iran about their leaders. In fact, it would inevitably be rejected as United States propaganda by both the regime and by its people as a predictable attack on the country's government by the United States.

In light of the bill's limited practical utility, its failure to meet its own stated objectives, its diversion of resources away from investigations related to sanctions, and the destabilizing effects it would have on the Iran nuclear deal, I urge its opposition. Moreover, the President has announced that he would veto this bill if it came across his desk.

I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5461—IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET
TRANSPARENCY ACT—SEPTEMBER 21, 2016

The Administration shares the Congress' goals of increasing transparency and bringing Iran into compliance with international standards in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering. However, this bill would be counterproductive toward those shared goals.

The bill requires the U.S. Government to publicly report all assets held by some of Iran's highest leaders and to describe how these assets are acquired and used. Rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would incentivize those involved to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran's banking sector to demonstrate transparency. These onerous reporting requirements also would take critical resources away from the U.S. Department of the Treasury's important work to identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct. Producing this information could also compromise intelligence sources and methods.

One of our best tools for impeding destabilizing Iranian activities has been to identify Iranian companies that are controlled by the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) or other Iranians on the list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List) to non-U.S. businesses, so that they can block assets or stop material transfers. This process is labor-intensive and requires the judicious use of our national intelligence assets. Redirecting these assets to preparing this onerous public report would be counterproductive and will not reduce institutional corruption or promote transparency within Iran's system.

In addition, this bill's required public postings also may be perceived by Iran and likely

our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitments to our closest allies.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region. The United States should retain all of the tools needed to counter this activity, ranging from powerful sanctions to our efforts to disrupt and interdict illicit shipments of weapons and proliferation-sensitive technologies. This bill would adversely affect the U.S. Government's ability to wield these tools, would undermine the very goals it purports to achieve, and could even endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, let me end this part of my presentation by saying that the world is watching us. And for us to do anything to undermine an agreement that the President has entered into along with other major allies in the world would be devastating. And for us to do that and not understand the implications of that is beyond my ability to understand.

With the combination of Donald Trump, who they think is way out of line and crazy and does not know or understand what is going on, and these kind of actions in the Congress of the United States, who is standing up for this country? Who is supporting the President? Who is making sure that we are safe? I raise that question.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who is the chairman of the Terrorism Financing Task Force in our Financial Services Committee and a real leader in this area.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership and impaneling a bipartisan task force to investigate terrorism finance, which I have chaired for the past 2 years, as we have looked into the increasing ability of terror groups to fund and to finance their actions and to evaluate the United States' response to these challenges.

Throughout the duration of this task force, several policy experts provided testimony to the Iranian regime's direct supportive groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Iraqi Shiite militias, the Houthis in Yemen, and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in Damascus.

Prior to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the United States-led

sanctions regime decimated the Iranian economy, suffocating domestic industry and causing the Iranian rial to free fall. However, even during this economic duress, the regime continued to provide billions to these destabilizing groups instead of providing for its citizens.

This bill, offered by Mr. POLIQUIN of Maine, H.R. 5461, will provide the citizens of the Islamic Republic of Iran—who have suffered great economic hardship as a result of their rogue government's nefarious policies—with the transparency necessary to see how the other half lives.

This bill will make a positive advancement and change in their lives and provide the ability for them to see corruption in their economy and corruption in their government, and it will be for our security as well.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill, with all due respect to my friends, Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. HILL.

The Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act is one of those bills that sounds like a good idea. And I am sure many of my colleagues are thinking, Why not? Transparency is a good thing. The Iranian regime is a bad thing. Let's support this thing. What could possibly go wrong?

I have a couple of points to make in that respect. The first one is that—again, with all due respect to my friends on the other side—this bill, if it is intended to get at the wealth of the Iranian leadership, will fail, and it will fail in an embarrassing and spectacular and almost laughable fashion.

The reason I say that, of course, is that the bill specifies that the estimated total funds or assets held in accounts at U.S. and foreign financial institutions shall be enumerated. Funds are defined as cash, equity, and bonds.

So if we pass this bill, we are going to know that the Supreme Leader has a thousand shares of IBM down at the local Merrill Lynch office. But European real estate, private jets, boats, piles of gold bars, stacks of unrefined heroin, Swiss watches, shell businesses in South America, we won't know about any of them.

I ask my colleagues: How many shares of IBM do you think the Iranian regime has down at the local Merrill Lynch office?

Probably not a lot. We froze their assets for a very, very long time.

This bill, if it passes, will get at some tiny fraction of the wealth of the Iranian regime in a way that will, frankly, embarrass our country because we will show how little we know, which brings me to the second problem I have with this bill.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I am very concerned about

what this bill would do with respect to disclosing or at least pointing at our sources and methods for intelligence gathering.

I think there are probably very few assets of the kinds captured by this bill in U.S. banks or banks that we would have ready access to in Europe, but I am not so sure there aren't perhaps cash or securities in Albanian, Pakistani, or Russian banks. If we enumerate those assets, we will be inevitably pointing at a capacity we may or may not have to determine what is going on inside those banks. I would suggest that this bill does not provide nearly enough good to put at risk the sources and methods of our intelligence gathering.

We know what is happening here. This bill is an installment in the relentless attempt by the majority to tank the Iranian nuclear bill. Look, we can disagree over whether that bill was a good idea. Certainly, we did. But the fact is—and I say this as a member of the Intelligence Committee—it is working. Iran is in compliance with their nuclear obligations.

The Prime Minister of Israel stood in the General Assembly a couple of years ago and had a little drawing of a bomb and said: We are 2 to 3 months away from breakout.

Today we are probably 12 to 15 months away from an Iranian nuclear breakout, in the worst case scenario. Yet the Republican majority, in this latest installment, wants to make that go away. Moreover, they do that without a backup plan.

If they succeed in tanking this bill and we are right back where we were a year ago, 2 to 3 months away from breakout, what then?

We are isolated. We have lost the moral high ground and we are probably a lot closer to another war in the Middle East. I don't understand that.

So think about where we wind up if the majority succeeds. We would be isolated, we would be closer to war, and we would be standing alone, clutching the moral low ground.

I ask my colleagues to think about these points, as well as the good points made by the ranking member, and to oppose this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), the author of the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act and a real leader in our committee and in this Congress in the fight against terrorist financing.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman very much for moving this very important bill through our Financial Services Committee onto the House floor. I also want to applaud my colleagues who have done so much work on this in our Terrorism Financing Task Force—of which I am a member—Democrat STEVE LYNCH from Massachusetts and Republican MIKE FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, the Iranian Government is a chief state sponsor of terrorism and instability throughout the

world. For many years, the senior political leaders and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard have trained, armed, and funded terrorist organizations. More recently, they have become experts at using the Internet and social media to recruit and teach other radical Islamic terrorists around the globe. The Iranian Government, Mr. Chair, has American blood on its hands.

The primary responsibility for every Member of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, is to support and defend our Constitution. That means keeping our families safe and keeping them free. National security, Mr. Chair, is not and should never be a political issue.

Today, about 70 to 80 top political and military leaders in Iran control approximately one-third of their economy. They use their power and their influence to corrupt the telecommunications, construction, and other important industries in that economy.

An investigation by Reuters found that the Supreme Leader alone has accumulated a tremendous amount of personal wealth through a foundation claiming to help the poor. While this corruption has grown, the average Iranian citizen earns the equivalent of about \$15,000 per year.

Mr. Chair, the people of Iran and the citizens of this world deserve to know how much the chief sponsors of terrorism in Iran have accumulated and what the money is being used for. Businesses around the world that are looking to possibly invest in Iran should know before their investment who and what they are dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, my bill, H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act, is a straightforward Maine commonsense bill. It simply requires the United States Treasury Department to collect, maintain, and post online the list of 70 to 80 senior political and military leaders in Iran, their personal assets, how that money was acquired, and what it is being used for.

My bill further requires the Treasury Department to post on its Web site this information in English as well as the three main languages spoken in Iran: Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri. The information must be able to be downloaded and shared easily by everyone.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, sunshine is the best disinfectant. Let's use the transparency of one click of a computer from any corner of this globe to expose what the chief sponsor of terrorism in this world is doing with its money.

Americans are alarmed and frightened about the increased terror attacks here at home and in peace-loving nations around the world. Secrecy and corruption in Iran breed more terrorism, so let's shed light on this destructive behavior and put pressure on the Iranian leader to change their ways.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask all of my colleagues here in the House, Republicans and Democrats, to stand with me, and to stand with our fellow Americans, and to stand with freedom-loving people throughout the world against terrorism. I ask, please, that everyone vote "yes" for H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a leading member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the latest Republican effort to undermine the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, a historic nuclear agreement negotiated by the world's major powers to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Since the deal was finalized, Republicans have tried time and time again to undermine not just the JCPOA but also the credibility of the President of our country, both here at home and on the international stage.

We had this very same debate right before leaving in July, when the majority refused to act on such urgent matters as Zika funding or countering gun violence. Instead, they trotted out three bills that would scuttle the Iran agreement.

Now, here we are again with two bills, one that would hinder the U.S.' ability to abide by the spirit of the deal and one that promotes a false narrative about American diplomatic activity. Predictably, both bills target President Obama and could require the U.S. to violate international accords.

As I have said before, for House Republicans the Iran nuclear agreement has become the ObamaCare of foreign policy. Republicans repeatedly proclaim it a failure, despite its objective success. They call for its immediate repeal without offering any alternative, despite the potentially disastrous consequences of such action. And they continue to clutter the Congressional calendar with so-called message votes designed to score political points instead of addressing the real issues facing our Nation—such as funding research to develop a vaccine against the Zika virus; such as funding the government for the next fiscal year and avoiding the threat of a government shutdown; or such as doing anything constructive that would ensure military readiness, strengthen our infrastructure, or make our Nation more secure.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5461, would draw a Presidential veto and would not achieve the goals the sponsor claims it would achieve.

The text of this legislation states that a new report on a select number of Iranian assets would help the Treasury Department's "efforts to prevent the financing of terrorism" and make "re-

quired compliance with remaining sanctions more easily understood."

That sounds good, but, in reality, the bill would take away critical resources used to help the Treasury identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct—such as human rights violations, financing terrorism, and ballistic missile development—in order to make this new report.

In reality, this bill would incentivize corrupt Iranian actors to conduct their financial dealings farther and farther in the shadows. It would actually decrease transparency in Iran's banking sector, thereby undermining existing efforts to force Iran's compliance with international financial standards.

In reality, the publication of this report would promote distrust and strengthen the position of hard-liners in Iran.

These legislative antics continue, even though the opponents of the JCPOA know full well that strong sanctions on Iran remain in place.

Instead of scoring political points or seeking to deny the President a foreign policy achievement, we should be working together in a bipartisan manner to ensure the agreement's success.

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that the world is watching what we do here today. We may think a politicized bill that has no chance of being signed into law doesn't matter much, but, in fact, to the leaders of China, Russia, or Iran, it sends a message of hesitation and disunity. And to the American public, it shows that House leadership is more interested in debating messaging bills than addressing our Nation's most pressing policy concerns.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, forego the partisan games, and focus on the needs of Americans and the security of our Nation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), vice chairman of our Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for yielding the time. I also thank Congressman POLIQUIN for his leadership on this very critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, we are frequently reminded that Iran remains the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism, spreading their terrorism throughout the Middle East and throughout northern Africa.

Terrorism takes money. Training, recruiting, smuggling weapons, supporting sleeper cells, all of these are business activities of terrorist organizations which require major funding.

For Iran, much of the funding comes when Iran's small network of tyrannical leaders pilfer Iran's economy. Iran's top political and military leaders control roughly one-third of Iran's economy, including large portions of the telecommunications, construction, airport, and seaport sectors. This cozy arrangement provides Iran's radical Islamic leaders with significant cash to export terror and evil, while leaving

Iran's citizens to suffer the effects of a depleted economy.

The Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act will shine a bright light on the rampant corruption and the self-serving behavior of the Iranian mullahs. Through this report, we hope to make international corporations aware of how their dealings with Iran are supporting terrorism and barbaric evil and to help the Iranian people fully understand how their supposed leaders are not operating in their best interests.

Through this report, the American people will also better understand why President Obama's \$1.7 billion ransom payment to Iran is likely to be used, again, to support terrorism and why President Obama's unyielding commitment to negotiate with Iran's corrupt leaders will ultimately make America and the world less safe.

Iran is the new evil empire, a corrupt regime intent on spreading nefarious actions, destroying freedom, human rights, and free speech throughout the world. They exist by sucking dry the very people they claim to serve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act. While everyday Iranians earn around \$15,000 a year, corruption pervades the highest levels of the Iranian Government, where bad actors use their wealth and positions of power to fund terrorism and to advance their own interests. The wealthiest and most powerful of the Iranian elites, including members of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and the foundations they run control an estimated one-third of the nation's total economy.

While President Obama and his administration have engaged in negotiations with Iran's leadership under the delusional pretext that they are in any way trustworthy or honorable, we know better. The Iranian Ayatollah's favored slogan, "Death to America," should have tipped the administration off that Iran is our adversary, not a peace-loving ally.

President Obama's foreign policy with respect to Iran has set America back, endangering us and our allies. And with the implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, he has funneled billions of dollars to the world's leading state sponsor of terror. Indeed, Iran funds Hezbollah, which was responsible for more American deaths than any other terrorist organization prior to September 11, 2001.

This legislation is among several key efforts the House is making to mitigate the damage the Obama administration

has already done by providing Iran with billions of dollars in sanctions relief and cash payments.

Requiring increased transparency regarding the funds that Iran's leaders hold, many of whom are engaged in sinister activities, will help financial institutions and private businesses comply with money laundering, related laws, and more carefully decide with whom they do business.

Mr. Chairman, to a large degree, holding corrupt Iranian leaders more accountable is a matter of life and death for Americans and our allies. Iran has made its evil intentions toward America clear, and its leaders are intent upon harming us. I strongly urge this House to pass this crucial legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have received any number of letters and correspondence in opposition to this bill, but I thought it would be important to just share with you one such communication from J Street, which is an Israel lobbying group. They basically say that:

"... in light of its limited practical utility—this bill appears to be yet another piece of a sustained effort by US opponents of the JCPOA and other diplomatic engagement with Iran to undermine the agreement by weakening the domestic standing of Iranian President Hassan Rouhani and his allies vis-a-vis Iranian hardliners who also oppose the agreement and bilateral dialogue. It is likely not a coincidence that proponents have arranged for floor consideration of this bill just as Rouhani is in the United States for the United Nations General Assembly, and that it would require the finalization of the first report around the time of the next Iranian Presidential election.

"Hindering the US Government's ability to enforce the terms of the JCPOA and sanctions on Iran's dangerous non-nuclear behavior while simultaneously undermining Rouhani's standing would make America and our allies less safe and rebound to the benefit of the very Iranian hardliners who seek to do us harm. Risking these consequences for the sake of procuring information that could not be shared with its intended audience would be both pointless and reckless. We therefore urge Members of Congress to oppose this bill."

That is from J Street, the Israel lobbying group.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, here are the facts: This summer, Congress was made aware that \$400 million worth of cash was secretly airlifted to Iran. Two days later, an additional \$1.3 billion was sent to Iran. This comes on top of the approximately \$55 billion Iran had access to after the Iran nuclear deal was reached.

But here is something that Americans do not know: Where is all the money going and why? Is it going to help Iran rebuild its badly aging infrastructure? Is it going to support expanding freedoms for the average Iranian, or improving basic living conditions? Who believes any of that?

In June of this year, Secretary Kerry admitted: Some of the money would go to groups labeled as terrorist organizations.

He then said: The rest of it, well, we just don't know.

I am proud to rise today in support of my friend from Maine's bill, a bill that will provide some transparency by requiring the Department of the Treasury to develop and post online a list that estimates the amount of funds and assets held by senior Iranian and military leaders and how they acquired those assets.

As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, our committee learned firsthand the dangers associated with approving the Iran nuclear deal and giving them access to large amounts of cash. Frankly, Iran's leaders cannot be trusted. They are our enemy.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the investment made by all U.S. taxpayers in Iran was very costly. Let's make sure we hold their leaders accountable. Please support the bill.

In God we trust.

□ 1545

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill because, well, it is a distraction. It is a distraction not just from the work we should be doing—I mean, I would ask more than rhetorically exactly how many babies have to be born with microcephaly before we actually get serious about dealing with that proposed issue and the menace that it threatens America with. Frankly, this bill is meant to be a distraction from the fact that when it actually mattered, the Financial Services Committee was absent from the debate over the Iran deal—MIA.

In May 2015, we passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act to provide a framework to consider the Iran deal, which we all know now is known as JCPOA. Frankly, as one Member—I know a lot of others spent a lot of time thinking about that issue and that vote, and I, frankly, would suggest that Members on both sides of the aisle gave this a considerable amount of consideration, but we didn't learn anything about it from the Financial Services Committee—zero, zip, nada.

One would think that if the committee were so concerned about JCPOA, they would have explored these issues in detail while the deal

was still under consideration, just as many other committees did.

In fact, I counted more than 30 Iran-related hearings in the House of Representatives between June 2014 and June 2016, including 9 in the 2-month review period mandated in the REVIEW Act. In that full 2 years, Financial Services had no Iran hearings in full committee or subcommittee—zip, zero, nada. All we got was one solitary hearing and a working group before the deal went into effect.

It is not just hearings where Financial Services was MIA. Since I have arrived in Congress, we have passed at least four bills dealing with financial sanctions or terrorism finance where the chair agreed in writing to waive jurisdiction with an exchange of letters. On two additional bills, the leadership brought to the floor without the chairman's seeking to protect the committee's jurisdiction over this critical issue.

So I would just ask, Mr. Chairman, if this issue were so important—and it is—where was the Financial Services Committee while the JCPOA was being debated? It was MIA. It was absent. Then, after sitting silent while the pivotal deal was being developed, considered, and debated, the committee has finally sprung to life to attempt to sabotage a deal that didn't fall apart, frankly, as a lot of the proponents of this deal would have liked.

The IAEA has stated clearly, for months, that Iran is compliant with its nuclear-related obligations under JCPOA, but we are only now bringing to the floor legislation that undermines our own commitments to the JCPOA.

Sadly, it is clear that the bill we have on the floor today is about politics. It is a distraction, and we should reject it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5461 today, and I am a proud original cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POLIQUIN's approach is simply a commonsense thing to do. When you consider that this administration, 6 years ago, turned its back on the Iranian people when they were trying to protest their notorious regime and take to the streets, but then instead of aiding those citizens, they turned their back on the people of Iran to negotiate with the ayatollahs what I believe to be an ill-conceived and poorly designed nuclear deal.

My friend from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) makes the point of asset transparency and argues that this bill would not, in fact, help advance the transparency of the Quds Force or the aggregation of these assets in the hands of these 80 individuals. But, in fact, if the administration was serious about transparency, they would not give the

largest state sponsor of terrorism \$1.7 billion in Swiss francs and euros to become an untraceable honey pot for the purchase of ballistic missile components or fund terrorism in the West Bank or back Assad.

Representative PRICE of North Carolina talks about this act actually strengthening the hard-liners. I would argue, if this is strengthening the hardliners, what, in fact, did the JCPOA accomplish when we report a 50 percent increase in incursions from the Iranian military in our air and sea activities in the Persian Gulf?

The hard-liners in Iran called the payment of \$1.7 billion a ransom—not the people of the United States. In fact, they have taken two more additional hostages as a result of this administration's process.

If we are not strengthening the hard-liners, then why is Iran doubling down on acquiring ballistic missile technology and backing the absolute destruction of Syria?

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a commonsense measure that will let the people of Iran see what the 80 powerful individuals are doing with the billions that have been freed up to come back to the people, to the country of Iran.

Street paving is not going on, Mr. Chairman. What is going on is the expansion of terrorism and billions in untraceable money backing a regime that our own State Department and Treasury says is undiminished in their sponsor of terrorism worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. POLIQUIN's commonsense bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a member of the Financial Services and Foreign Affairs Committees.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, let me see. Let's look at this bill.

H.R. 5461 would require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to Congress on the estimated total assets under the direct or indirect control by Iranian leaders and certain senior political and other figures regardless of whether such individuals are subject to U.S. sanctions.

So what will that do? By creating this report, it would place a substantial time and human resource burden on the Treasury and, in fact, divert critical energy and resources away from targeting sanctionable conduct and compliance over existing sanctions tied to human rights, terrorism, and ballistic missiles.

Moreover, since the report would not be tied to any prohibition or legal action, it would have little use as a compliance tool and, in fact, would likely confuse the Office of Foreign Assets Control's regulated publicly.

Finally, such a report would undoubtedly be seized upon by Iran—and quite possibly by all of our P5 allies—as an intended effort to discourage international investment in Iran,

which, in turn, could be viewed as a violation of the expressed U.S. commitment under the JCPOA to prevent interference with the realization of the full benefit by Iran of the JCPOA and, therefore, undermine the continued support for the JCPOA with Iran.

So I know some people on the other side of the aisle don't believe that this is the right thing, but it is clear JCPOA prevents an armed nuclear Iran. We should vote against H.R. 5461.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, it has recently come to light that this administration may have sent the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism as much as \$33 billion in cash and gold payments over the last 2 years.

American lives have been lost because of Iran's state-sponsored terrorism; families have been ripped apart. Yet, just last month, we learned that the administration paid Iran \$1.7 billion—400 million of which was in unmarked, non-U.S. currency—before they could secure the release of American military personnel held hostage in Iran. There is no way to track how Iran is using this money—or any of the rest of the billions in payments it has received.

If this administration will not act to keep its citizens safe, then the House must force its hand. This starts by holding both our administration and Iran's government accountable. We are expressly prohibiting any future ransom payments to Iran, and we are requiring the Treasury to publicize any assets associated with members of Iran's government leadership. We are also requiring the Treasury to submit a report to Congress that shows how the assets were acquired and how they have been put to use.

Fighting terrorism should not be a partisan issue. Depriving evil regimes of the ability to fund terrorism should not be a partisan issue. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the two pieces of legislation that we have on the House side, on the Republican column. Mr. POLIQUIN's bill, H.R. 5461, is a step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, can I bring a slightly different discussion and weave it back into the things that have been said here?

Mechanically, we often have this conversation that if we had a more holistic understanding of the money that was going to bad actors around the world—

I am holding parts of the report here talking about 18 tons of cocaine being moved through north Africa and then, ultimately, through Lebanon, through the handlers of Hezbollah and a billion-plus dollars of cash. As you and I know, we have all sat through the terrorism financing testimony and others that Hezbollah doesn't move, ultimately, without their puppet masters in Iran instructing them on what to do.

So take a step backwards. If I came to you and said I care about terrorism, I care about bad actors, I care about drug resources moving through the world, and I have the country of Iran whose proxies are functionally, today, the leading money launderers not only in the region, but probably the world, and then we look at what the administration has done—I understand many people support it for the nuclear arms side. I am fine. I am enraged that the openness and the misrepresentation and lying—just plain lying—to Congress on the timing, what happened, and how it was delivered—was it in cash, or was it in wires? So a piece of legislation like this, why would we fear another layer of just openness and disclosure saying that this is woven into many evil, bad actors in the world that are moving billions of dollars of illicit money and illicit narcotics, people—human smuggling—why wouldn't we want to sort of have the view of what is Iran's hand in it, what is their proxy's hand in it we call Hezbollah?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, many of us have sat on the terrorism finance committee, and I appreciate Chairman HENSARLING for allowing me to sit there. But the more you learn, the more you understand the levels of complication. We have this habit around here, when we get behind the microphones, we make things direct and simple in a sound bite. It is complex, and there are tremendous amounts of money and bad things happening here.

Why would a simple piece of legislation—one of the beautiful things in here is it gives me more openness so we understand what the bad actors are doing.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said at the onset of this debate, it is clear that this bill is nothing more than an effort to derail the administration's diplomatic accomplishments with regard to the Iran nuclear deal.

□ 1600

After failing to block the deal from being implemented, opponents have shifted their focus towards unraveling and delegitimizing it bit by bit. This is despite the fact that over a year after the accord was signed, the JCPOA is

widely seen as having diffused the global security threat of a nuclear armed Iran for at least a generation.

Despite the ongoing success of the agreement, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have gone to great lengths to promote a false narrative that the administration too readily concedes to Iran's demands, including by pushing claims that the U.S. made secret ransom payments to Iran. Other efforts to destabilize the agreement have been aimed squarely at violating the terms of the agreement itself.

For example, Republicans moved a spate of measures earlier this summer that would block the sale of aircraft to Iran, despite the fact that these sales were a central component of the nuclear agreement. Moreover, Republicans also rushed legislation to the floor before leaving for the last congressional recess to undermine Iran's conduct of banking transactions outside of the United States—activity that became permissible as part of the nuclear deal.

So while the bill before us today, H.R. 5461, may appear to contain a simple reporting requirement, it is most certainly not a bill that promotes our national security interests. By requiring an extraneous report on the assets of Iranian leaders without regard to current sanctions or other obligations, the bill would prevent the Iranian people from receiving the full benefits of this agreement. This would put the agreement in jeopardy and strengthen the hand of the hardliners in Iran who want nothing more than to see the nuclear deal fall apart. This scenario would threaten global security and deal a severe blow in our efforts to prevent a nuclear Iran.

In closing, I would like to ask critics of the deal what they believe their moral responsibility will be if their relentless efforts to undo the deal are successful? How do you think rejection by the U.S. of the nuclear deal will affect American leadership on any future foreign policy negotiations?

Some critics of the Iran nuclear deal express outrage that the deal has not curtailed Iran's other destabilizing influence in the region or support for what they say is terrorism at this time.

I think it is important to note that the Iran nuclear deal was quite deliberately focused on the nuclear issue as the paramount concern regarding Iran's foreign policy. The Iran nuclear deal is an arms control agreement, and in that respect, it has been successful to date.

It is my hope that the ongoing success of the nuclear deal might give us the leverage to work toward constructing a better policy towards Iran that will help us address the range of Iran's destabilizing behavior in the region, but I urge my colleagues not to confuse the legislation like H.R. 5461 with any serious effort to move us in that direction. So rather than force the President to veto this harmful and mis-

guided legislation, I urge my colleagues to block this bill from moving forward here in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to reiterate that the world is watching what we do here. I want to reiterate that we didn't just enter into this deal by ourselves. We have all of our allies who have agreed to this deal. If this is undermined, if it is seen to cause us to act in bad faith, then what are we to say to our allies? What are we to say to the rest of the world about a deal that was negotiated by the leader of this country, the President of the United States?

If the President of the United States of America can't count on the Congress of the United States to back him up in the world, if the President of the United States can't count on the Members of Congress to stand with him, and if the President of the United States can't be comfortable that the Members of Congress are not going to make him look as if he did not mean what he said, that he was not truthful in the negotiation, then what can a leader do? How can a leader lead a country?

All of us who claim to love this country and to care about its safety and security have ourselves on the line with this legislation. This is legislation that will be deemed to undermine that agreement and be seen as just another attempt to undermine the President of the United States of America. It is not concerned about whether or not we have stopped the nuclear proliferation in Iran, not concerned that we have caused all of that region to feel safe and us to feel safe for another generation, but rather, pursuing to undermine the agreement simply because they don't like some part of it or they are not able to make the President do what they want him to do.

This is outrageous. This cannot go forward in the way that it is intended by my friends on the opposite side of the aisle. I know that they are smart and they are bright and they are intelligent, but they cannot let their emotions about either not liking the President of the United States or simply not liking Iran to get in the way of this deal that will create safety in the world.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I cannot imagine what the American people who are tuning in to C-SPAN must think. They must think that when they hear our friends on the other side of the aisle, that they have tuned in not to the United States Congress, but to the Iranian Parliament.

Rarely have I heard so many come to the House floor to defend this regime. Oh, oh, we might hurt their feelings if we make them disclose their personal finances.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress has to disclose their personal finances. So what is wrong with the foremost state sponsor of terrorism exposing their assets, their funding, where

they control one-third of the Iranian economy?

No. We hear: Oh, we might hurt their feelings, we may hurt their sensibilities.

Now, many have come to quote the administration. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me quote the administration—the State Department’s Country Reports on Terrorism. The last one noted that:

“Iran continued to sponsor terrorist groups around the world, principally through its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. . . . These groups included Lebanese Hizballah, several Iraqi Shia militant groups, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Iran, Hizballah, and other Shia militia continued to provide support to the Asad regime, dramatically bolstering its capabilities, prolonging the civil war in Syria, and worsening the human rights and refugee crisis there.”

Mr. Chairman, those aren’t my words. Those are the words of the President’s State Department. Now, this is their country report.

Maybe, maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to offer an amendment so that no longer can the State Department publish such reports on terrorism because it might offend the sensibilities of the Iranians.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, this is a total red herring. There is nothing, nothing in this bill that violates the JCPOA. I think it is a terrible agreement. This is well known. In fact, a strong majority of this body opposed it, but we understand the President entered into it.

How can they object? How can my friends on the other side of the aisle object to transparency and accountability for the leadership of the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism—again, that is the Obama administration saying that, Mr. Chairman—how can they object to a little transparency there and yet allow this report to come out from the State Department?

It makes no sense at all. We heard some say: Oh, my Lord, this might take up resources at the State Department.

Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this comes in in thousands. Not millions, not billions, not trillions, but thousands. And given that the most important thing we do as Members of Congress is to provide for the common defense, including the common defense against the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism, I think that it would be wise that we put the resources towards this report. It may be a first because I have never heard, in the years I have been here, any of my Democratic colleagues ever be concerned about the resources of the United States of America, as they have worked to give us the worst debt and deficit in the history of our Republic, an unsustainable debt that undermines our common defense.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a regime involved in cyberterrorism. This is a regime trying to develop ballistic

missile technology. This is a regime that funds Hezbollah as it rains missiles down on Israel.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) has come up with a very commonsense piece of legislation. I applaud his leadership in bringing forth H.R. 5461. Let’s have some transparency, let’s have some accountability. We know—we know that to combat terrorist financing. We must follow the money. We must expose the money. And that is what the gentleman from Maine does with his bill.

I do not understand why such a commonsense piece of legislation is being so vigorously opposed by my friends on the other side of the aisle. Again, Americans must be in a tizzy trying to figure out if they have tuned in to the United States Congress or the Iranian Parliament. Let’s make sure they understand this is the United States Congress. We will stand for the common defense, we will expose this terrorist financing, and we will stand with the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) and stand for all Americans, and we will vote for H.R. 5461.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support H.R. 5461, the “Iranian Leadership Transparency Act,” introduced by my colleague BRUCE POLIQUIN.

This bill will give the Iranian people some measure of the transparency they deserve—but have long been denied—about the corrupt financial dealings of their government. H.R. 5461 would require the Administration to produce an annual report on the financial and other assets owned by Iran’s senior leaders and the highest ranks of Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The report will be published in an easily downloadable format in English, Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri to make sure the information winds up in the hands of Iranians and empowers transparency advocates.

With a corruption index ranking of 130 out of 168 countries from Transparency International and a media freedom ranking of 169 out of 180 from Reporters Without Borders, Iran is one of the most difficult climates in which to discover and report the truth about official corruption.

This United States Government report would provide unique insights for Iranian and international audiences, particularly since so much of Iran’s economy is controlled by shadowy organizations, such as the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. The United States Institute of Peace assesses that the IRGC is Iran’s single largest economic force with major stakes in most sectors of the economy, including construction, energy, and telecommunication, among others.

To further draw back the curtain on Iran’s shadowy dealings, the report would detail how the IRGC and Iranian leaders acquired these assets, how they use them, and any methods or techniques they have employed to launder them.

Mr. Chair, the report will also enable us to whether the Administration is doing everything in its power to curtail Iran’s well-known money laundering practices—which serve as the conduit for much of the support Iran provides to the terrorist groups and armed proxies that

threaten American and Israeli lives on a daily basis.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5461

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 “Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran is characterized by high levels of official and institutional corruption, and substantial involvement by Iran’s security forces, particularly the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), in the economy.

(2) Many members of Iran’s senior political and military leadership have acquired significant personal and institutional wealth by using their positions to secure control of significant portions of Iran’s national economy.

(3) Sanctions relief provided through the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action has resulted in the removal of many Iranian entities that are tied to governmental corruption from the list of entities sanctioned by the United States.

(4) The Department of Treasury in 2011 designated the Islamic Republic of Iran’s financial sector as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern under section 311 of the USA PATRIOT Act, stating “Treasury has for the first time identified the entire Iranian financial sector; including Iran’s Central Bank, private Iranian banks, and branches, and subsidiaries of Iranian banks operating outside of Iran as posing illicit finance risks for the global financial system.”.

(5) Iran continues to be listed by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) among the “Non-Cooperative Countries or Territories”—countries which it perceived to be non-cooperative in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering.

(6) Iran and North Korea are the only countries listed by the FATF as “Non-Cooperative Countries or Territories” against which FATF countries should take measures.

(7) The Transparency International index of perceived public corruption ranks Iran 130th out of 168 countries surveyed.

(8) The State Department identified Iran as a country/jurisdiction of “primary concern” for money laundering in its 2014 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report (INCSR).

(9) The State Department currently identifies Iran, along with Sudan and Syria, as a state sponsor of terrorism, “having repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism”.

(10) The State Department’s “Country Reports on Terrorism”, published last in June 2015 noted that “Iran continued to sponsor terrorist groups around the world, principally through its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps—Qods Force (IRGC-QF). These groups included Lebanese Hizballah, several Iraqi Shia militant groups, Hamas, and Palestine Islamic Jihad. Iran, Hizballah, and other Shia militia continued to provide support to the Asad regime, dramatically bolstering its capabilities, prolonging the civil war in Syria, and worsening the human rights and refugee crisis there.”.

(11) The Iranian Government’s tolerance of corruption and nepotism in business limits

opportunities for foreign and domestic investment, particularly given the significant involvement of the IRGC in many sectors of Iran's economy.

(12) The IRGC and the leadership-controlled bonyads (foundations) control an estimated one-third of Iran's total economy, including large portions of Iran's telecommunications, construction, and airport and port operations. These operations give the IRGC and bonyads vast funds to support terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas.

(13) By gaining control of major economic sectors, the IRGC and bonyads have also served to further disadvantage the average Iranian.

SEC. 3. REPORT REQUIREMENT RELATING TO ASSETS OF IRANIAN LEADERS AND CERTAIN SENIOR POLITICAL FIGURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter (or more frequently if the Secretary of the Treasury determines it appropriate based on new information received by the Secretary) for the following 2 years, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in furtherance of the Secretary's efforts to prevent the financing of terrorism, money laundering, or related illicit finance and to make financial institutions' required compliance with remaining sanctions more easily understood, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing—

(1) the estimated total funds or assets held in accounts at U.S. and foreign financial institutions that are under direct or indirect control by each natural person described in subsection (b) and a description of such assets;

(2) an identification of any equity stake such natural person has in an entity on the Department of the Treasury's list of Specially Designated Nationals or in any other sanctioned entity;

(3) a description of how such funds or assets or equity interests were acquired, and how they have been used or employed; and

(4) a description of any new methods or techniques used to evade anti-money laundering and related laws, including recommendations to improve techniques to combat illicit uses of the U.S. financial system by each natural person described in subsection (b).

(b) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The natural persons described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The Supreme Leader of Iran.
 (2) The President of Iran.
 (3) Members of the Council of Guardians.
 (4) Members of the Expediency Council.
 (5) The Minister of Intelligence and Security.

(6) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC.

(7) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC Ground Forces.

(8) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC Aerospace Force.

(9) The Commander and the Deputy Commander of the IRGC Navy.

(10) The Commander of the Basij-e Mostaz'afin.

(11) The Commander of the Qods Force.

(12) The Commander in Chief of the Police Force.

(13) The head of the IRGC Joint Staff.

(14) The Commander of the IRGC Intelligence.

(15) The head of the IRGC Imam Hussein University.

(16) The Supreme Leader's Representative at the IRGC.

(17) The Chief Executive Officer and the Chairman of the IRGC Cooperative Foundation.

(18) The Commander of the Khatam-al-Anbia Construction Head Quarter.

(19) The Chief Executive Officer of the Basij Cooperative Foundation.

(20) The head of the Political Bureau of the IRGC.

(c) FORM OF REPORT; PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—

(1) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The unclassified portion of such report shall be made available to the public and posted on the website of the Department of the Treasury—

(A) in English, Farsi, Arabic, and Azeri; and

(B) in precompressed, easily downloadable versions that are made available in all appropriate formats.

(d) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In preparing a report described under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury may utilize any credible publication, database, web-based resource, and any credible information compiled by any government agency, nongovernmental organization, or other entity provided to or made available to the Secretary.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) FUNDS.—The term "funds" means—

(A) cash;

(B) equity;

(C) any other intangible asset whose value is derived from a contractual claim, including bank deposits, bonds, stocks, a security as defined in section 2(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)), or a security or an equity security as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)); and

(D) anything else that the Secretary determines appropriate.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-778. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-778.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 23, strike "Committee on Financial Services" and insert "Committees on Financial Services and Foreign Affairs".

Page 9, line 24, strike "Committee" and insert "Committees".

Page 10, line 1, after "Affairs" insert the following: "and Foreign Relations".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the Poliquin amendment to the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

My amendment is very simple, Mr. Chairman. It adds the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the reporting requirements in the bill.

Right now, the legislation requires the Department of Treasury to provide a report to the House Financial Services Committee and the Senate Banking Committee, the unclassified portion of which will be posted for everyone to see on the U.S. Department of Treasury's Web site. My amendment, Mr. Chairman, adds the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate as appropriate congressional committees to receive the report.

It is a small adjustment to the bill, but a good one, as I think we all benefit from the good work that Chairman ROYCE and his committee has conducted with regard to the Iranian regime.

I urge support of this amendment and, once again, for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF INDIANA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-778.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. 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 7, line 7, strike "and".

Page 7, line 13, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 7, after line 13, insert the following:

(5) recommendations for how U.S. economic sanctions against Iran may be revised to prevent the funds or assets described under this subsection from being used by the natural persons described in subsection (b) to contribute to the continued development, testing, and procurement of ballistic missile technology by Iran;

(6) a description of how the Department of the Treasury assesses the impact and effectiveness of U.S. economic sanctions programs against Iran; and

(7) recommendations for improving the ability of the Department of the Treasury to rapidly and effectively develop, implement, and enforce additional economic sanctions against Iran if so ordered by the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act or other corresponding legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

□ 1615

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) for his timely and valuable bill.

Iran is a determined and treacherous enemy of the United States. Despite the hopes of the Obama administration's following the adoption of the JCPOA nuclear agreement, Iran has only escalated its aggressive foreign policy over the past year. It has not locked arms agreeably with the community of civilized nations.

While the Obama administration removed the sanctions related to Iran's nuclear program following the adoption of the JCPOA, U.S. sanctions remain in place against Iran in response to its state sponsorship of terrorism, ballistic missile program, and human rights violations.

Tracking and cataloging the assets and funds that are controlled by the Iranian regime is a necessary step towards uncovering how Iran continues to challenge and attempts to circumvent the U.S. sanctions regime.

My amendment simply builds upon the excellent foundation laid out in the underlying bill by expanding the scope of the reporting requirements. These new components require Treasury to provide recommendations for improving the U.S. sanctions regime against Iran and a description of how Treasury assesses the impact and effectiveness of U.S. sanctions.

The amendment will enhance the ability of Congress to assess and exercise oversight over Iran policy. The expanding reporting requirements will also contribute to the ability of Congress to ensure that Iran policy is serving the national security interests of the United States.

Iran's continued aggression threatens all Americans regardless of one's political party. It is not partisan maneuvering for Congress to require the Department of the Treasury to provide valuable information to Congress on matters of great importance to our national security.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, the Young amendment would add three additional requirements to the report that are called for under the underlying bill, including a description of how the administration views the effectiveness of its sanctions programs and recommendations for improving their enforcement.

I believe it would be a strategic mistake to disclose to our adversaries how we view the effectiveness of our sanctions programs and would be imprudent to signal to them how we might

respond or alter our approach through the use of economic sanctions.

Furthermore, the amendment appears to be premised on the assumption that the administration isn't already actively enforcing sanctions related to Iran, particularly its pursuit of ballistic missile technology. Ironically, the extensive reporting requirements on roughly 80 senior Iranian officers in the underlying bill would detract from the administration's ability to implement the very sanctions that the Young amendment seeks to embrace.

Given its false premise, the increased burden the amendment would place on the Treasury Department, and the strategic folly of revealing our strategy for using sanctions to rein in Iran's nefarious behavior, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply don't believe that these Members who are engaging in this kind of activity really understand what they are doing. I refer to it as folly, but it is worse than that. It is weighing in on something they really don't know about. In doing so, they don't recognize the damage they are doing to their own country and to the President of the United States. I 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 Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-778.

Mr. LANCE. 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 8, after line 23, insert the following:
(21) The head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 876, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LANCE. My thanks to Chairman HENSARLING, and my thanks, as well, to Congressman POLIQUIN for their tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about the underlying Iranian nuclear agreement, and nothing in this amendment and nothing in the Poliquin bill will change that agreement. Obviously, there is significant debate about the underlying agreement. I am a strong opponent of that, as was the majority here in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, the other Chamber never voted on the issue because we could not reach a conclusion of debate on that issue.

On this amendment, it is in our national security interest to be scrutinizing the assets that are held by senior Iranian political and military leaders so that we might know how those

assets were acquired and how they are being spent. This amendment would add the name of the head of the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization, a position currently held by Ali Akbar Salehi, to a list of Iranian leaders who are named in this legislation.

Given Iran's known desire for a nuclear weapons program and its clear ties to international terror, we should be monitoring the finances of the head of its nuclear program regardless of who he is. For years, the Iranian regime has been mired in institutionalized corruption; and the nexus of nuclear weapons, state-sponsored terrorism, money laundering, secret financial agreements, and mass pilfering from the Iranian people is cause for great alarm.

Mr. Chairman, we need all of the tools at our disposal. Let's add the head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran to this legislation, and let's have the U.S. Treasury do all it can to investigate the finances of this regime.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment I am offering, and I certainly urge a "yes" vote on the underlying legislation that has been sponsored by Congressman POLIQUIN.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I really should not spend my time on this. This is kind of ridiculous that this long list we have of which they want to find out about the assets—where they came from, how they are managed, who they give them to, et cetera—is kind of senseless anyway because, even if the Treasury Department took all of this time and effort that it should be using on enforcing sanctions, et cetera, it would be classified. I don't know how they expect to get this to the Iranian people to view as they are trying to have them think that they can somehow undermine what their government is doing and, I guess, create a war between Iran and the United States.

I don't know what they are doing, but I know this—it doesn't make good sense. It ties up the Treasury Department to do all of this useless stuff. And to have a list where you spend time on the floor of the United States Congress saying, I want to add one more name—give me a break. I oppose the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT) having assumed the chair, Mr.

SIMPSON, 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. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 876, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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. HENSARLING. 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5931, PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN 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, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-781) on the resolution (H. Res. 879) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3438.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 875 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3438.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1627

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Washington's regulatory system is one that virtually every day places new obstacles in the path of American jobs and economic growth. The biggest obstacles of all are new regulations that impose more than \$1 billion per year in costs on the American economy.

Struggling workers, families, and small business owners have every right to ask why regulations that cost this much are ever promulgated at all. Surely, there are less costly measures that are effective and should be adopted instead.

Those less costly measures would allow many more resources to be devoted to job creation and productive investment. But billion-dollar rules are promulgated, and there are more and more as the Obama administration grinds to an end. This is one of the reasons our economy has faced so much difficulty in achieving a full recovery under the Obama administration's misguided policies.

Making matters worse, when billion-dollar rules are challenged in court, regulated entities must often sink billions of dollars into compliance while litigation is pending even if that litigation ultimately will be successful. Such was the case in Michigan v. EPA, for example, in which an Environmental Protection Agency rule for utilities imposed about \$10 billion in costs to achieve just \$4 million to \$6 million in benefits. That is, at best, about \$1,600 in costs for every \$1 of benefit.

□ 1630

This is money for job creation and economic recovery we simply cannot

afford to waste. But EPA and the courts allowed it to be wasted for years during successful litigation challenging the rule, because neither the EPA nor the courts stayed the rule.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chairman MARINO, is a commonsense measure that responds to this problem with a simple, bright-line test. Under the bill, if a new regulation imposes \$1 billion or more in annual cost, it will not go into effect until after litigation challenging it is resolved. Of course, if the regulation is not challenged, it may go into effect as normal. This is a balanced approach, and it provides a healthy incentive for agencies to promulgate effective, but lower-cost regulations that are more legally sound to begin with.

I want to thank Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chairman TOM MARINO for his work on this important legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3438 would stay the enforcement of any rule imposing an annual cost to the economy in excess of \$1 billion, pending judicial review.

Now, do you suspect what that might do? It would have a pernicious impact on rulemaking and the ability of agencies to respond to critical health and safety issues. In essence, the bill would encourage anyone who wants to delay a significant rule from going into effect to simply seek a judicial review of the rule.

Please, we all know that the judicial review process can take months—sometimes years—to finalize, especially if the appellate process reaches the United States Supreme Court. So rather than ensuring predictability and streamlining the rulemaking process, this bill would have the completely opposite impact by making the process less predictable and more time-consuming.

Equally important, H.R. 3438 has absolutely no health or safety emergency exceptions. If anything, this bill would empower the very entities that caused a serious health or safety risk to delay and maybe even derail legitimate efforts by regulatory agencies to respond to such threats.

As with other bills proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this legislation myopically focuses only on the cost of a proposed rule while ignoring the rule's benefits, which often exceed its costs by many multiples.

In closing, there is broad agreement among experts in the administrative law field that our Nation's regulatory system is already too cumbersome and slow-moving.

Now, in addition to the Administrative Procedure Act's procedural mechanisms which are designed to ensure an

open and fair rulemaking system, Congress has passed various additional Federal laws that impose further rulemaking requirements, and rulemaking agencies must also comply with a number of executive orders issued over the past several decades that have created additional layers of analytical and procedural requirements. The result of this dense web of existing requirements is a complex, time-consuming rulemaking process.

In response to the explosion of analytical requirements imposed on the rulemaking process, the American Bar Association as well as many administrative law experts have urged Congress to exercise restraint and assess the usefulness of existing requirements before considering sweeping legislation.

Imposing new analytical and procedural requirements on the administrative system also carries real human and economic costs. As Professor Weissman, the president of Public Citizen, has observed, the cost of regulatory delay is “far more severe than generic inefficiency. Lengthy delay costs money and lives; it permits ongoing ecologic destruction and the infliction of needless injury; and it enables fraudsters and wrongdoers to perpetuate their misdeeds.”

Rather than alleviating these problems, H.R. 3438 would clearly exacerbate them. Accordingly, I must urge Members to oppose this ill-conceived legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chief sponsor of the legislation and the chairman of the Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the full committee chairman, Mr. GOODLATTE, for supporting the REVIEW Act as an original cosponsor and for moving it through the Judiciary Committee. I am also grateful for the many other Members who have cosponsored this bill.

The REVIEW Act rests upon a very simple premise: that regulations with annual costs exceeding \$1 billion annually should receive full judicial review before they go into effect.

The regulations we are concerned about are so massive that their compliance costs are felt nationwide. These regulations touch every corner of our economy. They drive up the cost to put food on the table and clothes on our backs, and, in the worst of situations, they take away the very jobs Americans have earned.

Due to these immense costs, it is not only prudent, but appropriate that aggrieved parties have their day in court. These costs demand that executive agencies must justify their reasoning and legal underpinnings of their rulemaking. Requiring American taxpayers and businesses to comply before the ju-

dicial process runs its course reeks of injustice.

Historically, these high-impact rules with costs over \$1 billion annually have been few and far between. Since 2006, there have been just 26 in total. However, in recent years, their number has grown exponentially alongside the growth and reach of the regulatory state. There have been an average of three over the past 8 years and six in 2014 alone.

Although some may insist that the straightforward reforms in this bill overreach, recent events indicate otherwise. Last summer, in the Supreme Court’s decision in *Michigan v. EPA*, we saw firsthand the irreparable harm that can occur when expansive, costly, and poorly crafted regulations are not given time for review. In this case, the Court found that the EPA had promulgated its Utility MACT power plant rule through a faulty process and on legally infirm grounds because it chose not to consider costs when promulgating the rule. The costs of the rule were estimated by the EPA itself—by the EPA who created the rule—at \$9.6 billion per year. In return, the EPA’s best estimate of potential benefits were in the range of a mere \$4 million to \$6 million—with an M—annually.

As the late Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in his opinion for the Court: “One would not say that it is even rational, never mind ‘appropriate,’ to impose billions of dollars in economic costs in return for a few dollars in health or environmental benefits.”

Unfortunately for workers, homeowners, and taxpayers across the country, when the Utility MACT rule was promulgated in early 2012 and after litigation began, neither the EPA nor Court stayed it, pending judicial review. It remained in effect as litigation took 3 years to work itself to a final decision in the Supreme Court in 2015. When review finally got to the Court, the effects were nearly irreversible.

Action on the REVIEW Act is a reasonable step on our part to continue proper and reasonable regulatory reforms.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, action on the REVIEW Act is a reasonable step on our part to continue proper and responsible regulatory reform.

In the end, this is a bill that encourages smaller, sensible rulemaking. When the costs are borne on the back of our constituents, this is a cause that we all certainly can get behind.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only important because of the jobs that are lost, because of the businesses, the manufacturing companies that are going out of business because of these rules by the EPA and other agencies, but it is Congress’ responsibility to litigate and Congress’ responsibility to set budgets and control the purse strings.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2016, also known as the REVIEW Act, which would automatically stay so-called high-impact rules that a party challenges by filing suit in court.

Now, this is a very arcane and esoteric subject that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will literally put you to sleep listening to their arguments about it. But make no mistake about it, this is a very important piece of legislation that would torpedo the good work of legislators who are trying to protect the health, safety, and well-being of the American people.

Simply put, this bill is yet another reckless measure designed to delay the implementation of the most important rules protecting the health, safety, and financial well-being of everyday people. Passage of this bill will only benefit the pocketbooks of the large corporations in the top 1 percent while the American people will be left unprotected from corporate greed.

Other than satisfying the insatiable thirst of the superwealthy for more and more and more profits to stuff into their already fat and overflowing pockets, this bill is completely unnecessary and is not in the best interest of the greater good.

Under current law, both courts and the agency issuing a rule may stay the effective date of a final rule. While agencies have broad discretion in postponing the effective date of a rule, a court considers several factors in deciding whether to stay a rule, including whether the party is likely to succeed on the merits.

In 2009, the Supreme Court, in *Nken v. Holder*, instructed courts to consider four factors when deciding whether to issue a stay: One, whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; two, whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; three, whether the issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceedings; and, four, where the public interest lies.

The REVIEW Act would discard this very flexible and practical test in favor of an inflexible and unyielding requirement that agencies automatically delay the effective date of any rule exceeding \$1 billion in costs that is challenged in court regardless of whether the party challenging the rule has any likelihood of success on the merits, is actually harmed by the rule, or whether staying the rule would be contrary to the public interest.

□ 1645

It is virtually guaranteed that every high-impact rule would be delayed through litigation challenges, regardless of whether the litigation is meritorious. Frivolous litigation would almost certainly create years of delays

for these rules which, in many cases, have already taken years to promulgate.

But the bill wouldn't just simply apply to lifesaving rules that exceed \$1 billion in costs that keep our air clean and our children safe. Rather, it would likely apply to transfer rules which involve the transfer of funds for budgetary programs authorized by Congress, such as transfer rules involving the Medicare program or the Federal Pell Grant Program, as the Office of Management and Budget has clarified.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because it is a dangerous solution to a nonexistent problem. Any party affected by a final agency action may challenge that action in court while agencies may also delay the effective date of rules on a discretionary basis. Professor William Funk, a leading administrative law expert, explains that existing law "weeds out frivolous claims and takes account of both the cost of the rule and the benefits of the rule that would be avoided by granting the stay." Absent any evidence whatsoever that courts have inappropriately refused to grant stays, I am confident that existing law provides adequate protection.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and make in order any of the amendments that you will hear hereafter.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REVIEW Act. Since 2009, this administration has imposed almost 21,000 rules and regulations on U.S. families and job creators. Of those, over 200 are major regulations, costing \$108 billion annually, \$22 billion of that coming from 43 major rules just last year.

These regulations suffocate opportunity and economic freedom. Whether it is EPA's rule that will double the electricity bills of hardworking families or EPA's waters of the U.S. Federal land grab rule that will force landowners to get permission from the Federal Government in order to make decisions on their land or face onerous fines, it is time to rein in the Federal control over our lives that is hurting people.

In my district in western central Missouri, one of these rules, the Department of Labor's overtime rule, which is set to go into effect December 1, will hurt everyday Americans, raising the cost of living while reducing wages and incomes.

A senior care group in my district has told me that this rule will likely lead to a reduction in hiring, meaning fewer seniors will be able to get care. Schools have expressed concerns that they will be forced to cut staff and limit the educational services and extracurricular activities they provide for our students. A bank in my district will have to transition 13 of their salaried tellers on staff to hourly wage

workers in order to assume the \$129,000 in anticipated compliance costs from this rule. Religious organizations have also told me that they will have to cut staff, reducing their ability to provide charitable services to those in need.

Washington's top-down mandates are hurting our friends and our neighbors. We need this bill to stop these overbearing regulations which cripple industries and harm American livelihoods. Instead of stifling opportunity, we should remove barriers to job creation and economic prosperity. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

The majority argues that H.R. 3438 responds to cases where a court vacates a rule after it has already gone into effect. The majority argues that H.R. 3438 responds to the Supreme Court's 2015 decision in *Michigan v. EPA*, where the Court remanded a clean air rule adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce power plants' emissions of hazardous air pollutants.

As leading administrator and law professor William Funk has noted, the Court remanded the rule rather than vacating it altogether because the "grounds upon which the Supreme Court found the rule invalid appear to be easily remedied." He further observes that delaying this rule would cost the U.S. economy \$20- to \$80 billion per year.

Importantly, the industry and State challengers to the EPA's rule at issue in *Michigan v. EPA* did not seek judicial stay of the rule prior to the Court's remand. Perhaps that is because they knew it would fail and that they could not meet the judicial test requiring showings of irreparable harm and likelihood of success on the merits.

These challengers are hardly in a good position to complain now about the rule being found unlawful in one respect but not unlawful with respect to every other issue raised by the challengers when they themselves even failed to ask the Court to stay the rule beforehand.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the majority's misleading claims that this rule caused irreparable harm and cost billions of dollars to implement while only offering potential benefits in the millions of dollars, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, which is the same entity that would be charged with conducting cost estimates under the bill, states that annual benefits of the rule range between \$30- and \$90 billion, very much dwarfing its annual cost of \$9.6 billion.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member.

Following the Court's remand, the EPA has reaffirmed its original finding that it is appropriate to achieve deep cuts in mercury and up to 7 dozen hazardous air pollutants such as lead, arsenic, and benzene from coal-burning power plants even after considering cost, which was the only issue in the Supreme Court's remand of the case.

This rule delivers immense benefits to Americans, with monetized benefits greatly outweighing compliance costs. An automatic stay brought by the REVIEW Act would result in all of those health hazards—4,200 premature deaths, 2,800 cases of chronic bronchitis, and on and on and on. The automatic stay brought by the REVIEW Act, if it passes, would result in so many health hazards occurring to Americans and health costs being borne by the public after the rules compliance date.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this ill-founded and ill-conceived piece of legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there is broad opposition to H.R. 3438. In the context of a veto threat, the Obama administration notes in its Statement of Administration Policy that H.R. 3438 would "promote unwarranted litigation, introduce harmful delay, and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly enacted laws," and would also "increase business uncertainty and undermine much-needed protections for the American public, including critical rules that provide financial reform and protect public health, food safety, and the environment."

The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which includes more than 150 diverse labor, consumer, public health, food safety, financial reform, faith, environmental, and scientific integrity groups representing millions of Americans, strongly opposes H.R. 3438, stating that it "will make the single biggest problem in our current regulatory process, namely, excessive and out of control regulatory delays, even worse."

Other leading consumer and public interest groups strongly oppose this misguided legislation, noting that, "like numerous other anti-regulatory bills," H.R. 3438 "further tilts the regulatory process in favor of corporate special interests by creating more opportunities for the manipulation and abuse of the process to their benefit and at the expense of protecting consumers, working families, and other vulnerable communities."

Indeed, this bill is no different than the many other antiregulatory bills considered this Congress. It is a dangerous solution to a problem that is nonexistent. Accordingly, I urge each and every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to resist this and oppose H.R. 3438.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Michigan makes reference to the administration's Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 3438. The administration opposes this bill precisely because it would be effective. It would help to halt their regulatory overreach. The administration claims that this bill is unnecessary because rulemaking procedures already exist to ensure that new rules are as least burdensome as possible and produce a net benefit, and courts already can issue judicial stays. But the whole reason for this legislation is that the administration is ignoring such procedures. The courts rarely issue judicial stays, and by the time the courts finally strike down illegal rules, it is too late.

For example, the administration lost in *Michigan v. EPA* because it failed to consider the costs and benefits of the rule which imposed about \$10 billion in costs to achieve just \$4- to \$6 million in benefits. By the time the Court issued the ruling, huge sums had already been spent on compliance.

These are resources that otherwise could have gone into productive jobs and investment rather than complying with an illegal rule. Our economy cannot afford this waste. Do not be fooled by the administration's fear-mongering about delaying rules addressing public safety emergencies. It is difficult to imagine a public safety emergency requiring a billion-dollar rule to solve.

Indeed, we reviewed a list of billion-dollar rules issued since 2000, and not one responds to an immediate public safety emergency. Even if there were such a case, imposing costs of that magnitude for whatever reason should be made by elected representatives accountable to the people, not agency bureaucrats. Instead of recommending a veto of this bill, the President's senior advisers should recommend agencies faithfully follow rulemaking procedures so Congress does not have to shorten the leash even further.

Billion-dollar rules are a fast-growing plague inflicted by Washington's out-of-control regulators on small businesses and ordinary citizens throughout the land. According to a 2014 report by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, over 30 billion-dollar rules since the year 2000 are imposing roughly \$100 billion a year in costs on our struggling economy. The American Action Forum reports that the Obama administration plans to impose at least another \$113 billion in regulatory costs before it leaves office, and this is on top of the estimated \$2 trillion-plus in total costs from Washington regulators that are crushing our economy and strangling economic recovery.

□ 1700

It is time for measures that shout, "Stop," to Washington's regulators

and force them to find a better way. That is exactly what this bill does. It imposes automatic stays when new billion-dollar rules are challenged in court so small businesses and hard-working Americans don't have to bear the crushing cost of illegal rules while they pursue their rights in court. It creates a powerful incentive for agencies tempted to zoom past the billion-dollar mark to stop, turn around, and find a less costly way to achieve the same benefits for the American people.

Hopefully, once this bill becomes law, we will stop seeing needless billion-dollar rules. And if we ever do need a billion-dollar-a-year solution, this bill will help make sure regulators leave it to the accountable Members of Congress to make such monumental policy decisions by statute.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3438

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 "Require Evaluation before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act of 2016" or as the "REVIEW Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. RELIEF PENDING REVIEW.

Section 705 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "When" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—When"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) HIGH-IMPACT RULES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget; and

"(B) the term 'high-impact rule' means any rule that the Administrator determines may impose an annual cost on the economy of not less than \$1,000,000.

"(2) IDENTIFICATION.—A final rule may not be published or take effect until the agency making the rule submits the rule to the Administrator and the Administrator makes a determination as to whether the rule is a high-impact rule, which shall be published by the agency with the final rule.

"(3) RELIEF.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an agency shall postpone the effective date of a high-impact rule of the agency until the final disposition of all actions seeking judicial review of the rule.

"(B) FAILURE TO TIMELY SEEK JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding section 553(d), if no

person seeks judicial review of a high-impact rule—

"(i) during any period explicitly provided for judicial review under the statute authorizing the making of the rule; or

"(ii) if no such period is explicitly provided for, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the high-impact rule is published in the Federal Register,

the high-impact rule may take effect as early as the date on which the applicable period ends.

"(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to impose any limitation under law on any court against the issuance of any order enjoining the implementation of any rule."

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-777. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-777.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike ";" and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 21, insert after "rule" the following: "(other than an excepted rule)".

Page 3, line 23, strike the period and insert ";" and".

Page 3, insert after line 23 the following:

(C) the term "excepted rule" means any rule that would reduce the cost of healthcare for a person over the age of 65.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, my amendment would exempt rules that reduce the cost of health care for Americans over the age of 65 from the unnecessary requirements of this legislation.

Mr. Chair, our country's seniors face growing healthcare costs, and any delays in rules that could reduce those costs would be a terrible burden to place on America's seniors.

According to the latest retiree healthcare cost estimates from Fidelity Benefits Consulting, a 65-year-old couple retiring this year will need an average of \$260,000 in today's dollars to cover medical expenses throughout their retirement. That applies only to retirees with traditional Medicare insurance coverage and does not include costs associated with nursing home care.

Fidelity estimates that a 65-year-old couple would need an additional

\$130,000 to ensure against long-term care expenses. That is because the median annual cost for the base rent at an assisted living community is about \$41,000 per year. The average annual cost for skilled nursing is about \$71,000 per year. Because much long-term care is provided by unpaid family caregivers or is covered by Medicaid, the average senior's lifetime out-of-pocket long-term care expenses are about \$50,000.

The legislation before us would open up the rulemaking process to lengthy delay tactics, allowing companies or entities opposed to certain rules to take advantage of the court system to stymie final rulemaking for years. Our seniors don't have years to wait on policies that could save them precious dollars in their retirement. There is already a robust process in place for opponents to challenge them in court, with the decision whether to delay a rule rightly placed in the court's hands.

This legislation is a gift to special interests who will benefit from the delay of the imposition of rules that reduce costs for seniors. These special interests are willing to spend millions of dollars and waste years fighting regulations that will benefit the American people, particularly our seniors.

High-impact rules typically involve either the transfer of Federal funds or rules with billions of dollars in benefits to the public. During fiscal year 2014, for example, executive branch agencies adopted 53 major rules, 35 of which were transfer rules. According to the Office of Management and Budget, transfer rules merely implement Federal budgetary programs as required or authorized by Congress, such as rules associated with the Medicare program and the Federal Pell Grant Program.

There are 44.9 million seniors on Medicare in this country. Frivolous lawsuits to delay rules that will increase benefits or those that will produce cost savings would be a grave betrayal of the promise that we have made to keep America's seniors healthy.

My amendment simply ensures that any rule that reduces costs of health care for Americans 65 or older will not be subject to unnecessary delays.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the REVIEW Act applies to all new billion-dollar rules. That is for one simple reason: the harm that wasting billions of dollars in unnecessary compliance costs does to job creation, productive investment, and economic recovery. Those costs should not have to be incurred during ultimately successful litigation challenging new billion-dollar rules.

The amendment is concerned primarily with transfer rules that authorize the flow of funding between Federal healthcare accounts for seniors. With respect to those rules, there is no need for concern that the bill would impede the operation of those rules. To my knowledge, there has never been a billion-dollar transfer rule, much less one affecting seniors, that has been challenged in court, nor am I aware of any reason to expect that one ever will be challenged. The bill, of course, only requires a stay if a timely challenge to a rule is brought in court.

As for other rules that may be within the amendment's scope, if such rules are needed, then agencies can avoid the bill's application by coming up with effective regulations that cost less than \$1 billion a year. That is a goal to be pursued, not blocked.

If, in an unusual case, the needed solution truly must cost a billion dollars a year or more, then the decision to adopt that solution is a decision Congress should make, not an agency. Congress, moreover, can make that decision without hindrance of litigation through fair and open consideration and debate by the people's Representatives, not unaccountable bureaucrats.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, the chairman just made my point. This legislation, as currently written, would apply to all rules, including rules that would reduce the cost of health care for America's seniors. In fact, the OMB says—and I repeat—that a transfer rule merely “implements Federal budgetary programs, as required or authorized by Congress, such as rules associated with the Medicare program and the Federal Pell Grant Program.”

So we know, in fact, that, according to OMB, the Medicare program is considered part of the transfer rule. So this legislation, as currently written, means that all rules, including any rule that is promulgated that would reduce costs for seniors would, in fact, be subjected to this delay.

My amendment is necessary, by the chairman's own admission. We need this amendment so that we can at least exempt out those provisions that might produce real savings for America's seniors.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-777.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 21, insert after “rule” the following: “(other than an excepted rule)”.

Page 3, line 23, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 3, insert after line 23 the following:

(C) the term “excepted rule” means any rule that would increase college affordability.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3438, which would exempt from the bill any rule related to increasing the affordability of higher education.

It is no secret that the rising cost of college is posing grave challenges to students and families across the country. Every year, Americans are being forced to take out higher loan amounts to pay for tuition, fees, textbooks, and housing. Today, student debt totals more than \$1.3 trillion.

In my home State of Washington, 56 percent of graduates from 4-year universities leave school with debt and, on average, those students owe more than \$23,000 upon graduation. At a time when Americans owe more in student loan debt than credit card debt, it is more critical than ever that we prioritize college affordability for all.

The issue is personal for me. When I was young, my father lost his job, and my parents never got back on track financially. But thanks to student loans and financial aid, I was still able to get a great education. With that education and hard work, I was able to build a successful career and be in the position that I am in today.

We need to make sure students have the same opportunities that were available to us. That starts by protecting the Department of Education's ability to administer vital financial aid programs like Pell grants and Federal student loans. These programs have enabled millions of low-income students to attend college. If we restrict the Department's ability to administer them, we are also endangering the millions of hardworking Americans who rely on their critical support.

This year alone, more than 8.4 million low-income students will benefit from Pell grants. Over 20 million student loans will be issued to help students and families afford the cost of college. We cannot put these essential resources at risk. They help ensure higher education is never out of reach, and they must be protected.

That is why I am offering this straightforward and narrowly tailored amendment. It simply protects the Department of Education's ability to administer Federal student aid programs that keep college affordable and accessible to all.

Today, too many families are struggling to put their kids through college, and we should be making it easier for them, not harder. My amendment will prevent the underlying bill from threatening the vital assistance offered each year through Pell grants, student loans, and other forms of financial aid.

Particularly as students are heading back to school in communities across the country, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Once again, the REVIEW Act applies to all new billion-dollar rules. The bill's relief is urgently needed. Failures to require stays of billion-dollar rules during litigation wastes billions of dollars in unnecessary compliance costs and resources that are needlessly paid. Those costs are essential to job creation, productive investment, and economic recovery. These costs should not have to be incurred during ultimate successful litigation challenging new billion-dollar rules.

If education rules like those the amendment would carve out are needed, the relevant agencies can avoid the bill's application by coming up with effective regulations that cost less than \$1 billion a year. That is a goal to be pursued, not blocked, especially when it is the presence in higher education that is actually driving up much of the cost concerning the upward spiral in the cost of higher education.

If, in an unusual case, a needed solution truly must cost a billion dollars a year or more, then, once again, the decision to adopt that solution is a decision Congress should make, not an agency.

With all due respect, my friend and I have worked on legislation together. I have a list here of the billion-dollar rules and there is nothing—not one name on here—that has anything to do with the Department of Education.

Furthermore, I would love to work on a piece of legislation reducing the cost of post-high school education with my colleague. I didn't start college until after I was 30. My wife and I put me through college and law school. We borrowed money through grants and anything we could do. I know the cost of education was expensive back then, and I am stymied at what it is now, but this is not the mechanism to do that.

This legislation that Republicans brought to the floor—my legislation—deals with overseeing the government

and the regulation that is crushing jobs in this country. Congress has the responsibility, as I repeat, to make the laws and to control the purse strings.

So I offer again to my good friend an opportunity to work with her on lowering the cost of education in this country, but I think it should be in a separate piece of legislation and not this. I ask my colleagues to not support the amendment and I ask them to support the overall legislation that we brought to the floor.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, the bill, as it exists, doesn't require challenges to have any merit, so it opens the door to frivolous lawsuits. The Office of Management and Budget did say that this would hit the billion-dollar threshold.

I do think that it is very, very important that we support my amendment so that we protect students today from harmful, unintended consequences of the REVIEW Act. I want to thank my colleague for being willing to work together on ways to improve college affordability going forward. I would ask that he support this amendment as part of that, but I would be happy to work with him on other issues as well.

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

□ 1715

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-777 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. DELBENE of Washington.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

AYES—189

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Aguilar	Fudge	Napolitano
Ashford	Gabbard	Neal
Bass	Gallego	Nolan
Beatty	Garamendi	Norcross
Becerra	Graham	O'Rourke
Bera	Grayson	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Payne
Blum	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hahn	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pingree
F.	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Poliquin
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	Rigell
Carney	Jeffries	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Royal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Katko	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Keating	T.
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kind	Scott, David
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Connolly	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Langevin	Sherman
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sinema
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sires
Courtney	Lawrence	Slaughter
Crowley	Lee	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin	Speier
Cummings	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Curbelo (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Takano
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Titus
DeGette	Lowenthal	Tonko
Delaney	Lowey	Torres
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Tsongas
DelBene	(NM)	Van Hollen
Dent	Luján, Ben Ray	Vargas
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Veasey
Deutch	Lynch	Vela
Dingell	Maloney,	Velázquez
Doggett	Carolyn	Visclosky
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Walz
F.	Matsui	Wasserman
Duckworth	McCollum	Schultz
Edwards	McDermott	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Engel	McNerney	Welch
Eshoo	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
Esty	Meng	Yarmuth
Farr	Moulton	
Foster	Murphy (FL)	
		NOES—232
Abraham	Bucshon	Denham
Aderholt	Burgess	DeSantis
Allen	Byrne	DesJarlais
Amash	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dold
Babin	Carter (TX)	Donovan
Barletta	Chabot	Duffy
Barr	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Barton	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Benishek	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Bilirakis	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bishop (MI)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Black	Comstock	Fitzpatrick
Blackburn	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bost	Cook	Fleming
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Flores
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Forbes
Brat	Crawford	Fortenberry
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Foxx
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Franks (AZ)
Buchanan	Davidson	Frelinghuysen
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Garrett

Gibbs Loudermilk
 Gibson Love
 Gohmert Lucas
 Goodlatte Luetkemeyer
 Gosar Lummis
 Gowdy MacArthur
 Granger Marchant
 Graves (GA) Marino
 Graves (LA) Massie
 Graves (MO) McCarthy
 Griffith McCaul
 Grothman McClintock
 Guinta McHenry
 Guthrie McKinley
 Hanna McMorris
 Hardy Rodgers
 Harper McSally
 Harris Meadows
 Hartzler Meehan
 Heck (NV) Messer
 Hensarling Mica
 Herrera Beutler Miller (FL)
 Hice, Jody B. Miller (MI)
 Hill Moolenaar
 Holding Mooney (WV)
 Hudson Mullin
 Huelskamp Mulvaney
 Huizenga (MI) Murphy (PA)
 Hultgren Neugebauer
 Hunter Newhouse
 Hurd (TX) Noem
 Hurt (VA) Nugent
 Issa Nunes
 Jenkins (KS) Olson
 Jenkins (WV) Palazzo
 Johnson (OH) Paulsen
 Johnson, Sam Pearce
 Jolly Perry
 Jordan Peterson
 Joyce Pittenger
 Kelly (MS) Pitts
 Kelly (PA) Pompeo
 King (IA) Posey
 King (NY) Price, Tom
 Kinzinger (IL) Ratcliffe
 Kline Reed
 Knight Reichert
 Labrador Renacci
 LaHood Ribble
 LaMalfa Rice (SC)
 Lamborn Roby
 Lance Roe (TN)
 Latta Rogers (KY)
 LoBiondo Rohrabacher
 Long Rokita

NOT VOTING—10

Brooks (AL) Rogers (AL)
 Moore Rush
 Palmer Sanchez, Loretta
 Poe (TX) Schrader

□ 1742

Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, WESTBER of Florida, WESTERMAN, REICHERT, HURT of Virginia, BURGESS, BILIRAKIS, COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. WOODALL, GOODLATTE, JOLLY, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, DENT, BLUM, CURBELO of Florida, and KATKO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
 A recorded vote was ordered.
 The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]
 AYES—184

Adams Fudge
 Aguilar Gabbard
 Ashford Gallego
 Beatty Garamendi
 Becerra Graham
 Bera Grayson
 Beyer Green, Al
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
 Blumenauer Grijalva
 Bonamici Gutierrez
 Boyle, Brendan Hahn
 F. Hanna
 Brady (PA) Hastings
 Brown (FL) Heck (WA)
 Brownley (CA) Higgins
 Bustos Himes
 Butterfield Hinojosa
 Capps Honda
 Capuano Hoyer
 Cárdenas Huffman
 Carney Israel
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee
 Cartwright Jeffries
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B.
 Chu, Judy Jones
 Cicilline Kaptur
 Clark (MA) Keating
 Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL)
 Clay Kennedy
 Cleaver Kildave
 Clyburn Kilmer
 Cohen Kind
 Connolly Kirkpatrick
 Conyers Kuster
 Cooper Langevin
 Costa Larsen (WA)
 Costello (PA) Larson (CT)
 Courtney Lawrence
 Crowley Lee
 Cuellar Levin
 Cummings Lewis
 Curbelo (FL) Lieu, Ted
 Davis (CA) Lipinski
 Davis, Danny Loebbeck
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeGette Lowenthal
 Delaney Lowey
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham (NM)
 DelBene Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 DeSaulnier Lynch
 Deutch Maloney,
 Dingell Doyle, Michael F.
 Doggett Duckworth
 Doyle, Michael F. Edwards
 Duckworth Ellison
 Edwards Ellison
 Engel Engel
 Eshoo Eshoo
 Esty Esty
 Foster Foster
 Frankel (FL) Frankel

NOES—237

Abraham Brady (TX)
 Aderholt Brat
 Allen Bridenstine
 Amash Brooks (AL)
 Amodei Brooks (IN)
 Babin Buchanan
 Barletta Buck
 Barr Bucshon
 Barton Burgess
 Benishek Byrne
 Bilirakis Calvert
 Bishop (MI) Carter (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Carter (TX)
 Black Chabot
 Blackburn Chaffetz
 Blum Clawson (FL)
 Bost Blum
 Boustany Coffman
 Cole Cole
 Collins (GA) Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY) Collins (NY)
 Comstock Comstock
 Conaway Conaway
 Cook Cook
 Cramer Cramer
 Crawford Crawford
 Crenshaw Crenshaw
 Culberson Culberson
 Davidson Davidson
 Davis, Rodney Davis, Rodney
 Denham Denham
 Dent Dent
 DeSantis DeSantis
 DesJarlais DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart
 Dold Dold
 Donovan Donovan

Duffy Kinzinger (IL)
 Duncan (SC) Kline
 Duncan (TN) Knight
 Ellmers (NC) Labrador
 Emmer (MN) LaHood
 Farenthold LaMalfa
 Farr Lamborn
 Fincher Lance
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann LoBiondo
 Fleming Long
 Flores Loudermilk
 Forbes Love
 Fortenberry Lucas
 Foss Luetkemeyer
 Fox Franks (AZ)
 Franks (AZ) MacArthur
 Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen
 Garrett Garrett
 Gibbs Gibbs
 Gibson Gibson
 Gohmert Gohmert
 Goodlatte Goodlatte
 Gosar Gosar
 Gowdy Gowdy
 Granger Granger
 Graves (GA) Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA) Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
 Griffith Griffith
 Grothman Grothman
 Guinta Guinta
 Guthrie Guthrie
 Hardy Hardy
 Harper Harper
 Harris Harris
 Hartzler Hartzler
 Heck (NV) Heck (NV)
 Hensarling Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B. Hice, Jody B.
 Hill Hill
 Holding Holding
 Hudson Hudson
 Huelskamp Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren Hultgren
 Hunter Hunter
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA) Hurt (VA)
 Issa Issa
 Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV) Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
 Jolly Jolly
 Jordan Jordan
 Joyce Joyce
 Kelly (MS) Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
 King (IA) King (IA)
 King (NY) King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL) Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline Kline
 Knight Knight
 Labrador Labrador
 LaHood LaHood
 LaMalfa LaMalfa
 Lamborn Lamborn
 Lance Lance
 Latta Latta
 LoBiondo LoBiondo
 Long Long

NOT VOTING—10

Bass Rogers (AL)
 Moore Rush
 Poe (TX) Sanchez, Loretta
 Rice (NY) Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1746

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.
 The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review, and, pursuant

to House Resolution 875, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

□ 1745

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3438 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 21, insert after "rule" the following: "(except as provided in subsection (c))".

Page 5, insert after "of any rule." on line 4 the following:

"(c) EXCEPTION FOR RULES TO DECREASE THE VULNERABILITY OF THE PUBLIC TO A TERRORIST ATTACK.—The provisions of subsection (b) do not apply in the case of a rule that pertains to protecting the Nation against security threats."

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

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

Just over a week ago, the Nation observed the 15th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack. On that day, terror and hate not only took the lives of 3,000 innocent people, but also inflicted \$3.3 trillion in economic damage to our Nation. In response to this unprecedented attack on U.S. soil, the Department of Homeland Security was established.

To be successful, DHS must work with State, local, and private sector partners. Many of DHS's programs are voluntary, but in some areas, where the threats are high and voluntary measures are inadequate, DHS utilizes Federal rulemaking.

As we saw last weekend in Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey, the threat picture is constantly evolving. Today, the threat of individuals acting alone, inspired online by foreign and domestic terrorist groups, is arguably

one of the greatest homeland security challenges we face. Our government needs to be able to respond to evolving threats like the "lone wolf" threat.

I am alarmed to see that, under this bill, critical action by the Department of Homeland Security could be indefinitely hamstrung, as protracted, possibly frivolous, legal challenges move through the courts. From a homeland security standpoint, there is no justification for putting arbitrary obstacles in the way of DHS when it needs to issue regulations to protect critical infrastructure from infiltration by terrorists, keep dangerous materials out of terrorists' hands, and secure the border, yet the underlying bill would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would provide for an exception to the rule in instances that "pertain to protecting the Nation against security threats." There are things we can do to make the country more secure, but it seems that the majority lacks the will to do so.

Earlier today, Democrats tried to get legislation to bar individuals on the no-fly terrorist watch list from buying guns considered. The majority blocked the legislation.

Then we tried to get considered a measure that I authored to expand DHS' overseas screening and vetting operations to protect ISIL-trained European foreign fighters and other dangerous people from entering the United States. This measure was blocked, too.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, in my committee, we received testimony from prominent law enforcement officials about how the availability of firearms put their officers and the citizens they protect in harm's way. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Austin, Texas, police chief testified that police chiefs are "haunted" by the threat posed by the "widespread availability of firearms in our country," which "makes it possible for potentially dangerous persons to legally acquire weapons to cause mayhem and colossal casualties."

To this point, this past weekend, in a St. Cloud, Minnesota, mall, 10 people, including a pregnant woman, were stabbed by a young man who is believed to have been radicalized by ISIL. Thankfully, all the injured individuals are expected to recover.

These days, it is not too hard to imagine the carnage that could have been inflicted on this innocent population if the assailant had, instead, entered the mall with an AK-47 assault weapon and large-capacity clips.

This Congress must show leadership on the pressing homeland security challenges to the Nation. Standing in the way of the Department of Homeland Security, as it tries to protect our citizens, is the wrong thing to do.

For these and a number of other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "aye" on my motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, billion-dollar rules are among the worst offenses of the pen-and-phone Obama administration. This administration is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to insert EPA's water permitting agents into every American's backyard. It is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to shut down this country's cheap generation of electricity. It is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to impose unachievable ozone standards that will strangle economic opportunities in counties all over this Nation. Above all, wherever it can, it is using overreaching billion-dollar rules to execute end runs around Congress and achieve legislative ends it knows it cannot achieve in Congress.

The Obama administration says, on spurious grounds, it will veto this bill.

This motion to recommit tries to obstruct this bill by means of procedural obstruction. The House has already passed antiterrorism measures. Why do my colleagues across the aisle want to block this good bill?

The legislation that we have passed is H.R. 4401, the Amplifying Local Efforts to Root Out Terror Act; H.R. 4820, the Combating Terrorist Recruitment Act; and H.R. 4407, the Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act. These were all almost unanimously passed. I sit on the Committee on Homeland Security. We have been passing good legislation, and we continue to pass good legislation.

This administration and its allies on the other side of the aisle would rather let Congress duck accountability to the voters for billion-dollar decisions. It would rather give billion-dollar phones and pens to unaccountable bureaucrats up and down Pennsylvania Avenue so they can do things the voters cannot stop.

The American people are telling us every day, "Enough." I am telling President Obama and my colleagues, "Enough."

Stand up for accountability. Stand up for the small-business owners and workers who are being crushed by Washington's bureaucratic billion-dollar bullies who are against this motion and please vote for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; passage of H.R. 5461; and suspending the rules and passing the following bills: H.R. 5859, H.R. 6007, H.R. 5977, H.R. 6014, and H.R. 5147.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 240, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

AYES—182

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

NOES—240

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (NY)
Allen	Bridenstine	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Babin	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Buck	Cramer
Barr	Bucshon	Crawford
Barton	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benishek	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chabot	Denham
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Dent
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Bost	Coffman	DesJarlais
Boustany	Cole	Diaz-Balart

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

NOT VOTING—9

Duffy	Rush	Tiberi
Moore	Lujan, Loretta	Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX)	Stivers	Yoder

□ 1804

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 180, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

AYES—244

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Ashford

Babin	Grothman	Palazzo
Barletta	Guinta	Palmer
Barr	Guthrie	Paulsen
Barton	Hanna	Pearce
Benishek	Hardy	Perry
Bilirakis	Harper	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Harris	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Poliquin
Black	Hensarling	Pompeo
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Blum	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bost	Hill	Ratcliffe
Boustany	Holding	Reed
	Hudson	Reichert
	Huelskamp	Renacci
	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
	Hunter	Rigell
	Hurd (TX)	Roby
	Hurt (VA)	Roe (TN)
	Bucshon	Rogers (AL)
	Burgess	Rogers (KY)
	Byrne	Rohrabacher
	Calvert	Rokita
	Carter (GA)	Rooney (FL)
	Carter (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
	Chabot	Roskam
	Chaffetz	Ross
	Jordan	Rothfus
	Joyce	Rouzer
	Katko	Royce
	Kelly (MS)	Russell
	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
	King (IA)	Scalise
	King (NY)	Schweikert
	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
	Kline	Sensenbrenner
	Knight	Sessions
	Labrador	Shimkus
	LaHood	Shuster
	LaMalfa	Simpson
	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
	Lance	Smith (NE)
	Latta	Smith (NJ)
	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
	Denham	Love
	Dent	Lucas
	DeSantis	Luetkemeyer
	DesJarlais	Lummis
	Diaz-Balart	MacArthur
	Dold	Marchant
	Donovan	Marino
	Duffy	Massie
	Duncan (SC)	McCarthy
	Duncan (TN)	McCaul
	Ellmers (NC)	McClintock
	Emmer (MN)	McHenry
	Fincher	McKinley
	Farenthold	McMorris
	Fitzpatrick	Rodgers
	Fleischmann	Flores
	Fleming	Meadows
	McSally	Fortenberry
	Forbes	Fox
	Frelinghuysen	Franks (AZ)
	Garrett	Frelinghuysen
	Gibbs	Garrett
	Gibson	Gillespie
	Gohmert	Gibson
	Goodlatte	Gohmert
	Gosar	Goodlatte
	Gowdy	Gosar
	Granger	Gowdy
	Graves (GA)	Granger
	Graves (LA)	Graves (GA)
	Graves (MO)	Graves (LA)
	Griffith	Graves (MO)
		Griffith
		Olson

NOES—180

Capuano	Cooper
Cárdenas	Costa
Carmichael	Courtney
Carney	Crowley
Carson (IN)	Cummings
Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Chu, Judy	DeGette
Cicilline	Delaney
Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Clay	DeSaulnier
Cleaver	Deutch
Brown (FL)	Cohen
Brownley (CA)	Connolly
Bustos	Conyers
Butterfield	
Capps	

Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 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)

NOT VOTING—7

Crenshaw
 Moore
 Poe (TX)

□ 1811

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET
 TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 143, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—282

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford

Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bera
 Bilirakis

Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany

Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buhtanes
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Cárdenas
 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
 DeFazio
 Delaney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)

NAYS—143

Adams
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)

Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pittenger

Pitts
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Foster
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries

NOT VOTING—6

Moore
 Poe (TX)

□ 1818

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNITY COUNTERTERRORISM
 PREPAREDNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5859) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the major metropolitan area counterterrorism training and exercise grant program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 30, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—395

Abraham
 Adams
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bass

Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn

Blum
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Boustany
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (IN)

Brown (FL) Gibbs
 Brownley (CA) Gibson
 Buchanan Goodlatte
 Buschon Gowdy
 Burgess Graham
 Bustos Granger
 Butterfield Graves (GA)
 Calvert Graves (LA)
 Capps Graves (MO)
 Capuano Grayson
 Cárdenas Green, Al
 Carney Green, Gene
 Carson (IN) Griffith
 Carter (GA) Grijalva
 Carter (TX) Grothman
 Cartwright Guinta
 Castor (FL) McHenry
 Castro (TX) Gutiérrez
 Chabot Hahn
 Chaffetz Hanna
 Chu, Judy Hardy
 Cicilline Harper
 Clark (MA) Hartzler
 Clarke (NY) Hastings
 Clawson (FL) Heck (NV)
 Clay Heck (WA)
 Cleaver Hensarling
 Clyburn Herrera Beutler
 Coffman Hice, Jody B.
 Cohen Higgins
 Cole Hill
 Collins (GA) Himes
 Collins (NY) Hinojosa
 Comstock Holding
 Conaway Honda
 Connolly Hoyer
 Conyers Hudson
 Cook Huffman
 Cooper Huizenga (MI)
 Costa Hultgren
 Costello (PA) Hunter
 Courtney Hurd (TX)
 Cramer Hurd (VA)
 Crawford Israel
 Crenshaw Issa
 Crowley Jackson Lee
 Cuellar Jeffries
 Culberson Jenkins (KS)
 Cummings Jenkins (WV)
 Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA)
 Davis (CA) Johnson (OH)
 Davis, Danny Johnson, E. B.
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam
 DeFazio Jolly
 DeGette Joyce
 Delaney Kaptur
 DeLauro Katko
 DelBene Keating
 Denham Kelly (IL)
 Dent Kelly (MS)
 DeSantis Kelly (PA)
 DeSaulnier Kennedy
 DesJarlais Kildee
 Deutch Kilmer
 Diaz-Balart Kind
 Dingell King (IA)
 Doggett King (NY)
 Dold Kinzinger (IL)
 Donovan Kirkpatrick
 Doyle, Michael Kline
 F. Knight
 Duckworth Kuster
 Duffy Renacci
 Duncan (SC) LaHood
 Edwards LaMalfa
 Ellison Lamborn
 Ellmers (NC) Lance
 Emmer (MN) Langevin
 Engel Larsen (WA)
 Eshoo Larson (CT)
 Esty Latta
 Farenthold Lawrence
 Farr Lee
 Fincher Levin
 Fitzpatrick Lewis
 Fleischmann Lieu, Ted
 Flores Lipinski
 Forbes LoBiondo
 Fortenberry Loeb sack
 Foster Lofgren
 Foxx Long
 Frankel (FL) Loudermilk
 Franks (AZ) Love
 Frelinghuysen Lowenthal
 Fudge Lucas
 Gabbard Luetkemeyer
 Gallego Lujan Grisham
 Garamendi Lujan Grisham
 Garrett (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McSally
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Duncan (TN)
 Fleming
 Gohmert

NOT VOTING—6
 Moore
 Poe (TX)

□ 1826

Messrs. RICE of South Carolina, WITTMAN, and DUNCAN of South Carolina changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 49 TO INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN IMPACTS ON COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH AND REENTRY ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6007) to amend title 49, United States Code, to include consideration of certain impacts on commercial space launch and reentry activities in a navigable airspace analysis, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—425

Abraham
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin

NAYS—30

Aderholt
 Amash
 Brat
 Brooks (AL)
 Buck
 Byrne
 Labrador
 Lummis
 Massie
 Meadows
 Mulvaney
 Gosar
 Harris
 Huelskamp
 Jones
 Jordan
 Labrador
 Lummis
 Massie
 Meadows
 Mulvaney
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta

Tiberi
 Walters, Mimi

Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Boustany
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clawson (FL)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DeSaulnier
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Donovan
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garrett

Palmer
 Posey
 Ribble
 Rigell
 Roby
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Schweikert
 Stutzman
 Webster (FL)

Donovan
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garrett
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 Labradon
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marin
 Massie
 Matsui
 McArthur
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Kennedy
 Poli quin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Price (NC)
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppberger
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff

Perry	Sánchez, Linda	Trott	Amodei	Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Peters	T.	Tsongas	Ashford	Doggett	Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter	Salmon	Torres
Peterson	Sanford	Turner	Babin	Dold	Kelly (PA)	Perry	Sánchez, Linda	Trott
Pingree	Scarbanes	Upton	Barletta	Donovan	Kennedy	Peters	T.	Tsongas
Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao	Barr	Doyle, Michael	Kildee	Peterson	Sanford	Turner
Pitts	Schakowsky	Van Hollen	Barton	F.	Kilmer	Pingree	Scarbanes	Upton
Pocan	Schiff	Vargas	Bass	Duckworth	Kind	Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao
Poliquin	Schrader	Veasey	Beatty	Duffy	King (IA)	Pitts	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Polis	Schweikert	Vela	Becerra	Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Pocan	Schiff	Vargas
Pompeo	Scott (VA)	Velázquez	Benisishek	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin	Schrader	Veasey
Posey	Scott, Austin	Visclosky	Bera	Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Polis	Schweikert	Vela
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Wagner	Beyer	Ellison	Kline	Pompeo	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Walberg	Bilirakis	Ellmers (NC)	Knight	Posey	Scott, Austin	Visclosky
Quigley	Serrano	Walden	Bishop (GA)	Emmer (MN)	Kuster	Price (NC)	Scott, David	Wagner
Rangel	Sessions	Walker	Bishop (MI)	Engel	Labrador	Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Walorski	Bishop (UT)	Eshoo	LaHood	Quigley	Serrano	Walden
Reed	Sherman	Walz	Black	Esty	LaMalfa	Rangel	Sessions	Walker
Reichert	Shimkus	Wasserman	Blackburn	Farenthold	Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Sewell (AL)	Walorski
Renacci	Shuster	Schultz	Blum	Farr	Lance	Reed	Sherman	Walz
Ribble	Simpson	Waters, Maxine	Blumenauer	Fincher	Langevin	Reichert	Shimkus	Wasserman
Rice (NY)	Sinema	Watson Coleman	Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)	Renacci	Shuster	Schultz
Rice (SC)	Sires	Weber (TX)	Bost	Fleischmann	Larson (CT)	Ribble	Simpson	Waters, Maxine
Richmond	Slaughter	Webster (FL)	Boustany	Fleming	Latta	Rice (NY)	Sinema	Watson Coleman
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Welch	Boyle, Brendan	Flores	Lawrence	Rice (SC)	Sires	Weber (TX)
Roby	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup	F.	Forbes	Lee	Richmond	Slaughter	Webster (FL)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Westerman	Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Levin	Rigell	Smith (MO)	Welch
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland	Brady (TX)	Foster	Lewis	Roby	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Williams	Brat	Foxx	Lieu, Ted	Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Rohrabacher	Speier	Wilson (FL)	Bridenstine	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Rokita	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)	Brooks (AL)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Williams
Rooney (FL)	Stewart	Wittman	Brooks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Loeback	Rohrabacher	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Womack	Brown (FL)	Fudge	Lofgren	Rokita	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Roskam	Stutzman	Woodall	Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Long	Rooney (FL)	Stewart	Wittman
Ross	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth	Buchanan	Gallego	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Womack
Rothfus	Takano	Yoder	Buck	Garamendi	Love	Roskam	Stutzman	Woodall
Rouzer	Thompson (CA)	Yoho	Bucshon	Garrett	Lowenthal	Ross	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)	Burgess	Gibbs	Lowe	Rothfus	Takano	Yoder
Royce	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)	Bustos	Gibson	Lucas	Rouzer	Thompson (CA)	Yoho
Ruiz	Thornberry	Young (IN)	Butterfield	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Young (AK)
Ruppersberger	Tipton	Zeldin	Byrne	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham	Royce	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Russell	Titus	Zinke	Calvert	Gosar	(NM)	Ruiz	Thornberry	Young (IN)
Ryan (OH)	Tonko		Capps	Gowdy	Lujan, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	Tipton	Zeldin
Salmon	Torres		Capuano	Graham	(NM)	Russell	Titus	Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Moore	Rush	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi

□ 1832

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION TO PROVIDE CONGRESS ADVANCE NOTICE OF CERTAIN ANNOUNCEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5977) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to provide to the appropriate committees of Congress advance notice of certain announcements, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—424

Abraham	Aderholt	Allen
Adams	Aguilar	Amash

NOT VOTING—6

Carney	Granger	Lummis
Carson (IN)	Graves (GA)	Lynch
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	MacArthur
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
Cartwright	Grayson	Carolyn
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Marchant
Chabot	Griffith	Marino
Chaffetz	Grijalva	Masse
Chu, Judy	Grothman	Matsui
Cicilline	Guinta	McCarthy
Clark (MA)	Guthrie	McCaul
Clarke (NY)	Gutiérrez	McClintock
Clawson (FL)	Hahn	McCollum
Clay	Hanna	McDermott
Cleaver	Hardy	McGovern
Clyburn	Harper	McHenry
Coffman	Harris	McKinley
Cohen	Hartzler	McMorris
Cole	Hastings	Rodgers
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	McNerney
Collins (NY)	Heck (WA)	McSally
Comstock	Hensarling	Meadows
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Meehan
Connolly	Hice, Jody B.	Meeks
Conyers	Higgins	Meng
Cook	Hill	Messer
Cooper	Himes	Mica
Costello (PA)	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Courtney	Holding	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Honda	Moolenaar
Crawford	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)
Crenshaw	Hudson	Moulton
Crowley	Huffman	Mullin
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney
Culberson	Hultgren	Murphy (FL)
Cummings	Hunter	Murphy (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Nadler
Davidson	Hurt (VA)	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Israel	Neal
Davis, Danny	Issa	Neugebauer
Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee	Newhouse
DeFazio	Jeffries	Noem
DeGette	Jenkins (KS)	Nolan
Delaney	Jenkins (WV)	Norcross
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Nugent
DelBene	Johnson (OH)	Nunes
Denham	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Olson
DeSantis	Jolly	Palazzo
DeSaulnier	Jones	Pallone
DesJarlais	Jordan	Palmer
Deutch	Joyce	Pascrell
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Paulsen
	Katko	Payne
	Keating	Pearce

NAYS—1

Huelskamp

NOT VOTING—6

Moore	Rush	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi

□ 1839

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION TO ALLOW CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION OR ALTERATION OF STRUCTURES BY STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6014) to direct the Federal Aviation Administration to allow certain construction or alteration of structures by State departments of transportation without requiring an aeronautical study, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—425

Abraham DeLauro Jenkins (KS)
 Adams DeBene Jenkins (WV)
 Aderholt Denham Johnson (GA)
 Aguilar Dent Johnson (OH)
 Allen DeSantis Johnson, E. B.
 Amash DeSaulnier Johnson, Sam
 Amodei DesJarlais Jolly
 Ashford Deutch Jones
 Babin Diaz-Balart Jordan
 Barletta Dingell Joyce
 Barr Doggett Kaptur
 Barton Dold Katko
 Bass Donovan Keating
 Beatty Doyle, Michael Kelly (IL)
 Becerra F. Kelly (MS)
 Benishek Duckworth Kelly (PA)
 Bera Duffy Kennedy
 Beyer Duncan (SC) Kildee
 Bilirakis Duncan (TN) Kilmer
 Bishop (GA) Edwards Kind
 Bishop (MI) Ellison King (IA)
 Bishop (UT) Ellmers (NC) King (NY)
 Black Emmer (MN) Kinzinger (IL)
 Blackburn Engel Kirkpatrick
 Blum Eshoo Kline
 Blumenauer Esty Knight
 Bonamici Farenthold Kuster
 Bost Farr Labrador
 Boustany Fincher LaHood
 Boyle, Brendan Fitzpatrick LaMalfa
 F. Fleischmann Lamborn
 Brady (PA) Fleming Lance
 Brady (TX) Flores Langevin
 Brat Forbes Larsen (WA)
 Bridenstine Fortenberry Larson (CT)
 Brooks (AL) Foster Latta
 Brooks (IN) Foxx Lawrence
 Brown (FL) Frankel (FL) Lee
 Brownley (CA) Franks (AZ) Levin
 Buchanan Frelinghuysen Lewis
 Buck Fudge Lieu, Ted
 Bucshon Gabbard Lipinski
 Burgess Gallego LoBiondo
 Bustos Garamendi Loebisack
 Butterfield Garrett Lofgren
 Byrne Gibbs Long
 Calvert Gibson Loudermilk
 Capps Gohmert Love
 Capuano Goodlatte Lowenthal
 Cárdenas Gosar Lowey
 Carney Gowdy Lucas
 Carson (IN) Graham Luetkemeyer
 Carter (GA) Granger Lujan Grisham
 Carter (TX) Graves (GA) (NM)
 Cartwright Graves (LA) Luján, Ben Ray
 Castor (FL) Graves (MO) (NM)
 Castro (TX) Grayson Lummis
 Chabot Green, Al Lynch
 Chaffetz Green, Gene MacArthur
 Chu, Judy Griffith Maloney,
 Cicilline Grijalva Carolyn
 Clark (MA) Grothman Maloney, Sean
 Clarke (NY) Guinta Marchant
 Clawson (FL) Guthrie Marino
 Clay Gutiérrez Massie
 Cleaver Hahn Matsui
 Clyburn Hanna McCarthy
 Coffman Hardy McCaul
 Cohen Harper McClintock
 Cole Harris McCollum
 Collins (GA) Hartzler McDermott
 Collins (NY) Hastings McGovern
 Comstock Heck (NV) McHenry
 Conaway Heck (WA) McKinley
 Connolly Hensarling McMorris
 Conyers Herrera Beutler Rodgers
 Cook Hice, Jody B. McNeerney
 Cooper Higgins McSally
 Costa Hill Meadows
 Costello (PA) Himes Meehan
 Courtney Hinojosa Meeks
 Cramer Holding Meng
 Crawford Honda Messer
 Crenshaw Hoyer Mica
 Crowley Hudson Miller (FL)
 Cuellar Huelskamp Miller (MI)
 Culberson Huffman Moolenaar
 Cummings Huiuzenga (MI) Mooney (WV)
 Curbelo (FL) Hultgren Moulton
 Davidson Hunter Mullin
 Davis (CA) Hurd (TX) Mulvaney
 Davis, Danny Hurt (VA) Murphy (FL)
 Davis, Rodney Israel Murphy (PA)
 DeFazio Issa Nadler
 DeGette Jackson Lee Napolitano
 Delaney Jeffries Neal

Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Pomy
 Price (NC)
 Price, Tom
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)

Moore
 Poe (TX)

Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—6

Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Tiberi
 Walters, Mimi

□ 1845

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to allow the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into reimbursable agreements for certain airport projects."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BATHROOMS ACCESSIBLE IN EVERY SITUATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend title 40, United States Code, to require that male and female restrooms in public buildings be equipped with baby changing facilities, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 34, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—389

Abraham Deutch Kildee
 Adams Diaz-Balart Kilmer
 Aderholt Kind
 Aguilar Doggett King (IA)
 Allen Dold King (NY)
 Amodei Donovan Kinzinger (IL)
 Ashford Doyle, Michael Kirkpatrick
 Babin F. Kline
 Barletta Duckworth Knight
 Barr Duffy Kuster
 Barton Duncan (TN) Labrador
 Bass Edwards LaHood
 Beatty Ellison LaMalfa
 Becerra Ellmers (NC) Lamborn
 Benishek Emmer (MN) Lance
 Bera Engel Langevin
 Beyer Eshoo Larsen (WA)
 Bilirakis Esty Latta
 Bishop (GA) Farr Lawrence
 Bishop (MI) Fincher Lee
 Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Levin
 Black Fleischmann Lewis
 Blackburn Fleming Lieu, Ted
 Blum Flores Lipinski
 Blumenauer Forbes LoBiondo
 Bonamici Fortenberry Loebisack
 Bost Foster Lofgren
 Boustany Foxx Long
 Boyle, Brendan Frankel (FL) Love
 F. Franks (AZ) Lowenthal
 Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen Lowey
 Brady (TX) Fudge Lucas
 Bridenstine Gabbard Luetkemeyer
 Brooks (IN) Brooks (IN) Gallego
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Garamendi
 Brownley (CA) Brownley (CA) Garrett
 Buchanan Buchanan Gibbon Luján, Ben Ray
 Buck Gohmert (NM)
 Bucshon Goodlatte Lynch
 Burgess Goodlatte MacArthur
 Bustos Gowdy Maloney,
 Butterfield Graham Carolyn
 Byrne Granger Maloney, Sean
 Calvert Graves (GA) Marchant
 Capps Graves (LA) McSally
 Capuano Graves (MO) Matsui
 Cárdenas Grayson McCarty
 Carney Green, Al McCaul
 Carson (IN) Green, Gene McCollum
 Carter (GA) Grijalva McDermott
 Carter (TX) Guinta McGovern
 Cartwright Guthrie McHenry
 Castor (FL) Gutiérrez McKinley
 Castro (TX) Hahn McMorris
 Chabot Hanna Rodgers
 Chu, Judy Hardy McNeerney
 Cicilline Harper McSally
 Clark (MA) Hartzler Meadows
 Clarke (NY) Hastings Meehan
 Clawson (FL) Hill Meeks
 Clay Himes Meng
 Cleaver Hinojosa Messer
 Clyburn Hensarling
 Coffman Herrera Beutler Mica
 Cohen Higgins Miller (FL)
 Cole Hill Miller (MI)
 Collins (GA) Himes Moolenaar
 Collins (NY) Hinojosa Mooney (WV)
 Comstock Holding Moulton
 Conaway Honda Mullin
 Connolly Hoyer Murphy (FL)
 Conyers Hurd (TX) Murphy (PA)
 Cook Hudson Murphy (PA)
 Cooper Huffman Nadler
 Costa Huiuzenga (MI) Napolitano
 Costello (PA) Hultgren Neal
 Courtney Hunter Neugebauer
 Cramer Hurd (TX) Newhouse
 Crawford Hurd (VA) Noem
 Crenshaw Israel Nolan
 Crowley Issa Norcross
 Cuellar Jackson Lee Nugent
 Culberson Jeffries Nunes
 Cummings Jenkins (KS) O'Rourke
 Curbelo (FL) Jenkins (WV) Olson
 Davidson Johnson (GA) Palazzo
 Davis (CA) Johnson (OH) Pallone
 Davis, Danny Johnson, E. B. Palmer
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam Pascrell
 DeFazio Jolly Jolly
 DeGette Jordan Payne
 Delaney Joyce Pearce
 DeLauro Kaptur Pelosi
 DeBene Katko Perlmutter
 Denham Keating Peters
 Dent Kelly (IL) Peterson
 DeSantis Kelly (MS) Pingree
 DeSaulnier Kelly (PA) Pittenger
 DesJarlais Kennedy Pitts

Pocan	Scalise	Trott
Poliquin	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Polis	Schiff	Turner
Pompeo	Schrader	Upton
Posey	Schweikert	Valadao
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Price, Tom	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Quigley	Scott, David	Veasey
Rangel	Sensenbrenner	Vela
Ratcliffe	Serrano	Velazquez
Reed	Sessions	Visclosky
Reichert	Sewell (AL)	Wagner
Renacci	Sherman	Walberg
Ribble	Shimkus	Walden
Rice (NY)	Shuster	Walker
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Walorski
Richmond	Sinema	Walz
Rigell	Sires	Wasserman
Roby	Slaughter	Schultz
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Watson Coleman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Welch
Rooney (FL)	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)	Westerman
Roskam	Speier	Williams
Ross	Stefanik	Wilson (FL)
Rothfus	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Rouzer	Stivers	Wittman
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Womack
Royce	Takano	Woodall
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Yoder
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Ryan (OH)	Tipton	Young (IN)
Sánchez, Linda	Titus	Zeldin
T.	Tonko	
Sarbanes	Torres	

NAYS—34

Amash	Grothman	Rokita
Brat	Harris	Salmon
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Sanford
Burgess	Huelskamp	Stutzman
Chaffetz	Jones	Thornberry
Clawson (FL)	Loudermilk	Weber (TX)
Collins (GA)	Lummis	Westmoreland
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Yoho
Farenthold	McClintock	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Zinke
Gosar	Perry	
Griffith	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—8

Larson (CT)	Rush	Walters, Mimi
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters, Maxine
Poe (TX)	Tiberi	

□ 1851

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require restrooms in public buildings to be equipped with baby changing facilities."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 535 (on passage of H.R. 3438), 536 (on passage of H.R. 5461), 537 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5859), 538 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 6007), 539 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5977), 540 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 6014), and 541 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5147) I did not cast my votes due to illness. Had I been present. I would have voted "yea" on all of the votes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE). Pursuant to clause 8 of

rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on additional motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

MOBILE WORKFORCE STATE INCOME TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2315) to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2315

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 "Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON STATE WITHHOLDING AND TAXATION OF EMPLOYEE INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No part of the wages or other remuneration earned by an employee who performs employment duties in more than one State shall be subject to income tax in any State other than—

(1) the State of the employee's residence; and

(2) the State within which the employee is present and performing employment duties for more than 30 days during the calendar year in which the wages or other remuneration is earned.

(b) WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.—Wages or other remuneration earned in any calendar year shall not be subject to State income tax withholding and reporting requirements unless the employee is subject to income tax in such State under subsection (a). Income tax withholding and reporting requirements under subsection (a)(2) shall apply to wages or other remuneration earned as of the commencement date of employment duties in the State during the calendar year.

(c) OPERATING RULES.—For purposes of determining penalties related to an employer's State income tax withholding and reporting requirements—

(1) an employer may rely on an employee's annual determination of the time expected to be spent by such employee in the States in which the employee will perform duties absent—

(A) the employer's actual knowledge of fraud by the employee in making the determination; or

(B) collusion between the employer and the employee to evade tax;

(2) except as provided in paragraph (3), if records are maintained by an employer in the regular course of business that record the location of an employee, such records shall not preclude an employer's ability to rely on an employee's determination under paragraph (1); and

(3) notwithstanding paragraph (2), if an employer, at its sole discretion, maintains a time and attendance system that tracks where the employee performs duties on a daily basis, data from the time and attendance system shall be used instead of the employee's determination under paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) DAY.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an employee is considered present and performing employment duties within a State for a day if the employee performs more of the employee's employment duties within such State than in any other State during a day.

(B) If an employee performs employment duties in a resident State and in only one nonresident State during one day, such employee shall be considered to have performed more of the employee's employment duties in the nonresident State than in the resident State for such day.

(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the portion of the day during which the employee is in transit shall not be considered in determining the location of an employee's performance of employment duties.

(2) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" has the same meaning given to it by the State in which the employment duties are performed, except that the term "employee" shall not include a professional athlete, professional entertainer, or certain public figures.

(3) PROFESSIONAL ATHLETE.—The term "professional athlete" means a person who performs services in a professional athletic event, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional athlete.

(4) PROFESSIONAL ENTERTAINER.—The term "professional entertainer" means a person who performs services in the professional performing arts for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for performing services in his or her capacity as a professional entertainer.

(5) CERTAIN PUBLIC FIGURES.—The term "certain public figures" means persons of prominence who perform services for wages or other remuneration on a per-event basis, provided that the wages or other remuneration are paid to such person for services provided at a discrete event, in the nature of a speech, public appearance, or similar event.

(6) EMPLOYER.—The term "employer" has the meaning given such term in section 3401(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 3401(d)), unless such term is defined by the State in which the employee's employment duties are performed, in which case the State's definition shall prevail.

(7) STATE.—The term "State" means any of the several States.

(8) TIME AND ATTENDANCE SYSTEM.—The term "time and attendance system" means a system in which—

(A) the employee is required on a contemporaneous basis to record his work location for every day worked outside of the State in which the employee's employment duties are primarily performed; and

(B) the system is designed to allow the employer to allocate the employee's wages for income tax purposes among all States in which the employee performs employment duties for such employer.

(9) WAGES OR OTHER REMUNERATION.—The term "wages or other remuneration" may be limited by the State in which the employment duties are performed.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on January 1 of the 2d year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—This Act shall not apply to any tax obligation that accrues before the effective date of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2315, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act provides a clear, uniform framework for when States may tax nonresident employees who travel to the taxing State to perform work. In particular, this bill prevents States from imposing income tax compliance burdens on nonresidents who work in a foreign State for fewer than 30 days in a year.

The State tax laws that determine when a nonresident must pay a foreign State's income tax and when employers must withhold this tax are numerous and varied. Some States tax income earned within their borders by nonresidents even if the employee only works in the State for just 1 day. These complicated rules impact everyone who travels for work and many industries.

As just one example, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony in 2015 that the patchwork of State laws resulted in a manufacturing company issuing 50 W-2s to a single employee for a single year. The company executive also noted, regarding the compliance burden: many of our affected employees make less than \$50,000 per year and have limited resources to seek professional advice.

States generally allow a credit for income taxes paid to another State. However, it is not always dollar for dollar when local taxes are factored in. Credits also do not relieve workers of substantial paperwork burdens.

There are substantial burdens on employers as well. The committee heard testimony in 2014 that businesses, including small businesses, that operate interstate are subject to significant regulatory burdens with regard to compliance with nonresident State income tax withholding laws. These burdens distract from productive activity and job creation.

Nevertheless, some object that the States will lose revenue if the bill is enacted. However, an analysis from Ernst & Young found that the bill's revenue impact is minimal.

There is little motive for fraud and gaming because the amount of money at issue—taxes on less than 30 days' wages—is minimal. Also, the income tax generally has to be paid; the question is merely to whom.

I commend the bill's lead sponsors, Representatives BISHOP and JOHNSON, and thank all of the bill's cosponsors. I urge the bill's passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to yield control of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2315.

A large and broad coalition of 11 large labor and tax organizations all oppose this bill because it is an attempt to impose standardized criteria for a uniform framework for the tax treatment of out-of-state residents, would cause certain States to lose massive State income tax revenues, and would facilitate tax liability avoidance through manipulation by employers and employees alike.

It achieves this flawed result in several ways. To begin with, rather than promoting uniformity, H.R. 2315 would have a significant adverse impact on income tax revenues for certain States.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, for example, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will explain, New York could lose between \$50 million and \$125 million annually if this measure were signed into law. Other States that would also be adversely impacted and affected include Illinois, Massachusetts, and California.

As a result of the lost revenues from nonresident taxpayers, these States would be forced to make up these losses by shifting the tax burden to resident taxpayers. It may even cause these States to cut government services, such as funding for education and critical infrastructure improvements.

Another problem with H.R. 2315 is that it essentially provides a roadmap for State income tax liability avoidance.

□ 1900

By allowing an employer to rely on an employee's determination of the time he or she is expected to spend working in another State during the year, the bill prevents the employer from withholding an employee's State income taxes to a nonresident State.

This would be the result even if the employer is aware that the employee has been working in a State for more than 30 days, as long as that State cannot prove that the employee committed fraud in making his annual determination and the employer knew it.

Rather than proceeding with this flawed bill, I urge my colleagues to pass a fair and uniform framework to allow States to collect taxes owed on remote sales. By staying silent since the Supreme Court's 1992 Quill decision, the Congress has failed to ensure

that States have the authority to collect sales and use tax on Internet purchases. I am disappointed that, rather than moving the bipartisan eFairness legislation that our communities need, we are considering this measure instead.

For these concerns and other reasons, I hope that you will join me in opposing H.R. 2315.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues regarding my bipartisan, bicameral, H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the 10th Amendment, States are generally free to set their own public policy. It is important, however, that they do so in a way that does not place a substantial burden upon the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

As the American workforce becomes increasingly more mobile, Congress has the constitutional duty to ensure that State public policy does not interfere with interstate economic activity.

As an attorney and businessowner, I have seen firsthand how complicated all these different State income tax laws are for those who travel and work. These burdens affect small businesses in particular, as well as their employees, because they simply do not have the resources to comply with all the varying State income tax requirements that exist today.

Employees are currently being punished with complex reporting standards and the expense that results from filing all of this paperwork simply because they must travel outside their home State for work. And rather than expanding payroll or reducing prices for consumer goods, businesses are being forced to spend their hard-earned and scarce resources on complying with convoluted State income tax laws. This certainly fits the definition, in my opinion, of government red tape.

During the subcommittee hearing on my bill last year, one witness testified that his employer had filed 10,500 W-2s on behalf of their numerous employees, primarily because they had crossed State lines for work. He went on to tell us that one of his coworkers had to file 50 W-2s just for himself.

Imagine an individual making less than \$50,000 a year having to file 50, 20, or even 10 W-2s. It is simply unacceptable to place that burden on our workforce today, and, moreover, it is unacceptable for us to let it go unresolved any longer.

The Constitution grants Congress the authority to enact laws to protect the free flow of commerce among the States. It is imperative that Congress respects the 10th Amendment, but States must not use that power to prey upon workers from different States simply to raise revenues.

That said, the complex array of State income tax laws in this Nation deserve

a serious overhaul, and that is why conservative states' rights legislative groups such as the American Legislative Exchange Council agree and support this legislation, specifically identifying H.R. 2315 as the type of interstate commerce regulation Congress should enact. In fact, that is why more than 300 outside organizations, to date, have pledged their support for this bill.

With the help of my colleague, Representative HANK JOHNSON, on the other side of the aisle, our Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act is a carefully crafted, bipartisan, bicameral measure that streamlines income tax laws across the Nation. It creates a uniform 30-day threshold before which a nonresident cannot be exposed to another State's income tax liability. This ensures employees will have a clear understanding of their tax liability, and it gives employers a clear and consistent rule so that they can plan and accurately withhold taxes, knowing that the same rule applies for all States with an income tax. And best of all, it means much less paperwork and reduced compliance costs for everyone involved—businessowners and employees.

The goal of H.R. 2315 is to protect our mobile workforce, and that includes traveling emergency workers, first responders, trade union workers, non-profit staff, teachers, and Federal, State, and local government employees. Any organization that has employees that cross State lines for temporary periods will benefit from this law.

I would also note that great care was taken with this bill to diminish the impact on State revenues. My colleague across the aisle suggested concerns with this, and I would point out that a 2015 study the chairman raised earlier, conducted by Ernst & Young, found that H.R. 2315 would actually raise tax revenues in some States, while other States would only see a *de minimis* change.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the 308 members of the Mobile Workforce Coalition who support the bill. I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for all of his time and effort, all 180 of my colleagues who have cosponsored this House bill, as well as Senator THUNE, Senator BROWN, and nearly half of the United States Senate that have cosponsored our companion bill so far.

The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act is a simple way to reduce obvious administrative burdens with so much red tape interwoven in today's Tax Code. This bill is just a plain commonsense way to cut through the clutter and simplify part of the filing process moving forward.

Together, we can make our workforce a priority and help our small businesses grow and save. I strongly urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 2315.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2315. This bill represents a major assault on the sovereignty of the States, and does particular damage to my home State of New York, depriving it of more than \$100 million of its own tax revenue. The Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act would prohibit States from collecting income tax from an individual unless the person works more than 30 days in that State in a calendar year.

Simplifying and harmonizing the rules on tax collection across the country is a worthy goal, but this bill would block States from setting their own tax policy within their own borders. That is both highly questionable, as a matter of constitutional law, and deeply troubling, as a matter of policy.

The power to tax is a key index of sovereignty, yet this legislation tells States they may not tax activity solely within their borders except as prescribed in the bill. I find this constitutionally dubious. Although I take a broad view generally of the Commerce Clause, I do not think it extends to a State's ability to tax a person doing business within its own borders.

Setting aside that concern, however, this bill would do great harm to a number of States, most especially to New York. According to some estimates, New York State could lose up to \$125 million annually if this bill were enacted.

New York City's unique location as the center of commerce for the Nation as well as its physical proximity to two other States means that many individuals go there throughout the year for business purposes. But if you work fewer than 30 days, which is up to six 5-day workweeks, this bill would strip New York of its right to tax any of your business activity within its borders. That is both grossly unfair and extremely costly. While a *de minimis* exception might make sense, I hardly think that 6 weeks and \$125 million is *de minimis*.

This bill comes at a time when Congress is intent on shifting more and more responsibilities to the States. As States continue to struggle with budgets that are stretched ever thinner, we should not further limit their authority to tax and deprive them of yet more revenue. The fiscal impact of this bill on certain States may be quite minimal but, on others like New York, it would be catastrophic. If we deprive a State of \$125 million each year, vital services like education, law enforcement, and health care could all be on the chopping block.

During consideration of H.R. 2315 in the Judiciary Committee, I offered two amendments that would have mitigated its impact. The first would have reduced the bill's 30-day threshold to a more reasonable 14 days, which is still almost 3 weeks of work without being subject to taxation. The other would have added highly paid individuals to the bill's list of exemptions, which would help avoid loopholes that could

allow wealthy people to escape millions of dollars of taxation.

Had my amendments been accepted, the expected impact on New York would have been reduced from more than \$100 million to roughly \$20 million a year. While still causing a significant drain on resources, these amendments would have gone a long way toward making the bill fairer, while still achieving its underlying goals. Unfortunately, they were defeated and, therefore, I must oppose the bill.

When the gentleman speaks of a company with 50 W-2 forms for one employee, if those W-2 forms total a few million dollars, that is not very burdensome. If they are for \$50,000, I understand the point. My amendment would have taken care of that.

I should note that this is not just about New York and that several other States would be similarly affected by this legislation. In addition, the bill is opposed by a broad coalition of labor and tax organizations, including the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, the International Union of Police Associations, the Federation of Tax Administrators, the Multistate Tax Commission, and many others.

We should not be depriving States of the ability to tax within their own borders as we are transferring more functions to the States and cutting back on Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this unfair and misguided legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the previous speaker, my colleague from across the aisle, I would respectfully respond to his concerns about states' rights. This bill does not violate federalism principles. On the contrary, it is an exercise of Congress' Commerce Clause authority in precisely the situation for which it was intended.

The Supreme Court has explained that the Commerce Clause was informed by structural concerns about the effects of State regulation on the national economy. Under the Articles of Confederation, State taxes and duties hindered and suppressed interstate commerce. The Framers intended the interstate Commerce Clause as a cure for these structural ills. This bill fits squarely within the authority by bringing uniformity to cases of *de minimis* presence by interstate workers in order to reduce compliance costs.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill, this bill enjoys broad bipartisan support. It has 180 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. This bill will minimize compliance burdens on both workers and employers so that they can get back to being productive, creating and performing jobs. We have received letters of support from hundreds of entities across the employment spectrum.

But this bill is not just about business; it is about individuals.

One businessowner told the Judiciary Committee that the compliance burdens from the patchwork of State laws falls on the employees who “make less than \$50,000 per year and have limited resources to seek professional advice.”

□ 1915

It may not seem like a lot to those who oppose this bill, but for folks that make that kind of money, it is a great burden.

It has been questioned whether there will be revenue loss to these States. Analysis shows that the impact is minimal, affecting mainly the allocation of revenues, not the overall size of the tax revenue pot.

This legislation is a great example of Congress working in a bipartisan way to relieve burdens on hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act of 2015, which is an important bipartisan bill that will help workers and small businesses across the country.

As a proud sponsor of this legislation in both the 110th and 111th Congresses, I am very familiar with this issue.

H.R. 2315 would provide for a uniform and easily administrable law that will simplify the patchwork of existing inconsistent and confusing State rules. It would also reduce administrative costs to the States and lessen compliance burdens on consumers.

From a national perspective, the mobile workforce bill will vastly simplify the patchwork of existing inconsistent and confusing State rules. It would also reduce administrative costs to States and lessen compliance burdens on consumers.

Take my home State of Georgia as an example. If an Atlanta-based employee of a St. Louis company travels to headquarters on a business trip once a year, that employee would be subject to Missouri tax, even if his annual visit only lasts a day. However, if that employee travels to Maine, her trip would only be subject to tax if her trip lasts for 10 days. If she travels to New Mexico on business, she would only be subject to tax if she was in the State for 15 days.

For example, in Georgia, Acuity Brands is a leading lighting manufacturer that employs over 1,000 associates and has over 3,200 associates nationwide who travel extensively across the country for training, conferences, and other business.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of H.R. 2315.

ACUITY BRANDS,

Conyers, GA, September 19, 2016.

Re H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act.

Hon. HANK JOHNSON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: We are writing to express our strong support for H.R. 2315, the Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act, and urge you to support the legislation when the bill is considered by the House this week.

H.R. 2315, which would establish unified, clear rules and definitions for nonresident personal income tax reporting and withholding, is supported by 300+ organizations comprising the Mobile Workforce Coalition, and has over 170 bipartisan co-sponsors. The bill was approved by the House Judiciary Committee in June 2015, and a nearly identical version of the legislation was passed by voice vote in the House during the 112th Congress (H.R. 1864).

Acuity Brands, Inc. is one of the leading manufacturers of lighting and controls equipment in the world. We are a U.S. corporation based in Georgia with offices, manufacturing facilities, and training centers across the United States. We employ over 4,000 associates in the United States, and our fiscal year 2015 net sales totaled over \$2.7 billion.

Acuity Brands is a large multinational company with locations in many states and customers in all 50 states, which requires a large number of our associates to travel outside of their respective states of residency in order to properly manage and grow our business. Our associates travel all over the country for training, conferences, intracompany business, and volunteer activities for communities or non-for-profit entities. Many of these activities contribute to the economy of those non-resident states. Our associates, some of the country's foremost experts on matters impacting the lighting industry, also travel at the invitation of state legislators and regulators to provide testimony and technical expertise on energy-related issues.

Given the extensive travel required of our associates, some of which is done at the behest of others, the current state-by-state system of nonresident personal income tax reporting and withholding imposes substantial operational and administrative burdens on Acuity Brands and our associates. The current requirements vary by state and are often changing, which presents significant compliance challenges. Furthermore, state laws are not always clear on what constitutes work travel or work days, or what exclusions apply. Thus, significant resources are expended trying to interpret various states' requirements and then attempting to satisfy them.

H.R. 2315 would simplify the current system and greatly reduce the burden on Acuity Brands and other businesses. Unified, simple rules and definitions for nonresident reporting and withholding obligations would undoubtedly improve compliance rates and it would strike the correct balance between state sovereignty and ensuring that America's modern mobile workforce is not unduly encumbered.

In light of the foregoing, we would sincerely appreciate your support on this legislation.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHERYL ENGLISH,

*VP, Government & Industry Relations,
Acuity Brands.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. In a letter, Richard Reece, Acuity's executive vice president, writes that current State

laws are numerous, varied, and often changing, requiring that the company expend significant resources merely interpreting and satisfying States' requirements.

He concludes that:

Unified, clear rules and definitions for nonresident reporting and withholding obligations would undoubtedly improve compliance rates, and it would strike the correct balance between State sovereignty and ensuring that America's modern mobile workforce is not unduly encumbered.

We should heed the calls of Acuity and numerous other businesses across the country by enacting H.R. 2315 into law. With over 175 cosponsors this Congress, it is clear that mobile workforce is an idea whose time has come.

I thank my colleagues for their work on the bill, and, in particular, Congressman BISHOP of Michigan for his leadership on this bill in the 114th Congress; also Chairman GOODLATTE for allowing this bill to come to the floor. Congressman BISHOP has carried the torch for our esteemed former colleague, the late Howard Coble, who fought alongside me in support of this bill when it passed out of the House by a voice vote in the 112th Congress.

I also thank our staffs who have worked tirelessly to build support for this legislation along bipartisan lines. This bill is a testament to the good that can come from working across the aisle on bipartisan tax fairness reforms.

I am optimistic that the passage of H.R. 2315 augers well for the passage of e-fairness legislation, which is critical to countless small businesses across the country this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to bring this bill up for a vote as soon as possible. This country's employees and businesses deserve quick action.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, whatever the gentleman may say, the fact is this bill, since it deals only with earnings earned completely within a State, represents a major assault on the sovereignty of the States. It is one thing to say that interstate commerce must be regulated, that the State's ability to extend its tax out, its tax through a company without much nexus to the State that sells into the State can be regulated, but that is not this.

What this says is: We are going to limit the State's ability to tax economic activity that occurs entirely within the State.

Now, one might argue that if someone only spends a couple days in the State, you shouldn't tax that because it will discourage doing business in the State; and maybe if I were still a member of the State legislature, maybe I

would argue that. But that is an argument for the State legislature. It is not an argument for Congress. That is an argument on the economic merits of the State's exercise of its own tax powers and its own judgment within its own borders. For Congress to step in and say: New York must forgo \$125 million in revenue or some other State must forgo \$55 million or maybe \$22.38 entirely based on economic activity within that State is, frankly, none of our business.

Today we talk about the burden that this imposes. Yes, a State might be wise to exempt small amounts of income so you don't need 50 W-2s to someone who earns a total of \$50,000, but for someone who earns \$50 million and may earn \$20 million in a couple of days in a State, that State ought to be able to tax it, and it ought to be up to the economic and political judgment of that State as to how, in the interests of economic intelligence, to limit its exercise of its taxing power so as not to discourage business. That is a State's decision.

We hear a lot of rhetoric about States' rights and sovereignty and yielding power to the States on the floor, but here is an example going much farther than anything else I have seen, frankly, of the Federal Government stepping in and saying to a State: You may not exercise your taxing power within your State when it has nothing to do with another State.

If someone comes into the State and earns \$50 million in 10 days or 3 weeks or 4½ weeks, why shouldn't that State be able to tax it if it wishes to? By what right does Congress tell it that it can't? By what right does Congress tell New York: You must forgo \$100 to \$125 million in revenue?

Even the efficiency argument doesn't make much sense with today's computers and computer ability.

So I think that this is an invasion of States' rights. It is an invasion of the core ability of the State to tax within its own borders. It is an invasion of—it is not a theft—it is a deprivation, my own State is about \$125 million, which our taxpayers will have to make up, and it is wrong for that reason.

Now, I understand why ALEC might support this bill. ALEC wants government to do nothing, wants the Federal Government not to tax, the State governments not to tax, and have as little power as possible. That is a view, but it is not a view that justifies the Federal Government telling a State and telling the States' voters that, whether they like it or not, they shouldn't tax economic activity within that State, they should come up with the money some other way or they should have less State services. That is for the States' taxpayers, the States' voters to decide.

This bill is an imposition on the people of the States. It is wrong.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to the United States Congress, I served as general counsel and chief legal officer for a small business. One of my primary functions was to ensure compliance on the patchwork of government requirements and issues that presented itself every day. It was a huge burden for our company. It was a huge burden for the employees of our company.

This is exactly what we are talking about today. This is the exact kind of compliance that is choking out small business and really, really falling on the shoulders of those who can least afford it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a commonsense solution to a real problem. We live in a global economy. It is something we can't deny. Our mobile workforce is there, and it is going to continue to grow. We cannot continue to penalize companies and individuals for that fact.

We have 180 cosponsors for this that accede the exact basis for what we are trying to accomplish here. These are bipartisan folks—Republicans and Democrats. The same is true with a companion bill in the Senate. There are lots and lots of outside groups that support it, not just specific legislative groups, but businesses that deal with this every day.

So I am very proud of this bill. I am grateful to Representative JOHNSON of Georgia for his work on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2315.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT OF TRIBES TO STOP THE EXPORT OF CULTURAL AND TRADITIONAL PATRIMONY RESOLUTION

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 122

Whereas this resolution may be cited as the "Protection of the Right of Tribes to

stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution" or the "PROTECT Patrimony Resolution";

Whereas the tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians (collectively "tribes" or "Native Americans") in the United States of America include ancestral remains; funerary objects; sacred objects; and objects of cultural patrimony (hereinafter "tribal cultural items"), which are objects that have ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to a Native American group or culture itself, and which, therefore, cannot be alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual;

Whereas tribal cultural items are vital to tribal cultural survival and the maintenance of tribal ways of life;

Whereas the nature and the description of tribal cultural items are sensitive and to be treated with respect and confidentiality, as appropriate;

Whereas violators often export tribal cultural items overseas with the intent of evading Federal and tribal laws;

Whereas tribal cultural items continue to be removed from tribal possession and sold in black or public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws, including laws designed to protect tribal cultural property rights;

Whereas the illegal trade of tribal cultural items involves a sophisticated and lucrative black market, as items make their way through domestic markets, and then are often exported overseas;

Whereas auction houses in foreign countries have held sales of tribal cultural items from the Pueblo of Acoma, the Pueblo of Laguna, the Pueblo of San Felipe, the Hopi Tribe, and other tribes;

Whereas after tribal cultural items are exported abroad, tribes have difficulty stopping the sale of these items and securing their repatriation to their home communities, where the items belong;

Whereas Federal agencies have a responsibility to consult with tribes to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

Whereas an increase in the investigation and successful prosecution of violations of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 470aa-470mm) is necessary to deter illegal traders; and

Whereas many tribes and tribal organizations have passed resolutions condemning the theft and sale of tribal cultural items, including—

(1) the National Congress of American Indians passed Resolutions SAC-12-008 and SD-15-075 to call upon the United States, in consultation with tribes, to address international repatriation and take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and abroad;

(2) the All Pueblo Council of Governors, representative of 20 Pueblo Indian tribes, noting that the Pueblo Indian tribes of the southwestern United States have been disproportionately affected by the illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and internationally and in violation of Federal and tribal laws, passed Resolutions Nos. 2015-12 and 2015-13 to call upon the United States, in consultation with tribes, to address international repatriation and take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and abroad;

(3) the United South and Eastern Tribes, an intertribal organization comprised of twenty-six federally recognized tribes, passed Resolution No. 2015:007, which calls

upon the United States to address all means to support repatriation of ancestral remains and cultural items from beyond United States borders; and

(4) the Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, uniting the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, Muscogee (Creek), and Seminole Nations, passed Resolution No. 12-07, which requests that the United States assist in international repatriations and take immediate action, after consultation with tribes, to address repatriation: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) condemns the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

(2) calls upon the Secretaries of the Department of the Interior, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General to consult with tribes and traditional Native American religious leaders in addressing this important issue, to take affirmative action to stop these illegal practices, and to secure repatriation of tribal cultural items to tribes;

(3) supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; and

(4) encourages State and local governments and interested groups and organizations to work cooperatively in deterring the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items and in securing the repatriation of tribal cultural items.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 122, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 122, the PROTECT Patrimony Resolution, which expresses support for efforts to stop the theft, illegal sale, and trafficking of Native American tribal cultural items. I commend my colleague from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for introducing this important resolution.

The United States is home to 567 federally recognized tribes. Tribal cultural items and sacred artifacts of these tribes are central to Native American culture and religion. As we study and learn from these items, it is imperative that we also protect them from theft and commercialization for personal gain.

The extent and nature of this illegal activity is largely understudied. While the exact numbers have yet to be determined, the Bureau of Indian Affairs reports in its most recent statistics

that more than 8,000 objects of cultural patrimony have been repatriated since 1990. It remains unclear, however, how many items have been stolen or illegally sold. We must obtain more comprehensive data to better understand the nature of this issue.

For that reason, I joined Congressman PEARCE and Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER in requesting a study by the Government Accountability Office to determine how the Federal Government can help prevent the illegal excavation and removal of cultural items from Federal and tribal land, the status of Federal agency efforts to repatriate Native American cultural items, and information about the international market for trafficking these cultural items.

Several auctions around the world have been criticized for routinely selling Native American goods. Earlier this year, the planned sale of an Acoma shield used in religious ceremonies was halted after the Federal Government and the Acoma Tribe advocated for its repatriation, claiming that there was reason to believe that this object was stolen.

H. Con. Res. 122 condemns the theft, illegal possession, or sale and export of tribal cultural items; supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; calls upon the secretaries of various Federal agencies and the Attorney General to take affirmative steps to secure the repatriation of these items to their respective tribes, and encourages cooperation between governmental and tribal entities in these efforts.

□ 1930

Protection of tribal cultural items is critical to maintaining our Nation's cultural heritage. I look forward to obtaining more information through the GAO's research, and I urge passage of the resolution sponsored by my colleague, Congressman PEARCE.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 122, the Protection of the Right of Tribes to stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution, or the PROTECT Patrimony Resolution. I commend Mr. PEARCE and his Democratic cosponsor, Ms. MCCOLLUM, for their leadership on this issue.

This important resolution condemns the theft, illegal possession, sale, transfer, and export for tribal cultural items belonging to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and American Hawaiians in the United States and internationally.

For those of us who have visited reservations, such as those in the State of Texas and Pueblos in New Mexico, we are well aware of the long, long history of Native Americans throughout the

United States. For far too long, Native Americans have struggled to protect their sacred and cultural artifacts—such as ancestral remains, funerary objects, and sacred items—from thieves who steal these precious objects, all in the pursuit of profits; and I hope it will now stop.

These irreplaceable objects are vital to the survival of tribal culture and to the maintenance of tribal ways of life. Yet, time and again, they are stolen by thieves who come in the dark of the night with axes, shovels, and even power tools to remove them from historical sites, which are often destroyed in the process.

In turn, these tribal cultural items are illegally sold domestically and internationally through black and public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws that protect tribal cultural property rights. The loss of these artifacts harms not only Native Americans but all Americans. It robs our Nation of an incredibly important opportunity to learn from and respect these rich and vibrant cultures.

In recognition of these concerns, H. Con. Res. 122 calls upon various Federal agencies to consult with Native American tribes and their religious leaders in order to better understand the problem and, thereby, stop these illegal practices and repatriate stolen tribal cultural items to their rightful owners.

This resolution also asks the Government Accountability Office to study the scope of illegal trafficking in these artifacts, both domestically and internationally, which will help identify ways to end illegal trafficking.

Further, the resolution expresses support for the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items. Specifically, it encourages cooperation among State and local governments, as well as groups and organizations, in an effort to deter the theft, illegal possession, sale, and export of these items.

Accordingly, I support H. Con. Res. 122.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BISHOP for yielding the time. I appreciate the comments from my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), on this significant bill and resolution that we are talking about tonight.

I grew up in the corner of New Mexico that does not have Indian tribes in it, so when I was elected to Congress in 2003, I began service, started traveling into some of the Indian reservations, and slowly began to develop relationships and friendships with those tribes.

In 2013, one of my friends from Laguna Pueblo called and said: we have one of our culturally significant items that is going on sale in Paris and in France.

And he said: we are going to try to buy it, but we are not sure that we can bring it home.

They ended up purchasing that item at the auction. And, sure enough, France would not allow them to take it out of the country, so we negotiated between our State Department and the French State Department. Finally, they were allowed to bring that item out.

They bought a first-class ticket for it. It was so significant that they did not want to let it travel as cargo in the hold of the airplane, instead, buying that first-class ticket to where it would sit there in the compartment with them.

Now, that is not a culture that I was familiar with until I began to form friendships among the Native Americans, but it is a story I hear repeated.

The same young man who purchased the item was going to buy the second item in that same sale and was dropped off the Internet down on the Indian reservation and did not purchase it. It is in his explanation of the missing of that second article. He said that he and his wife had lost a child in childbirth. And he said the feeling of missing that item was exactly the same as losing the child in childbirth.

Now, that is not something I necessarily can identify with, but I certainly identify with the emotions that say there are things that are so significant they should not be trafficked in.

We continued our kind of unofficial visits with the auction house at that point, and they began to say: look, many of the collectors would simply give the items back. They just don't want to be charged for things. These were sold usually in some sort of legal process. And so we had discussions, but nothing ever came of it.

Then again, at that same point, the Hopi Tribe in Arizona had articles for sale. One of them cost \$130,000. They had to buy them back. Again, the French Government would not help them at all. They took it to court and were simply turned down.

This year, Acoma came and said: look, we have got a couple of items that are in France, they are going on auction. We contacted the French Government, and they were simply resistant.

So we decided, with the help of the Acoma Tribe, with my friend, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM, who has been a champion for Native American rights—we all formed the idea of this bill and submitted it. The day we submitted the bill, the French pulled the item. It was this time a shield from Acoma. They pulled it out of the auction.

Negotiations are still going on to bring that item back. But the idea that we as a government, we as the U.S. Government, should be studying these things that are around the world being sold internationally, maybe have enough significance that we would want them to be repatriated, we would

want them to come back to where people would know about their heritage.

Now, as I began to be familiar with the Indian culture, the U.S. Government was not always gracious in dealing with those Native American tribes. And so the least that we can do is help them reestablish that culture that lets them tell the children who are coming up about who they were, where they came from, and the things that are significant to them.

When I visit the tribes, occasionally they will bring out canes that were given to them to indicate their sovereignty. Those were given by Abraham Lincoln. Now, it sends goose bumps up and down my spine when I am standing on a tribal ground and they carefully bring out these canes that came from Abraham Lincoln to just signify their importance to the country. That is the value that their culture places on these items, and those items are passed around from one family to another to be in charge of the caretaking for it.

So this resolution today simply says that we want to study it, we want to figure out what we can do better, and let's do better.

Again, I thank my Democrat cosponsors. It is a very good bipartisan bill. It is a bicameral piece of legislation. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and subcommittee Chairman SENSENBRENNER and the entire Judiciary Committee staff for the work on it.

I urge the passage of H. Con. Res. 122. Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, let me thank my good friend, Mr. PEARCE, and his cosponsors, Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COLE, for their leadership.

In closing, tribal cultural objects play a crucial role in ensuring that Native Americans and generations to come retain the opportunity to learn about their rich heritage. They help to connect tribal members to their history, traditions, and personal identity. The story Mr. PEARCE told was a moving one and evidences how important this legislation is.

The theft of these objects is a direct assault against the vitality of Native American cultures. When they are stolen or destroyed, a piece of that culture is irretrievably gone not only for Native Americans but for all Americans and all others to understand that culture.

Our Nation has a responsibility to do everything in its power to protect and return these priceless artifacts. H. Con. Res. 122 recognizes the importance of this responsibility.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 122, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SECURE MAIL INITIATIVE ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4712) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4712

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 "Strengthening the Department of Homeland Security Secure Mail Initiative Act".

SEC. 2. OPTION FOR SIGNATURE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE SECURE MAIL INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative (or any successor program) under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document.

(b) FEE.—The Secretary shall require the payment of a fee from a person requiring a signature under subsection (a). Such fee may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full costs of providing all such services. Such fee may also be set at a level that will recover any additional costs associated with the administration of the fees collected.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report which includes—

(1) the implementation of the requirements under section 2;

(2) the fee imposed under section 2(b); and

(3) the number of times during the previous year that a person required a signature under section 2(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4712, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4712, the Strengthening the Department of Homeland Security Secure Mail Initiative Act of 2016.

The bill is short, but it will have a great impact in the lives of many aliens seeking to play by the rules and legally live and work in the United States.

H.R. 4712 directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to allow immigration benefits recipients to elect to pay a fee and have their immigration documents sent to them via U.S. mail, signature required.

Currently, immigration documents are delivered via priority mail through the U.S. Postal Service. And while delivery can be monitored through use of a tracking number, there are numerous incidents of individuals not, in fact, receiving the documents that the U.S. Postal Service notes as delivered.

One obvious concern in such a case is that the document was intercepted by an unscrupulous individual who will fraudulently use it. Another concern is the cost and time it takes for the individual to reapply for the document, which, at this point, is the only recourse if a document has gone missing.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ombudsman discussed this problem in its FY16 report, noting that delays in receipt of immigration documents can adversely affect the ability of aliens to work or prove lawful immigration status.

H.R. 4712 imposes no cost to the United States taxpayer, since if an alien elects for their document to be delivered via signature required, the immigrant must first pay a fee set by USCIS that covers the cost of such delivery, as well as any administrative costs for the agency.

H.R. 4712 is a needed antifraud and good government measure.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am pleased to support H.R. 4712, a narrow and commonsense measure that requires U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to provide an option for green cards and employment authorization documents to be delivered via U.S. mail with a signature confirmation.

I congratulate and thank the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for offering this important legislation.

□ 1945

Each year, the USCIS sends millions of secure documents to applicants through the U.S. Postal Service, including green cards, employment authorization documents, and travel documents. Currently, the delivery status

of these documents is monitored solely through tracking numbers. While we know when a document is delivered to the address on file, we have no way of knowing if the immigration applicant actually received the document; and if we don't know if the secure documents reach the intended recipient, we also don't know if they have fallen into the wrong—possibly criminal—hands. Although specific data is not available, conservative estimates indicate that, every year, thousands of documents—perhaps tens of thousands—are lost in the mail or, worse yet, are stolen.

According to USCIS policy, if the U.S. Postal Service does not return a document or a notice and if there has been no change of address, the USCIS will consider the document as having been properly delivered, and the applicant must refile and again pay the filing fee in order to obtain a replacement document. For green cards, the fee is \$450 even if the failure to receive the document was no fault of the individual's. This is not only unfair to the immigration applicant, but a lost or a stolen document also raises national security, identity theft, and other fraud concerns.

Today's bill makes just one simple but important change in that it requires the USCIS to allow immigration applicants to elect to pay a fee and have their documents mailed with an added level of security by requiring a signature from the person who accepts delivery. The cost will be borne by the applicant; so immigrants can be assured that the document won't be delivered without there being a signature from the recipient.

I urge the USCIS to consider other options to address these basic mailing issues, such as holding documents at USCIS facilities for direct pickup by the applicant. But, for today, I am pleased that we have agreement on this bill, which will help ameliorate document mailing and receipt problems and will strengthen the security and reliability of the immigration document delivery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the author of the legislation.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for giving me the opportunity to speak about this bill.

Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, we get complaints, questions from constituents, and we actually can try and fix them. This is one of those situations.

For the longest time, I was getting complaints from residents in my district who had not received their immigration documentation. For the most part, I was not able to tell them that we could do anything, because we would call the Postal Service, and they would say there was really nothing we could do for them. I realized this was a serious problem.

There are some 50,000 green cards every year that go temporarily displaced or permanently displaced due to loss in delivery. That is about 5 percent of all green cards. With 50,000 green cards over 435 districts, you can see that we are talking about 10, 15, 20 complaints that we get every year. In my case, frankly, we stopped even logging them in because there was nothing that we could do about them. This idea came to be, and I thought why not try it. I am really very grateful that we are taking it up today.

My most recent constituent with this problem is from San Francisco. He has gone through the lawful process of getting his green card, only to have it lost. It has been over a year that he has been waiting for this document now. That means he can't travel, that he can't change jobs, that he can't get financial aid for college, that he can't open a retirement account, that he can't buy a house or anything else that most of us take for granted. This case shows that, when these documents are not properly delivered, the only solution is to reapply and pay another \$425. It is a small fix, but it carries a big wallop. That is why I am so grateful that we are taking it up.

The other issue is one of identity theft. You can also see how it could be used in a way that could create a national security risk. A stolen card could be used to travel or to purchase a firearm. We could easily fix this problem, as my colleagues have noted, by giving the applicant the option of paying an additional \$3 to require a signature at the time it is delivered.

I thank the committee, and especially my colleague Representative WOODALL from Georgia, for joining me in this effort. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time, and I appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I stuck around tonight because we are doing two of my favorite things in this institution. We are taking ideas that came from constituents with problems who trusted us enough to bring us those problems. We are putting those things into action, and we are doing it not with a lot of shouting and not with a lot of pomp and circumstance. We are doing it just the way the process was supposed to work by which the gentlewoman from California crafts an idea, and she goes out and she solicits cosponsors, and the team on the Judiciary Committee works it through the process. Then it comes down here to the House floor, Mr. Speaker, where it is going to make real differences for real people.

Imagine you have done everything the right way—you have stood in line; you have played by the rules. You have done everything the way citizen and

American law has asked you to do it. Finally, your green card is ready to be delivered, and you are waiting at the post office for it to come—right there by the mailbox, waiting for it to come. You check online. Online, it says it was delivered yesterday, but you don't have it. You call your Congressman for help, and your Congressman says, "There is nothing we can do," and there hasn't been until this Speier legislation today.

For the first time, we give constituents who have played by the rules an opportunity to pay, at their expense, in order to guarantee that this document that will allow them to work, that will allow them to feed their families, that will allow them to pursue that American Dream is going to end up in their hands. Golly, it sounds small when you read the legislation, but if you are that family, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing bigger in your life.

I am grateful for the partnership of all of my colleagues who made this possible tonight.

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

In closing, let me again congratulate Congresswoman SPEIER and Congressman WOODALL. I am equally grateful when we have the opportunity to work together. I see this as an opportunity on many, many issues.

For example, this legislation, albeit simple in context, has a broad influence and impact. It means that anyone who is intending to do harm by either having stolen mail or by having taken a document that does not belong to them now can be thwarted. In this climate in which we must be particularly sensitive in protecting the Nation against terrorism, domestic terrorism, people misusing documents, or identity theft, this is a very important contribution to thwarting that effort. As has been indicated, it gives individuals who work very hard and who desire the American Dream the opportunity to be documented.

I think it fits very well in what I hope will be an ongoing commitment to improving the immigration system to the extent of passing comprehensive immigration reform, because it does recognize that there are people who are desiring to do good who come to this country.

For that reason, I ask my colleagues to support this important contribution to those who work hard, who choose to support the values of this Nation, and who work hard as new immigrants and as potential citizens of this Nation. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4712.

I also thank the Judiciary Committee for its work on this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4712, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING SMALL BUSINESS CYBER SECURITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5064) to amend the Small Business Act to allow small business development centers to assist and advise small business concerns on relevant cyber security matters, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5064

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 "Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IN CYBER SECURITY AND PREPAREDNESS.

Section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "and providing access to business analysts who can refer small business concerns to available experts;" and inserting "providing access to business analysts who can refer small business concerns to available experts; and, to the extent practicable, providing assistance in furtherance of the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 5(b) of the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016"; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(iii) by adding at the end of the following:

"(G) access to cyber security specialists to counsel, assist, and inform small business concern clients, in furtherance of the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy developed under section 5(b) of the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016."

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL CYBER SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 21(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(8) CYBER SECURITY ASSISTANCE.—The Department of Homeland Security, and any other Federal department or agency in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, may leverage small business development centers to provide assistance to small businesses by disseminating cyber security risk information and other homeland security information to help small business concerns in developing or enhancing cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training programs for employees."

SEC. 4. CYBER SECURITY OUTREACH FOR SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (m); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

"(1) CYBERSECURITY OUTREACH.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may leverage small business development centers to provide assistance to small business concerns by disseminating information on cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks, incidents, analyses, and warnings to help small business concerns in developing or enhancing cybersecurity infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training programs for employees.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms 'small business concern' and 'small business development center' have the meaning given such terms, respectively, under section 3 of the Small Business Act."

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY ON SMALL BUSINESS CYBER SUPPORT SERVICES AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.

(a) REVIEW OF CURRENT CYBER SECURITY RESOURCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of current cyber security resources at the Federal level aimed at assisting small business concerns with developing or enhancing cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, or cyber training programs for employees.

(2) CONTENT.—The review required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An accounting and description of all Federal Government programs, projects, and activities that currently provide assistance to small business concerns in developing or enhancing cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, or cyber training programs for employees.

(B) An assessment of how widely utilized the resources described under subparagraph (A) are by small business concerns and a review of whether or not such resources are duplicative of other programs and structured in a manner that makes them accessible to and supportive of small business concerns.

(3) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and any association recognized under section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the review required under paragraph (1).

(b) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CYBER STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of the report under subsection (a)(3), the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall work collaboratively to develop a Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategy under this subsection, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with entities representing the concerns of small business development centers, including any association recognized under section 21(a)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act.

(3) CONTENT.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall include, at minimum, the following:

(A) Plans for leveraging small business development centers (SBDCs) to access existing cyber programs of the Department of Homeland Security and other appropriate Federal agencies to enhance services and streamline cyber assistance to small business concerns.

(B) To the extent practicable, methods for the provision of counsel and assistance to

improve a small business concern's cyber security infrastructure, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training programs for employees, including—

(i) working to ensure individuals are aware of best practices in the areas of cyber security, cyber threat awareness, and cyber training;

(ii) working with individuals to develop cost-effective plans for implementing best practices in these areas;

(iii) entering into agreements, where practical, with Information Sharing and Analysis Centers or similar cyber information sharing entities to gain an awareness of actionable threat information that may be beneficial to small business concerns; and

(iv) providing referrals to area specialists when necessary.

(c) An analysis of—

(I) how Federal Government programs, projects, and activities identified by the Comptroller General in the report issued under subsection (a)(1) can be leveraged by SBDCs to improve access to high-quality cyber support for small business concerns;

(ii) additional resources SBDCs may need to effectively carry out their role; and

(iii) how SBDCs can leverage existing partnerships and develop new ones with Federal, State, and local government entities as well as private entities to improve the quality of cyber support services to small business concerns.

(4) DELIVERY OF STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the issuance of the report under subsection (a)(3), the Small Business Development Center Cyber Strategy shall be issued to the Committees on Homeland Security and Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term “small business development center” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the requirements of this Act or the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

It is an honor to serve as chairman of the House Small Business Committee. It affords me the special opportunity of hearing directly from the very men and women who help drive our economy—America's small-business owners.

At a hearing several months ago, a small business owner shared his per-

sonal experience with a serious cyber attack. He said:

I logged into our bank accounts, and to my utter horror, I found that my balance was zero. This was a payday, and I was terrified that the paychecks that were issued that day would not clear. We were supporting a number of families, many of which live paycheck to paycheck and could not have made it without the paycheck we issued that day. I was also very worried about our business' reputation since a restaurant nearby had just bounced their paychecks, and the company never recovered from the bad publicity they received from not making their payroll.

Stories like this show the real-world consequences of cyber attacks. Small businesses are at serious risk from a growing number of cyber threats.

There is no doubt that the information technology revolution has provided small businesses with new tools and opportunities to compete in the global economy. However, technology changes mean hackers are coming up with more and more sophisticated methods to go after intellectual property, bank accounts, Social Security numbers, and anything else that can be used for financial gain or for a competitive edge.

In 2015, the average amount stolen from small business bank accounts after a cyber attack was over \$32,000; and according to a recent report by Verizon Enterprise Solutions, a shocking 71 percent of cyber attacks occurred in businesses with fewer than 100 employees.

It is absolutely critical to both the economic and national security of this country that our small businesses have all of the necessary cyber tools to protect themselves from cyber attacks. Small businesses lack the resources to combat cyber attacks. The Federal Government needs to step up its game when it comes to protecting the cybersecurity of small businesses and individuals. That is why I support H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016.

This legislation will help small businesses that face cyber threats by providing access to additional tools, resources, and expertise through existing Federal cyber resources by allowing the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal agencies to provide assistance to small businesses through the Small Business Administration's non-Federal partners, the Small Business Development Centers, or SBDCs. This increased coordination will lead to greater cyber support for small businesses.

I commend Mr. HANNA for his hard work on this legislation. He has done a great job as chairman of his subcommittee. Unfortunately, he announced his retirement, and he will be leaving us after this term. He has really done a tremendous amount of work for small businesses all over the country because he, himself, has been a successful small-business person; so he knows what the challenges are, and he has tried to put them to work in his years here in the House in helping

small businesses all across the country. After all, 70 percent of the new jobs that are created in the American economy are created by small businesses, so they are absolutely critical. Again, I commend Mr. HANNA for his hard work on behalf of these folks.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5064.

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

□ 2000

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

I rise in support of H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016. Technology has changed the way we all live, but none more so than for small businesses. It has afforded America's small employers a unique opportunity to sell their products not just nationally, but globally.

Despite new occasions for economic growth, technology has also introduced profound risks. We hear too often of data breaches and cyber espionage. Yet, we never really think this could happen to us until it does. All it takes is one incident to have devastating impacts to small businesses. In fact, 60 percent of small entities go out of business after 6 months of being hacked.

Clearly, cybersecurity should be a priority to protect our national security and economy. Failure to do so leaves us all at risk. Whether a business is adopting cloud computing or simply maintaining a Web site, cybersecurity should be part of their plan. However, only 31 percent of small firms take active measures to guard against such attacks, making them the ideal target for cybercriminals.

A lack of awareness and the high cost to install security mechanisms leaves many small-business owners exposed. Those that are aware of the threat, like government contractors, must navigate demanding IT specifications and complex regulations in order to stay competitive and win Federal contracts.

To help facilitate the preventive measures within the private sector, H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act, will leverage the Small Business Administration's vast network of Small Business Development Centers.

With 63 lead centers and 900 outreach locations, SBDCs have the capacity to reach small businesses throughout the country. They also have a proven record of assisting entrepreneurs with extensive courses in management and technical assistance. In the last fiscal year, SBDCs trained over 260,000 clients and advised almost 190,000 clients.

This bill will utilize these existing resource partners by allowing the centers to assist small firms in developing and enhancing their cybersecurity infrastructure and employee training programs. The bill also calls for an SBDC cyber strategy to be designed to further support small employers to

protect themselves, their employees, and their customers.

This legislation ensures that our national efforts combating cyber attacks can be utilized by our Nation's more vulnerable businesses. We cannot continue to accept the bare minimum as our Nation seeks to end continued data breaches. Therefore, I ask my fellow Members to support this bill.

Let me just take this opportunity, also, to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA) for the great work that he has done on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CHABOT, Chairman MCCAUL, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, and Ranking Member THOMPSON for the support of their committees on this bill. This bill was a collaborative endeavor and all of their staffs worked hard and long to help ensure this bill made it to the floor today.

I also want to thank the bill's lead sponsor, Representative KILMER, for working with us on this bipartisan legislation.

America's small businesses are a critical part of our Nation's economy. There are 28 million small businesses, and in recent years they have increasingly become the victims of cyber attacks. By one estimate, nearly 70 percent of all cyber attacks are now being directed at our Nation's small businesses.

The reason for this is clear. Small businesses too often lack the resources or the experience required to make prudent investments in cybersecurity.

The Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act addresses this issue by empowering the more than 900 Small Business Development Centers across our country to provide cyber support to these small businesses. This support would be offered in accordance with a small business cybersecurity strategy, which would be developed jointly by the Department of Homeland Security and the Small Business Administration.

Cyber attacks can decimate small businesses, potentially costing them tens of thousands of dollars to recover lost data and secure networks. It is clear to all of us that the upfront cost to invest in state-of-the-art technologies are prohibitive for many businesses.

This bill represents an opportunity to help small businesses bridge the knowledge gap in cyberspace by empowering the Small Business Development Centers to provide up-to-date relevant and cost-effective cyber support to service them.

This bill also makes good financial sense. By relying on already existing programs and infrastructure, it improves the Federal resources we already have to ensure that they better work for America's small businesses and at no additional cost.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill. Again, I would like to thank Chairman CHABOT for his support.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), a member of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about cybersecurity in the context of national defense, and rightfully so. As a Nation, we ought to take steps now to ensure our security into the 21st century. But this is an issue that affects so many people. One that often gets overlooked is the small business community.

As small businesses increasingly rely on Web-based products and services, they offer themselves more and more attacks from cybercriminals. Increases in technology have resulted in more sophisticated methods of cyber attacks, including hacking, malicious software, physical error, and lost or stolen devices.

Even a simple cyber attack can effectively destroy a small business. In fact, 81 percent of small businesses are concerned about a cyber attack, but only 63 percent have a cybersecurity measure in place.

Many businesses do not feel that they have the adequate legal protections to share cyber threat indicators with the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, the NCCIC. It is clear to me that the public and private sector must work together to protect our small businesses.

The Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016 eases the burden on small businesses facing cyber threats by providing access to additional tools, resources, and expertise through existing Federal cyber resources.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, and it will lead to increased security for our small businesses, which will lead to greater growth and opportunities for them.

I urge this Chamber to support this important measure.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), who is the chairman of Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, which handles cybersecurity and a number of other very important issues.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA) for leading the charge on this very important piece of legislation. I also thank Chairman CHABOT for his leadership on the Small Business Committee and Chairman MCCAUL for his leadership on the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, American small businesses are on the frontlines in the battle against cybercriminals, but right now many of them lack the resources to combat this growing and sophisticated threat. America's 28 million small businesses constitute 54 percent of our annual sales here in the United States and, because of that, they are under cyber attack like never before. The frequency and high costs of such attacks on small businesses is causing ripple effects throughout our economy right now.

H.R. 5064 amends the Homeland Security Act to ensure that Small Business Development Centers can leverage existing cybersecurity programs at the Department of Homeland Security. Additionally, this bill requires the Department of Homeland Security and the Small Business Administration to jointly develop a cyber strategy for small businesses so that they can better utilize cyber programs from DHS and from the Federal Government.

H.R. 5064 also requires a review by the Government Accountability Office of current cybersecurity programs offered by the Federal Government to small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, Small Business Development Centers have been on the ground helping small businesses in this country for more than 30 years. They have a presence in virtually every community in this country. This bill provides them with tools, resources, and the expert guidance that they need to tap into the already existing cyber resources in order to better meet the 21st century needs of small businesses in this country.

Small businesses, Mr. Speaker, are the life blood of the American economy, so we need to ensure that resources are available to all of them to combat these cyber threats. This bill works to achieve that goal.

I, therefore, ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5064.

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

Our committee hears from small businesses too often about the cost and complexities associated with cybersecurity. With businesses having to be familiar with small business data regulations, ever-changing cyber threats, and the cost to install and maintain a cybersecurity system, many small-business owners wonder when they will have time to actually operate their business.

The changes made by H.R. 5064 will unify our efforts and create a streamlined process for small employers seeking to install cyber safeguards. Utilizing the existing national network of SBDCs—many of which small businesses already seek assistance from—as a source for cyber education and awareness provides a critical tool for American entrepreneurs.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would, first of all, like to thank my colleague, Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ, for, once again, working in a bipartisan and cooperative effort. That is one thing on the Small Business Committee we always try to do, and we have a very good working relationship. I want to thank the gentlewoman for continuing that on this bill and bills in the past and, hopefully, bills in the future as well.

Relative to cybersecurity attacks, we have seen the United States under a legion of attacks in recent years. They happen virtually every day. The Federal Government itself has been hit a number of times. The Office of Personnel Management had 20-plus-million personal individuals who had their files hacked in the government. We have seen the Postal Service, we have seen the State Department, and we have even seen the White House hacked. So it is a big problem.

Now, this happens to large corporations. We have had some of the largest corporations who have really taken it on the chin, and literally it cost them millions of dollars. Corporations like Target and you name it, they have really been hit. They generally have the resources that they can recover from this. As detrimental as it is to their business, they survive.

When this happens to small businesses, it may virtually be the death knell for them. You may have families who no longer have their source of support because the business just can't take a hit like this.

In my opening statement, I mentioned the person who knew the restaurant down the street that it happened to them. The businessowner wanted to pay his employees, and he couldn't pay them because his balance was zero. So this is a serious threat.

The small business community needs help. This is a step in the right direction. Representative HANNA, whom we have all praised, really does deserve the praise because he took this and worked very hard to get this bill to the point where we are here tonight. Hopefully we are going to pass the bill.

So I think this is a great piece of legislation. H.R. 5064 would offer much-needed cybersecurity support to America's small businesses. It would also better coordinate the Federal Government's overall strategy in helping small businesses to thwart cyber attacks.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5064, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICARAGUAN INVESTMENT CONDITIONALITY ACT (NICA) OF 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5708) to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes, 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 California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5708

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 "Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2006, Nicaragua, under President Enrique Bolaños, entered into a \$175,000,000, 5-year compact with the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC).

(2) After the 2008 municipal elections, the MCC stated that there was a pattern of decline in political rights and civil liberties in Nicaragua.

(3) In 2009, the MCC terminated the compact and reduced the amount of MCC funds available to Nicaragua by \$61,500,000, which led to the compact ending in 2011.

(4) According to Nicaraguan law, the National Assembly is the only institution allowed to change the constitution but in 2009, Daniel Ortega circumvented the legislature and went to the Supreme Court, which he controls, to rule in his favor that Presidential term limits were inapplicable.

(5) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs convened a congressional hearing on December 1, 2011, entitled "Democracy Held Hostage in Nicaragua: Part 1" where former United States Ambassador to Nicaragua Robert Callahan testified, "First, that Daniel Ortega's candidacy was illegal, illegitimate, and unconstitutional; second, that the period leading to the elections and the elections themselves were marred by serious fraud; third, that Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista party have systematically undermined the country's fragile governmental institutions".

(6) From fiscal year 2012 until present, the Department of State found that Nicaragua did not meet international standards of fiscal transparency.

(7) On January 25, 2012, a press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said: "As noted by international observers and Nicaraguan civil society groups, Nicaragua's recent elections were not conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and the entire electoral process was marred by significant irregularities. The elections marked a setback to democracy in Nicaragua and un-

dermined the ability of Nicaraguans to hold their government accountable."

(8) According to the Department of State's 2015 Fiscal Transparency Report: "The government does not publicly account for the expenditure of significant off-budget assistance from Venezuela and this assistance is not subject to audit or legislative oversight. Allocations to and earnings from state-owned enterprises are included in the budget, but most state-owned enterprises are not audited. The supreme audit institution also does not audit the government's full financial statements. Nicaragua's fiscal transparency would be improved by including all off-budget revenue and expenditure in the budget, auditing state-owned enterprises, and conducting a full audit of the government's annual financial statements and making audit reports publicly available within a reasonable period of time."

(9) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015: "In 2011 the Supreme Electoral Council (CSE) announced the re-election of President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seriously flawed. International and domestic organizations raised concerns regarding the constitutional legitimacy of Ortega's re-election. The 2011 elections also provided the ruling party with a supermajority in the National Assembly, allowing for changes in the constitution, including extending the reach of executive branch power and the elimination of restrictions on re-election for executive branch officials and mayors. Observers noted serious flaws during the 2012 municipal elections and March 2014 regional elections."

(10) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: "The principal human rights abuses were restrictions on citizens' right to vote; obstacles to freedom of speech and press, including government intimidation and harassment of journalists and independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and increased government harassment and intimidation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations."

(11) The same 2015 report stated: "Additional significant human rights abuses included considerably biased policies to promote single-party dominance; arbitrary police arrest and detention of suspects, including abuse during detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions with arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention; discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous persons and communities."

(12) In February 2016, the Ortega regime detained and expelled Freedom House's Latin America Director, Dr. Carlos Ponce, from Nicaragua.

(13) On May 10, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council announced and published the electoral calendar which aims to govern the electoral process.

(14) After receiving the electoral calendar for the 2016 Presidential elections, the Nicaraguan political opposition raised concerns and pointed to a number of anomalies such as: the electoral calendar failed to contemplate national and international observations, failed to agree to publicly publish the precincts results of each Junta Receptora de Voto (JRV), and failed to purge the electoral registration rolls in a transparent and open manner.

(15) Nicaragua's constitution mandates terms of 5 years for municipal authorities,

which would indicate that the next municipal elections must occur in 2017.

(16) On June 3, 2016, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court—which is controlled by Ortega—instructed the Supreme Electoral Council not to swear in Nicaraguan opposition members to the departmental and regional electoral councils.

(17) On June 5, 2016, regarding international observers for the 2016 Presidential elections, Daniel Ortega stated: “Here, the observation ends. Go observe other countries . . . There will be no observation, neither from the European Union, nor the OAS . . .”.

(18) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media: “Disappointed government of Nicaragua said it will deny electoral observers requested by Nicaraguan citizens, church, and private sector . . . We continue to encourage the government of Nicaragua to allow electoral observers as requested by Nicaraguans.”.

(19) On June 8, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council—which is controlled by Ortega—announced a ruling, which changed the leadership structure of the opposition party and in practice allegedly barred all existing opposition candidates from running for office.

(20) On June 14, 2016, Daniel Ortega expelled three United States Government officials (two officials from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and one professor from the National Defense University) from Nicaragua.

(21) On June 22, 2016, a Global Fellow from the Woodrow Wilson Center chose to leave Nicaragua because of fear. According to a media report, the fellow stated “Police were following me. I did not understand the reason why they were following me, but it was clear to me what they were doing . . . Of course (I felt fear), I was surprised especially because the research I am doing is completely academic, not journalistic, and that made me wonder why they would be so interested in something like that.”.

(22) On June 29, 2016, the Department of State issued a Nicaragua Travel Alert which stated: “The Department of State alerts U.S. citizens about increased government scrutiny of foreigners’ activities, new requirements for volunteer groups, and the potential for demonstrations during the upcoming election season in Nicaragua . . . Nicaraguan authorities have denied entry to, detained, questioned, or expelled foreigners, including U.S. government officials, academics, NGO workers, and journalists, for discussions, written reports or articles, photographs, and/or videos related to these topics. Authorities may monitor and question private U.S. citizens concerning their activities, including contact with Nicaraguan citizens.”.

(23) On June 30, 2016, the Human Rights Foundation issued a press release stating: “. . . Daniel Ortega has used all sorts of trickery to push for constitutional reforms and illegal court rulings in order to extend his time in power indefinitely . . . If the opposition is not allowed to meaningfully compete, the upcoming elections in Nicaragua cannot be considered free and fair and the Inter-American Democratic Charter should be applied to the Sandinista regime.”. The release continued, stating that “The principle of alternation of power is enshrined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter (IADC) as an essential element of democracy. Even though Ortega pushed through a constitutional amendment allowing for indefinite re-election, he did so by circumventing the separation of powers illegally. An uncontested re-election of Ortega would clearly violate the IADC, which was signed by Nicaragua in 2001. If that is the case, Secretary General Almagro should activate the

IADC and, if necessary, call for the suspension of Nicaragua from the OAS.”.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support—

(1) the rule of law and an independent judiciary and electoral council in Nicaragua;

(2) independent pro-democracy organizations in Nicaragua; and

(3) free, fair, and transparent elections under international and domestic observers in Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any loan or other utilization of the funds of the respective institution for the benefit of the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or to promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to—

(1) hold free, fair, and transparent elections overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers;

(2) promote democracy, as well as an independent judiciary system and electoral council;

(3) strengthen the rule of law; and

(4) respect the right to freedom of association and expression.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “international financial institution” means the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, African Development Bank, African Development Fund, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa, and Inter-American Investment Corporation.

(c) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the day after the date on which the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements of subsection (a) are met.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, according to the Organization of American States (OAS) report on the Nicaraguan 2011 Presidential elections, Nicaragua: Final Report, General Elections, OAS (2011), the OAS made the following recommendations to the Government of Nicaragua:

(1) “Prepare alternative procedures for updating the electoral roll when a registered voter dies.”.

(2) “Publish the electoral roll so that new additions, changes of address and exclusions can be checked.”.

(3) “Reform the mechanism for accreditation of poll watchers using a formula that ensures that the political parties will have greater autonomy to accredit their respective poll watchers.”.

(4) “Institute regulations to ensure that party poll watchers are involved in all areas of the electoral structure, including the departmental, regional and municipal electoral councils and polling stations. Rules should be crafted to spell out their authorities and functions and the means by which they can exercise their authority and perform their functions.”.

(5) “Redesign the CSE administrative structure at the central and field levels, while standardizing technical and operational procedures, including the design of control mechanisms from the time registration to the delivery of the document to the citizens; the process of issuing identity cards should be timed to the calendar and, to avoid congestion within the process, be evenly spaced.”.

(b) ELECTORAL OBSERVATION MISSION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States (OAS) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the OAS to strongly advocate for an Electoral Observation Mission to be sent to Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 6. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should prioritize foreign assistance to the people of Nicaragua to assist civil society in democracy and governance programs, including human rights documentation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the bill at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Nicaraguan Investment Conditionality Act (NICA) of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 2006, Nicaragua, under President Enrique Bolaños, entered into a \$175,000,000, 5-year compact with the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC).

(2) After the 2008 municipal elections, the MCC stated that there was a pattern of decline in political rights and civil liberties in Nicaragua.

(3) In 2009, the MCC terminated the compact and reduced the amount of MCC funds available to Nicaragua by \$61,500,000, which led to the compact ending in 2011.

(4) According to Nicaraguan law, the National Assembly is the only institution allowed to change the constitution but in 2009, Daniel Ortega circumvented the legislature and went to the Supreme Court, which he controls, to rule in his favor that Presidential term limits were inapplicable.

(5) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs convened a congressional hearing on December 1, 2011, entitled “Democracy Held Hostage in Nicaragua: Part 1” where former United States Ambassador to Nicaragua Robert Callahan testified, “First, that Daniel Ortega’s candidacy was illegal, illegitimate, and unconstitutional; second, that the period leading to the elections and the elections themselves were marred by serious fraud; third, that Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista party have systematically undermined the country’s fragile governmental institutions”.

(6) From fiscal year 2012 until present, the Department of State found that Nicaragua did not meet international standards of fiscal transparency.

(7) On January 25, 2012, a press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said:

“As noted by international observers and Nicaraguan civil society groups, Nicaragua’s recent elections were not conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and the entire electoral process was marred by significant irregularities. The elections marked a setback to democracy in Nicaragua and undermined the ability of Nicaraguans to hold their government accountable.”

(8) According to the Department of State’s 2015 Fiscal Transparency Report: “Nicaragua’s fiscal transparency would be improved by including all off-budget revenue and expenditure in the budget, auditing state-owned enterprises, and conducting a full audit of the government’s annual financial statements and making audit reports publicly available within a reasonable period of time.”

(9) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015: “In 2011 the Supreme Electoral Council (CSE) announced the re-election of President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in elections that international and domestic observers characterized as seriously flawed. International and domestic organizations raised concerns regarding the constitutional legitimacy of Ortega’s re-election. The 2011 elections also provided the ruling party with a supermajority in the National Assembly, allowing for changes in the constitution, including extending the reach of executive branch power and the elimination of restrictions on re-election for executive branch officials and mayors. Observers noted serious flaws during the 2012 municipal elections and March 2014 regional elections.”

(10) According to the Department of State’s Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2015 in Nicaragua: “The principal human rights abuses were restrictions on citizens’ right to vote; obstacles to freedom of speech and press, including government intimidation and harassment of journalists and independent media, as well as increased restriction of access to public information, including national statistics from public offices; and increased government harassment and intimidation of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations.

(11) The same 2015 report stated: “Additional significant human rights abuses included considerably biased policies to promote single-party dominance; arbitrary police arrest and detention of suspects, including abuse during detention; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions with arbitrary and lengthy pretrial detention; discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous persons and communities.”

(12) In February 2016, the Ortega regime detained and expelled Freedom House’s Latin America Director, Dr. Carlos Ponce, from Nicaragua.

(13) On May 10, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council announced and published the electoral calendar which aims to govern the electoral process.

(14) After receiving the electoral calendar for the 2016 Presidential elections, the Nicaraguan political opposition raised concerns and pointed to a number of anomalies such as: the electoral calendar failed to contemplate national and international observations, failed to agree to publicly publish the precincts results of each Junta Receptora de Voto (JRV), and failed to purge the electoral registration rolls in a transparent and open manner.

(15) Nicaragua’s constitution mandates terms of 5 years for municipal authorities, which would indicate that the next municipal elections must occur in 2017.

(16) On June 3, 2016, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court—which is controlled by Nicaragua’s leader, Daniel Ortega—instructed the Supreme Electoral Council not to swear in Nicaraguan opposition members to the departmental and regional electoral councils.

(17) On June 5, 2016, regarding international observers for the 2016 Presidential elections, President Ortega stated: “Here, the observation ends. Go observe other countries . . . There will be no observation, neither from the European Union, nor the OAS . . .”

(18) On June 7, 2016, the Department of State’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor posted on social media: “Disappointed government of Nicaragua said it will deny electoral observers requested by Nicaraguan citizens, church, and private sector . . . We continue to encourage the government of Nicaragua to allow electoral observers as requested by Nicaraguans.”

(19) On June 8, 2016, the Supreme Electoral Council—which is controlled by Nicaragua’s leader, Daniel Ortega—announced a ruling, which changed the leadership structure of the opposition party and in practice allegedly barred all existing opposition candidates from running for office.

(20) On June 14, 2016, President Ortega expelled three United States Government officials (two officials from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and one professor from the National Defense University) from Nicaragua.

(21) On June 29, 2016, the Department of State issued a Nicaragua Travel Alert which stated: “The Department of State alerts U.S. citizens about increased government scrutiny of foreigners’ activities, new requirements for volunteer groups, and the potential for demonstrations during the upcoming election season in Nicaragua . . . Nicaraguan authorities have denied entry to, detained, questioned, or expelled foreigners, including United States Government officials, academics, NGO workers, and journalists, for discussions, written reports or articles, photographs, and/or videos related to these topics. Authorities may monitor and question private United States citizens concerning their activities, including contact with Nicaraguan citizens.”

(22) On August 1, 2016, the Department of State issued a press release to express grave concern over the Nicaraguan government limiting democratic space leading up to the elections in November and stated that “[o]n June 8, the Nicaraguan Supreme Court stripped the opposition Independent Liberal Party (PLI) from its long recognized leader. The Supreme Court took similar action on June 17 when it invalidated the leadership of the Citizen Action Party, the only remaining opposition party with the legal standing to present a presidential candidate. Most recently, on July 29, the Supreme Electoral Council removed 28 PLI national assembly members (16 seated and 12 alternates) from their popularly-elected positions.”

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support—

- (1) the rule of law and an independent judiciary and electoral council in Nicaragua;
- (2) independent pro-democracy organizations in Nicaragua; and
- (3) free, fair, and transparent elections under international and domestic observers in Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 4. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice, vote, and influence of the

United States to oppose any loan for the benefit of the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to—

- (1) hold free, fair, and transparent elections overseen by credible domestic and international electoral observers;
- (2) promote democracy, as well as an independent judicial system and electoral council;
- (3) strengthen the rule of law; and
- (4) respect the right to freedom of association and expression.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written report assessing—

- (1) the effectiveness of the international financial institutions in enforcing applicable program safeguards in Nicaragua; and
- (2) the effects of the matters described in section 2 on long-term prospects for positive development outcomes in Nicaragua.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “international financial institution” means the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Development Association, International Finance Corporation, Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, African Development Bank, African Development Fund, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Bank for Economic Cooperation and Development in the Middle East and North Africa, and Inter-American Investment Corporation.

(d) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the day after the earlier of—

- (1) the date on which the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements of subsection (a) are met; or
- (2) 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive this section if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, according to the Organization of American States (OAS) report on the Nicaraguan 2011 Presidential elections, Nicaragua: Final Report, General Elections, OAS (2011), the OAS made the following recommendations to the Government of Nicaragua:

- (1) “Prepare alternative procedures for updating the electoral roll when a registered voter dies.”
- (2) “Publish the electoral roll so that new additions, changes of address and exclusions can be checked.”
- (3) “Reform the mechanism for accreditation of poll watchers using a formula that ensures that the political parties will have greater autonomy to accredit their respective poll watchers.”

(4) “Institute regulations to ensure that party poll watchers are involved in all areas

of the electoral structure, including the departmental, regional and municipal electoral councils and polling stations. Rules should be crafted to spell out their authorities and functions and the means by which they can exercise their authority and perform their functions.”.

(5) “Redesign the CSE administrative structure at the central and field levels, while standardizing technical and operational procedures, including the design of control mechanisms from the time registration to the delivery of the document to the citizens; the process of issuing identity cards should be timed to the calendar and, to avoid congestion within the process, be evenly spaced.”.

(b) ELECTORAL OBSERVATION MISSION.—The President shall direct the United States Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States (OAS) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the OAS to strongly advocate for an Electoral Observation Mission to be sent to Nicaragua in 2016 and 2017.

SEC. 6. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development should prioritize foreign assistance to the people of Nicaragua to assist civil society in democracy and governance programs, including human rights documentation.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON CORRUPTION IN NICARAGUA.

(a) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), shall submit to Congress a report on the involvement of senior Nicaraguan government officials, including members of the Supreme Electoral Council, the National Assembly, and the judicial system, in acts of public corruption or human rights violations in Nicaragua.

(b) FORM.—The report required in subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex. The unclassified portion of the report shall be made available to the public.

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua, other than to address basic human needs or promote democracy, unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STABILITY AND DEMOCRACY FOR UKRAINE ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5094) to contain, reverse, and deter Russian aggression in Ukraine, to assist Ukraine’s democratic transition, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5094

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Stability and Democracy for Ukraine Act” or “STAND for Ukraine Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

Sec. 2. Statements of policy.

TITLE I—CRIMEA ANNEXATION NON-RECOGNITION

Sec. 101. United States policy against recognition of territorial changes effected by force alone.

Sec. 102. Prohibitions against United States recognition of the Russian Federation’s annexation of Crimea.

Sec. 103. Determinations and codification of sanctions under Executive Order 13685.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Prohibiting certain transactions with foreign sanctions evaders and serious human rights abusers with respect to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 202. Report on certain foreign financial institutions.

Sec. 203. Requirements relating to transfers of defense articles and defense services to the Russian Federation.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 301. Strategy to respond to Russian Federation-supported information and propaganda efforts directed toward Russian-speaking communities in countries bordering the Russian Federation.

Sec. 302. Cost limitation.

Sec. 303. Sunset.

SEC. 2. STATEMENTS OF POLICY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of the United States to further assist the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereignty and territorial integrity to contain, reverse, and deter Russian aggression in Ukraine. That policy shall be carried into effect, among other things, through a comprehensive effort, in coordination with allies and partners of the United States where appropriate, that includes sanctions, diplomacy, and assistance, including lethal defensive weapons systems, for the people of Ukraine intended to enhance their ability to consolidate a rule of law-based democracy with a free market economy and to exercise their right under international law to self-defense.

(b) ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is further the policy of the United States—

(1) to use its voice, vote, and influence in international fora to encourage others to provide assistance that is similar to assistance described in subsection (a) to Ukraine; and

(2) to ensure that any relevant sanctions relief for the Russian Federation is contingent on timely, complete, and verifiable implementation of the Minsk Agreements, especially the restoration of Ukraine’s control of the entirety of its eastern border with the Russian Federation in the conflict zone.

TITLE I—CRIMEA ANNEXATION NON-RECOGNITION

SEC. 101. UNITED STATES POLICY AGAINST RECOGNITION OF TERRITORIAL CHANGES EFFECTED BY FORCE ALONE.

Between the years of 1940 and 1991, the United States did not recognize the forcible

incorporation and annexation of the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union under a policy known as the “Stimson Doctrine”.

SEC. 102. PROHIBITIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES RECOGNITION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION’S ANNEXATION OF CRIMEA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with United States policy enumerated in section 101, no Federal department or agency should take any action or extend any assistance that recognizes or implies any recognition of the de jure or de facto sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters.

(b) DOCUMENTS PORTRAYING CRIMEA AS PART OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—In accordance with United States policy enumerated in section 101, the Government Printing Office should not print any map, document, record, or other paper of the United States portraying or otherwise indicating Crimea as part of the territory of the Russian Federation.

SEC. 103. DETERMINATIONS AND CODIFICATION OF SANCTIONS UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 13685.

(a) DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the assessment described in paragraph (2).

(2) ASSESSMENT DESCRIBED.—The assessment described in this paragraph is—

(A) a review of each person designated pursuant to Executive Order 13660 (March 6, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine) or Executive Order 13661 (March 16, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine); and

(B) a determination as to whether any such person meets the criteria for designation pursuant to Executive Order 13685 (December 19, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

(3) FORM.—The assessment required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) CODIFICATION.—United States sanctions provided for in Executive Order 13685, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (c).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a certification of the President that Ukraine’s sovereignty over Crimea has been restored.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to restrict the authority of the President to impose additional United States sanctions with specific respect to the Russian Federation’s occupation of Crimea pursuant to Executive Order 13685.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS AND SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSERS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-95; 22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

“SEC. 10. PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN SANCTIONS EVADERS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to impose with respect to a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly—

“(1) has materially violated, attempted to violate, conspired to violate, or caused a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in, or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order; or

“(2) has facilitated significant deceptive or structured transactions for or on behalf of any person subject to United States sanctions concerning the Russian Federation.

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that is subject to sanctions described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) on a case-by-case for a period of not more than 120 days, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than 120 days with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States and on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of and justification for the waiver.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this section.

“(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(2) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ means any of the following:

“(A) Executive Order 13660 (March 6, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 13493; relating to blocking prop-

erty of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(B) Executive Order 13661 (March 16, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 15535; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

“(C) Executive Order 13685 (December 19, 2014; 79 Fed. Reg. 77357; relating to blocking property of certain persons and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to the Crimea region of Ukraine).

“(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

“(4) STRUCTURED.—The term ‘structured’, with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given the term ‘structure’ in paragraph (xx) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(5) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given such term in section 589.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

“SEC. 11. PROHIBITING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS IN AREAS CONTROLLED BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to impose with respect to a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines that the foreign person, based on credible information—

“(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation;

“(2) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person that is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation; or

“(3) is owned or controlled by a foreign person, or has acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a foreign person, that is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses in any territory forcibly occupied or otherwise controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation.

“(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), without regard to section 202 of such Act, to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

“(2) PENALTIES.—A person that is subject to sanctions described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

“(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) on a case-by-case for a period of not more than 120 days, and may renew that waiver for additional periods of not more than 120 days with respect to a person if the President de-

termines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States and on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of and justification for the waiver.

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) for purposes of carrying out this section.

“(e) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

“(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ‘foreign person’ has the meaning given such term in section 595.304 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

“(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given such term in section 589.312 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section.”

SEC. 202. REPORT ON CERTAIN FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

The Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-95; 22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 11 (as added by section 201 of this Act) the following new section:

“SEC. 12. REPORT ON CERTAIN FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

“(1) foreign financial institutions that are in direct control of assets owned or controlled by the Government of Ukraine in a manner determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be in violation of the sovereignty, independence, or territorial integrity of Ukraine;

“(2) foreign financial institutions that are directly or indirectly assisting or otherwise aiding the violation of sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine; and

“(3) foreign financial institutions determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be complicit in illicit financial activity, including money laundering, financing of terrorism, transnational organized crime, or misappropriation of state assets, that are—

“(A) organized under the laws of the Russian Federation; or

“(B) owned or controlled by a foreign person whose property or interests in property have been blocked pursuant to any covered Executive order.

“(b) FORM.—The report required to be submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(2) COVERED EXECUTIVE ORDER.—The term ‘covered Executive order’ has the meaning given the term in section 10(f) of this Act.”.

SEC. 203. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TRANSFERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to oppose the transfer of defense articles and defense services from any country that is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to, or on behalf of, the Russian Federation, during any period in which the Russian Federation forcibly occupies the territory of Ukraine or of a NATO member country.

(b) ADOPTION OF NATO POLICY.—The President shall use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States in NATO to seek the adoption of a policy by NATO that is consistent with the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(c) MONITORING AND IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct the heads of the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States to identify those transfers of defense articles and defense services described in subsection (a) that are contrary to the policy of the United States specified in subsection (a).

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit a written report to the chairmen and ranking members of the appropriate committees of Congress within 5 days of the receipt of information indicating that a transfer described in paragraph (1) has occurred.

(B) FORM.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘‘appropriate committees of Congress’’ means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES.—The terms ‘‘defense article’’ and ‘‘defense service’’ have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794 note).

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. STRATEGY TO RESPOND TO RUSSIAN FEDERATION-SUPPORTED INFORMATION AND PROPAGANDA EFFORTS DIRECTED TOWARD RUSSIAN-SPEAKING COMMUNITIES IN COUNTRIES BORDERING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall develop and implement a strategy to respond to Russian Federation-supported dis-information and propaganda efforts directed toward persons in countries bordering the Russian Federation.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The strategy required under subsection (a) should include the following:

(1) Development of a response to propaganda and dis-information campaigns as an

element of the ongoing crisis in Ukraine, specifically—

(A) assistance in building the capacity of the Ukrainian military to document conflict zones and disseminate information in real-time;

(B) assistance in enhancing broadcast capacity with terrestrial television transmitters in Eastern Ukraine; and

(C) media training for officials of the Government of Ukraine.

(2) Establishment of a partnership with partner governments and private-sector entities to provide Russian-language entertainment and news content to broadcasters in Russian-speaking communities bordering the Russian Federation.

(3) Assessment of the extent of Russian Federation influence in political parties, financial institutions, media organizations, and other entities seeking to exert political influence and sway public opinion in favor of Russian Federation policy across Europe.

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy required under subsection (a) and its implementation.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term ‘‘appropriate congressional committees’’ means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 302. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

SEC. 303. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to be effective beginning on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the people of Ukraine have struggled against great odds to defend their freedom and ensure their national existence. It is a tortured history.

One of the Members who is on the floor today, ELIOT ENGEL, who was in Ukraine with me, his family, grandparents, all four of them came from Ukraine. Together we saw some of the evidence of that history in a gorge in Ukraine where so many Jewish Ukrainians were slaughtered. It is a reminder. The Holocaust and the other deprivations, the famine that Ukrainians lived through, are a reminder of the perils to the people in that country.

For several years, Vladimir Putin has employed all of the tools at his command to dominate that country, and that includes arming separatists in the east where almost 10,000 people have lost their lives in the fighting. It includes annexing Crimea, and the latest effort to legitimize his aggression was to include Crimea in Russia’s parliamentary elections held last Sunday. These were a sham, and the delegates represent no one but the rulers in Moscow.

The administration cannot allow Putin to believe that U.S. opposition to his aggression is weakening. Instead, the U.S. and its allies and partners in Europe must step up their pressure against Moscow, including providing the lethal assistance needed to stop Russian tanks, that the Ukrainians have repeatedly asked for. Their primary concern is to be able to check that armor in the east.

This legislation strengthens the sanctions imposed on Russia as well. It is a clear demonstration that the U.S. remains committed to supporting the Ukrainian peoples’ unyielding defense of their freedom and their national existence.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

Washington, DC, September 15, 2016.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing with respect to H.R. 5094, the ‘‘Stability and Democracy for Ukraine Act,’’ on which the Committee on Ways and Means was granted an additional referral.

In order to allow H.R. 5094 to move expeditiously to the House floor, I agree to waive formal consideration of this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that by forgoing formal consideration of H.R. 5094, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC., September 15, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further

consideration of H.R. 5094, the STAND for Ukraine Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 5094 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 5094, the "STAND for Ukraine Act."

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 5094 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the legislation.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2016.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5094, the STAND for Ukraine Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 5094 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation

and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2016.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I write with respect to H.R. 5094, the "STAND for Ukraine Act," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary among others. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions within H.R. 5094 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 5094 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 5094 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee report and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5094.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2016.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5094, the STAND for Ukraine Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on RR. 5094 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. Let me, first of all, thank our

chairman, ED ROYCE, for helping advance this bill. I introduced this bill in April along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER). I am proud to say we now have 36 additional cosponsors, both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't kid ourselves about the intentions of Russia's President, Vladimir Putin. Inside his own borders, he has stripped away the rights of Russia's citizens. He has silenced a free and open press. He has stolen countless billions and spread the wealth around to his cronies. And in the wake of a sham election that boosted his party's majority, it is being reported that he wants to breathe new life into the KGB.

His record abroad is more of the same. He has trampled his neighbors' sovereignty, worked to undermine NATO and Western unity, and posed a real threat to America's work and the work of our friends over the past seven decades to build a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.

Perhaps most egregious is Russia's ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea and parts of eastern Ukraine. Russia recently renewed its attack on Ukraine's sovereignty by holding parliamentary elections for the duma in Crimea. It is just outrageous, as the chairman mentioned. The United States will never recognize these claims, just as we never recognized Soviet control of the Baltic States during the 50-year occupation there.

My legislation underscores America's support for Ukraine's right to defend itself, and it keeps pressure on Russia so long as Russia's criminal behavior in Ukraine continues. This bill says that if Russia wants to see sanctions relief, it must abide by its Minsk Agreement obligations, namely, if Ukraine controls the entirety of its eastern border. It makes Crimea-related sanctions permanent so long as the Russian occupation there continues. It tightens sanctions enforcement with the new anti-evasion framework, and it requires reporting on banks illegally controlling Ukrainian assets, particularly Russian banks in Crimea.

This bill also takes steps to make it harder for Russia to buy defense equipment or services from our NATO allies. It goes after human rights abusers in Russian-occupied areas, and it calls for a comprehensive strategy from our own government to push back against Russian propaganda. The people of Ukraine need to know the United States stands with them. This Government of Ukraine is the most pro-Western government they have ever had. We need to help them. Vladimir Putin needs to know that his reckless ambition won't go unanswered.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) had to leave, but he submitted testimony. He strongly supports this bill and everything that the chairman and I are saying this evening. I ask that all Members support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I just want to come to applaud both the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this important measure.

I think this bill is incredibly important because, in the simplest of forms, conflicting signals never work with regard to foreign policy. Some people have said that the Korean war was, in many cases, in large measure created based on a void as to uncertainty as to what the American Government would or wouldn't do in the event that North Korea was attacked by South Korea. I think you can look at a long host of different examples that point to the simple fact that conflicting signals are never a good signal when it comes to foreign policy.

I just want to thank the gentlemen for their resolution and to stress its importance. I think if we learned anything in the days leading up to World War II, with the actions of Neville Chamberlain, it is that appeasement doesn't work and that unchecked aggression always creates problems.

I think this is about sending a clear message to the Russians, but it ultimately sends a message to more than just the Russians. This is, as well, about a message to the Chinese in the South China Sea or other parts around the globe. In that regard, I think that this bill is ultimately about things that are ultimately much bigger than Ukraine and Russia.

Let me give you two examples. One, this is about reminding our allies and even ourselves that, for sovereignty to mean anything, a border has to mean something. That means a border can't be porous. It means that a border can't be regulated and controlled by whoever your biggest and strongest neighbor is in the region.

I would say, secondly, that this is about what it means to be an American ally. I think that the Budapest Memorandum was unequivocally clear that, if you give up nuclear arms, we will do certain things in terms of your security.

So the question that we now have to ask as Americans, and I think what this bill ultimately does so forcefully is to say: What does that mean and what are we going to do about it? Indeed, that is the question.

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

Let me say before I close that Mr. SANFORD was absolutely right in what he just said. The fact is that Ukraine, which was part of the Soviet Union, gave up its nuclear weapons when the Soviet Union collapsed. As a result, they were given assurances that they would not have aggression perpetrated against them; and, of course, like other promises made by Mr. Putin, that fell by the wayside. I agree with the gen-

tleman from South Carolina. I think he is absolutely right on the money. I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we have no shortage of crises smoldering around the world, but we cannot take our eye off what is happening in Ukraine and the threat that Russia poses. NATO is being tested. Western democracy is being called into question. The progress we have made since the cold war is at risk.

Even if the administration is trying to work with Russia on other issues, we need to be clear-eyed when Vladimir Putin flouts international law and threatens the security of Europe. This bill would say plainly that no matter what happens in other parts of the world, if Russia continues to illegally occupy parts of Ukraine, Russia will pay a price.

I am pleased that the House is acting on my bill. I want to again thank Chairman ROYCE for being a partner with me and helping with this bill. I ask that all Members support it.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as an original sponsor of the STAND for Ukraine Act and a Co-Chair of the Congressional Ukraine Caucus, I rise in support of this important measure. This bill codifies and tightens existing U.S. sanctions on Russia for its violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity, including its illegal annexation of Crimea.

In passing this measure, I join my colleagues in making a strong statement that the United States stands with the people of Ukraine. Earlier this month, we celebrated the 25th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. It is the Ukraine people's will for a free, democratic, and sovereign country that is the underlying impetus for change and international support.

I believe we have a duty to stand behind democratic nations such as Ukraine against foreign aggression, and it is in our national interest to have an ally who shares our values. The STAND for Ukraine Act takes a meaningful step in helping Ukraine defend against foreign aggression. At the same time, we must continue our work in helping Ukraine develop the rule of law, root out corruption, and bring about economic prosperity.

I support the STAND for Ukraine Act, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the STAND for Ukraine Act. I'd like to thank my good friend and colleague Mr. ENGEL for introducing this legislation, which aims to solidify U.S. support for Ukraine's territorial integrity, under assault by the Russian government since 2014.

Last weekend Russian-occupied Crimea took part in Russia's parliamentary elections for the first time since Russia took over the peninsula in 2014. In the judgment of OSCE election observers, the elections took place in an environment marked by "restrictions to fundamental freedoms and political rights, firmly controlled media and a tightening grip on civil society. . . ." In timely response, this legislation solidifies the U.S. commitment to the territorial integrity of Ukraine.

The administration has applied various sanctions to Russia. In its leading provisions, this bill will give the sanctions created by executive orders the permanence of statutory law—until Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea is fully restored. These sanctions relate to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine. In addition, the bill provides that no federal agency shall take any action or extend any assistance that recognizes Russian sovereignty over Crimea.

Mr. Speaker, the Russian government's invasion of Ukraine, and particularly its land grab in Crimea—its forcible, illegal attempt to incorporate that peninsula into Russia—violated the core principles of several bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties, including all ten of the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act.

In July I led the U.S. delegation to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, which met this year in Tbilisi. Russian parliamentarians continually sought to undermine, and even demean and provoke the Ukrainian delegation. Mr. Speaker, our delegation provided strong and constant support for the Ukrainians. In the words of this bill's policy statement, we used our "voice, vote, and influence in international fora to encourage others to provide assistance" to Ukraine, particularly to restore its sovereignty and territorial integrity. In my own speeches, I focused on the issue of Crimea, and on the sharply declining human rights situation there.

Russian "anti-extremism" laws have been used to criminalize opposition and stifle free speech. The majority of victims have been Crimean Tatars and ethnic Ukrainians, who have been subject to killings, kidnappings, torture, harassment and intimidation.

I urge my House colleagues to support this measure that will ensure the United States' non-recognition of Russia's illegal occupation, solidify and sharpen sanctions against Russia over Crimea, and support the full territorial integrity of Ukraine.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in solidarity with my brothers and sisters in Ukraine by urging my colleagues to swiftly pass the STAND for Ukraine Act.

Nearly two and a half years ago, Russian President Vladimir Putin undermined Ukrainian sovereignty when the Russians began illegally occupying Crimea.

This act emboldened him to double down on bullying his neighbors, testing the resolve of NATO and trying to fracture Western unity.

His disrespect for global order knows no bounds. That is why the United States must reiterate to the world that it will not tolerate Russia's aggression.

While some misguided people have said that "Putin is not going into Crimea," this bill makes it perfectly clear: Russia's illegal occupation of Crimea will not be tolerated by the United States.

We must hold Russia accountable for its disrespect for global order and continued violations of international law.

That is why I am a strong supporter and co-sponsor of the STAND for Ukraine Act, which tightens sanctions on Russia and rejects any form of recognition of Russian rule over Crimea.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will become law quickly so we can make sure that President Putin knows the United States stands with our ally Ukraine.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5094.

Ukraine continues to face significant challenges from Russian meddling and aggression. We in Congress are under no illusions when seeing Vladimir Putin's true intentions for Ukraine.

Vladimir Putin and Russia are tearing Europe apart. Russian-backed separatists continue their shelling of Ukrainian military positions in Donetsk and Donbass, which in some cases has killed civilians.

Additionally, Vladimir Putin and Russia are delivering bombs on medical facilities and on children in Syria. Further proof that they are no ally of ours.

Rather than continuing to negotiate with Putin, we need to stand up to him. The best way to push back against Russia is to give the Ukrainians what they need to defend their sovereign territory, such as lethal weaponry to counter the Russian-backed "little green men."

This important bill does a number of things to continue to show American support for Ukraine, while also putting additional pressure on Russia for its continued violation of Ukraine's territorial sovereignty.

Most importantly, this bill states that the United States will never recognize Russian sovereignty over Crimea, which it illegally annexed in 2014.

This bill would also enhance our sanctions regime on Russia for its ongoing illegal and destabilizing activities against Ukraine.

In our history, we have always seen the impact that our nation has on others when we stand up and help them achieve a better tomorrow. It is imperative that we continue to help Ukraine achieve that better future for its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to work with Congressman ELIOT ENGEL to introduce this critical bill. By reaffirming U.S. support for Ukraine's self-defense, emphasizing that we never have nor will recognize Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea, and by holding Russia accountable for its continued violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, we will 'Stand with Ukraine' legislatively and most effectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5094, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT LAB ACT OF 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3924) to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3924

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Global Development Lab Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The effectiveness of United States foreign assistance can be greatly enhanced by fostering innovation, applying science and technology, and leveraging the expertise and resources of the private sector to find low-cost, common sense solutions to today's most pressing development challenges.

(2) Breakthroughs that accelerate economic growth and produce better health outcomes in developing countries can help support the growth of healthier, more stable societies and foster trade relationships that translate into jobs and economic growth in the United States.

(3) In 2014, the Office of Science and Technology and the Office of Innovation and Development Alliances at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) were streamlined and merged into the United States Global Development Lab.

(4) The Lab partners with entrepreneurs, experts, nongovernmental organizations, universities, and science and research institutions to find solutions to specific development challenges in a faster, more cost-efficient, and more sustainable way.

(5) The Lab utilizes competitive innovation incentive awards, a "pay-for-success" model, whereby a development challenge is identified, competitions are launched, ideas with the greatest potential for success are selected and tested, and awards are provided only after the objectives of a competition have been substantially achieved.

(6) Enhancing the authorities that support this pay-for-success model will better enable the Lab to diversify and expand both the number and sources of ideas that may be developed, tested, and brought to scale, thereby increasing USAID's opportunity to apply high value, low-cost solutions to specific development challenges.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT LAB.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in USAID an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab.

(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the Lab shall include—

(1) increasing the application of science, technology, innovation and partnerships to develop and scale new solutions to end extreme poverty;

(2) discovering, testing, and scaling development innovations to increase cost effectiveness and support United States foreign policy and development goals;

(3) leveraging the expertise, resources, and investment of businesses, nongovernmental organizations, science and research organizations, and universities to increase program impact and sustainability;

(4) utilizing innovation-driven competitions to expand the number and diversity of solutions to development challenges; and

(5) supporting USAID missions and bureaus in applying science, technology, innovation, and partnership approaches to decision-making, procurement, and program design.

(c) AUTHORITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Lab under subsection (b), the Administrator, in addition to such other authorities as may be available to the Administrator, including authorities under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), and subject to the limitations described in paragraph (3), is authorized to—

(A) provide innovation incentive awards (as defined in section 4(5) of this Act); and

(B) use funds made available to carry out the provisions of part I of the Foreign Assist-

ance Act of 1961 for each of the fiscal years 2017 through 2021 for the employment of not more than 30 individuals on a limited term basis pursuant to schedule A of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or similar provisions of law or regulations.

(2) RECOVERY OF FUNDS.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Lab under subsection (b), the Administrator, subject to the limitation described in clause (ii), is authorized to require a person or entity that receives funding under a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement made by the Lab to return to the Lab any program income that is attributable to funding under such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The amount of program income that a person or entity is required to return to the Lab under clause (i) shall not exceed the amount of funding that the person or entity received under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement.

(B) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount of any program income returned to the Lab pursuant to subparagraph (A) may be credited to the account from which the obligation and expenditure of funds under the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement described in subparagraph (A) was made.

(ii) AVAILABILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), amounts returned and credited to an account under clause (i)—

(aa) shall be merged with other funds in the account; and

(bb) shall be available, subject to appropriation, for the same purposes and period of time for which other funds in the account are available for programs and activities of the Lab.

(II) EXCEPTION.—Amounts returned and credited to an account under clause (i) may not be used to pay for the employment of individuals described in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Concurrent with the submission of the Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations for each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed accounting of USAID's use of authorities under this section, including the sources, amounts, and uses of funding under each of paragraphs (1) and (2).

(B) INNOVATION INCENTIVE AWARDS.—In providing innovation incentive awards under paragraph (1)(A), the Administrator shall—

(i) limit the amount of individual awards for fiscal year 2017 to not more than \$100,000;

(ii) limit the total number of awards for fiscal year 2017 to not more than 10 awards; and

(iii) notify the appropriate congressional committees not later than 15 days after providing each such award.

(C) STAFF.—In exercising the authority under paragraph (1)(B), the Administrator should seek to ensure that increases in the number of staff assigned to the Lab are offset by an equivalent reduction in the total number of staff serving elsewhere in USAID.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committees on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(3) LAB.—The term “Lab” means the United States Global Development Lab established under section 3.

(4) USAID.—The term “USAID” means the United States Agency for International Development.

(5) INNOVATION INCENTIVE AWARD.—The term “innovation incentive award” means the provision of funding on a competitive basis that—

(A) encourages and rewards the development of solutions for a particular, well-defined problem relating to the alleviation of poverty; or

(B) helps identify and promote a broad range of ideas and practices, facilitating further development of an idea or practice by third parties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3924, which authorizes the U.S. Global Development Lab within the U.S. Agency for International Development. Through the Lab, USAID workers, with the private sector, partner up; and they tap into the science and technology needed to source and to test proven, low-cost, high-impact solutions to pressing development challenges around the world.

From maternal health to food security, the innovations supported by the Lab are changing the way we think about and the way we deliver foreign aid. This bill provides important authorities to improve the Lab's efficacy and efficiency, and it approves incentive awards through a competitive pay-for-performance process.

It enables the Lab to bring in technical experts on a short-term basis without long-term salary and benefit obligations. When one of these new technologies becomes successful, it allows USAID to keep a portion of its initial investment so the Lab can become financially self-sustaining.

Mr. Speaker, this is the approach that will bend the development curve. This is effective foreign aid.

I want to thank Representative CASTRO and Representative MCCAUL for introducing this very important, bipartisan measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. I want to thank Chairman ED ROYCE for bringing this bill forward. I want to also thank Mr. CASTRO of Texas for his leadership and hard work on this measure, and I thank Mr. MCCAUL as well.

Mr. Speaker, around the world, 1.2 billion people live in extreme poverty. That means they live on less than \$1.25 a day. It is hard to imagine. No one should have to live on so little.

At the same time, we know that areas of extreme poverty can be hotbeds for other problems. Poverty leads to broader instability. It creates vulnerabilities that can be exploited by violent extremists, jihadists, or others spreading dangerous ideologies. It holds communities and countries back. So we view alleviating poverty as the right thing to do and also as a strategic concern.

That is why USAID established the Development Lab to help develop and deploy poverty reduction technologies more widely and at a lower cost.

I want to acknowledge former USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah, who did tremendous work at USAID helping build the Lab into a world-class center of innovation, working toward new solutions to extreme poverty.

The Lab works with NGOs, corporations, and universities to bring in the best ideas and stay on the cutting edge of development. It is also expanding USAID's impact through a public-private dollar-for-dollar matching program that allows us to scale these innovations up without expanding USAID's budget.

We are seeing real results. In 2014, the Lab invested in 362 new solutions that touch nearly 14 million people around the world. For example, the Lab funded an initiative aimed at producing more food where fresh water is hard to come by.

Securing Water for Food: A Grand Challenge for Development led to a system that makes seawater or brackish water usable for drinking or agriculture. It consumes so little energy that the cost to use it is low, even in areas off the power grid. This is what we mean when we talk about innovation.

Last May, the Development Lab hosted an international competition to develop technology to fight wildlife trafficking and crimes. I know that Chairman ROYCE has been very interested in this issue. This led to the development of an app called the Wildlife Scan that allows law enforcement to easily identify endangered species being smuggled out of countries. After just a couple of months, the app has already been downloaded more than 1,000 times.

And just last month, the Global Lab finished up a Zika challenge initiative, which led to 21 new solutions targeted at combating the spread of the Zika virus and are on track to be tested and deployed. They could be available within months.

The bill would build on the Lab's success by creating new authorities for the Lab to expand and manage its partnerships. It will give the Lab greater flexibility for hiring experts on a project-by-project basis, and it will allow the Lab to award small, targeted grants that have proven so effective in supporting healthcare providers.

I commend Mr. CASTRO for his hard work on this very good bill. It makes a good initiative better, and I am pleased to support it.

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), a very valuable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author of this measure.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member ENGEL for yielding me this time and for his support of this legislation. He, Chairman ROYCE, as well as their staff members have been terrific partners in moving this bill forward.

I also want to say a big thank you to my fellow Texan, Representative MIKE MCCAUL, for being the lead Republican cosponsor of this legislation, which aims to make our foreign aid efforts more impactful and cost-efficient.

Created in 2014 through the streamlining and merging of two offices, USAID's Global Development Lab is spearheading a new approach that supports the invention, testing, and utilization of more cost-efficient solutions to development challenges.

The Lab collaborates with entrepreneurs, corporations, NGOs, universities, and science and research institutions to solve some of the world's most difficult development challenges faster, more cheaply, and more sustainably.

Essentially, the Lab democratizes problem solving by crowdsourcing ideas and applications to find the best solutions from around the world. For example, the Lab has used what it calls Grand Challenges for Development to incentivize problem solvers to develop solutions for specific problems.

The Saving Lives at Birth Grand Challenge led to the creation of the Pratt Pouch, a small ketchup packet-like pouch filled with medication that women can use in rural areas to prevent birth-related HIV infections. Other Grand Challenges have led to the development of breakthrough products that keep healthcare workers treating Ebola patients safe, desalinate water in an environmentally sustainable manner, and bring electricity to folks living off the electrical grid in Africa.

The Lab also partners with outside entities, such as universities, to cultivate solutions to specific development challenges ranging from health and food insecurity to chronic conflict. Participating institutions equally match USAID's funding and leverage additional resources from private foundations.

The legislation before us today formally authorizes the U.S. Global Development Lab within USAID and provides new legislative authorities to augment the Lab's current capabilities, allowing the initiative to achieve greater results and maximize its impact.

The bill allows the Lab to use a pay-for-success model and tap into good ideas, no matter their source; bring in term-limited technical experts in a more cost-effective manner; and gain the flexibility to use program income more effectively.

In conclusion, Congress can be proud of the work that the Lab is currently doing and will continue to pursue once we authorize it and provide proper oversight.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. CASTRO and Mr. MCCAUL for their innovation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just say, in recent years, it has become very clear the way issues like global poverty fit into our broader national and international concerns. We see the links between poverty, health, stability, and security. So when we work to relieve this burden and lift up communities, we are also advancing a wide range of interests. As I like to say, it is the smart thing to do, and it is also the right thing to do.

The administration has already taken steps to incorporate poverty alleviation into our development efforts. This bill will help USAID do even more.

So, once again, I want to thank Mr. CASTRO for his hard work. I am glad to support this bill. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his help. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3924, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days

in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the importance of voting rights for all Americans across this country.

With less than 50 days before Americans go to the polls to elect our next President and other elected officials, we are still faced with the harsh reality that this will be the first election in 50 years where Americans will not have the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Today's Special Order hour is on behalf of the House Democratic Outreach and Engagement Task Force. I want to thank Assistant Leader CLYBURN for his leadership on the task force and all of the members of the task force as we work together to make sure that we engage all Americans on the importance of voting. In fact, one of the first things the task force did was to host a series of voting rights forums across this Nation to put together a report that shows modern-day barriers to voting still exist.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed not only by legislation but, Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed with the blood, sweat, and tears of so many Americans. In fact, all of us know of the courageous sacrifices of our very own JOHN LEWIS, but there were so many known and unknown foot soldiers that made it possible for America to live up to its ideals of democracy and justice for all.

As a daughter of Selma, Alabama, I am painfully aware that the injustices suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago have not been fully vindicated.

Although we no longer are required to count how many marbles are in a jar or recite how many counties there are in the State of Alabama, my proposition to you, Mr. Speaker, is that modern-day barriers to voting still exist. Those barriers may not be as overt as they were 50 years ago, but, Mr. Speaker, they are no less stained. They are no less important as those other barriers were.

I have seen example after example, as the Representative of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, of the modern-day barriers that exist to voting.

Since the Supreme Court struck down critical parts of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in the Shelby County v. Holder decision, so many Members have taken to the floor—mostly Democrats—day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year, urging our Republican colleagues to work with us to restore the essential protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Several of my Democratic colleagues, including myself, have hosted voting

rights forums across this country to highlight the continued need for restoring the Voting Rights Act. Members have also introduced legislation. I, for one, am quite proud of the Voting Rights Advancement Act, a bill that I sponsored, along with several other Members of the House, including Representative LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ and Representative JUDY CHU. Our bill, H.R. 2867, has over 187 cosponsors, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2045

It actually answers the Supreme Court's challenge to come up with a modern-day formula by which to have preclearance provisions in the Voting Rights Act.

I think it is so important, Mr. Speaker, and I know that so many will agree, that we make sure that we find these pernicious examples of restraining people's rights to vote on the front end because, after all, Mr. Speaker, once the elections have happened, you can't unring that bell.

So the beauty of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was that it allowed preemptive efforts to stop discrimination in voting. Therefore, any changes in voting practices in the covered States had to be precleared by the Justice Department or by the D.C. Court of Appeals. This was quite important.

I have to tell you that what the Shelby decision did was it struck down that key provision, section 4, which gave the covered States and provided the formula by which we know which States would be covered. Therefore, in the Shelby decision, the Supreme Court really issued a challenge to Congress to come up with a modern-day formula.

It was the Supreme Court who said that we can't punish States like Alabama, the State from which I hail, and other southern States, for what happened 50 years ago. Congress must come up with a modern-day formula that talks about current efforts to restrict the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have done in the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. I want you to know that, of the 187 sponsors we currently have, not one Republican has signed on.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the House of Representatives when voting rights becomes a partisan issue. Voting rights is an American issue. It is neither red nor blue but, rather, it is what our founding fathers fought for, drafted, and ensured that all Americans have a right, a fundamental right, to exercise that right to vote. After all, the integrity of our democracy depends upon every eligible voter being able to vote.

Most recently, I was privileged to also join with my colleagues and my fellow House Members, Representative MARK VEASEY of Texas and Representative BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia, and other Members of Congress, to launch the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus. The Caucus is committed to restoring the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to

its original state and restoring the vote to all suppressed voices in this Nation.

I want to commend my fellow colleagues, Representatives VEASEY and SCOTT, for their visionary leadership in starting this Caucus. I am honored to be a co-chair of the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus, and we will take as our charge to make sure that we fully restore all of the protections of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

In spite of these continued efforts, Mr. Speaker, it is disheartening to see that State after State, including my own State, after the Shelby decision, instituted photo ID laws, voter-restrictive photo ID laws.

So many of my colleagues, they say: Well, what is so restrictive about requiring a photo ID? After all, you need a photo ID in order to get on a plane or to get your passport.

But I say to all of my colleagues who question the restrictive nature of photo IDs that not all Americans fly, not all Americans have a passport, but all Americans who are eligible have the fundamental right to vote. And we, the elected Representatives on behalf of these Americans, must not impede that most fundamental right.

We should be looking at ways that we can encourage voting not discourage voting. After all, the fundamental foundation of our democracy is the right to vote.

So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite important that we, in this House, do what so many of our predecessors have done and restore full protections on the right to vote.

I wish I were alive when Lyndon Johnson signed the voting rights into law. But I can tell you that there were no more fundamental seminal pieces of legislation that passed this omniscient House than the right to vote. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 are still some of the most seminal pieces of legislation that this body has ever passed.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker: How can we, today, 50 years since the passage—53 years, to be exact—how can we stand on the cusp of electing another President and, for the first time in those 50 years, not have the full protections of the Voting Rights Act?

It is, indeed, a sad day. But I know that this body will and should do the people's work. And the people's work is to allow all Americans who qualify, who have registered to vote, who turned 18—these Americans have the right to vote.

I would love it if this body would pass an automatic voter registration bill. I have signed on to such a bill. But those bills don't get a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, and I am not sure why, Mr. Speaker, because nothing is more fundamental than to have every American, when they reach that certain age of 18, and they go and get their driver's license, be automatically registered to vote.

We are not talking about protecting one class of voters against another

class of voters. We are talking about protecting that fundamental right to vote for all Americans. Nothing seems more American and democratic than that.

The sad reality is that old battles have become new again, and so many States have now really taken the Shelby decision and allowed themselves to put up restrictive laws. We are reminded that they are restrictive laws by the judicial system.

Most recently, the Fourth Circuit overturned the North Carolina photo ID law, in which they said, point blank, that they were targeting—that that voter ID law targeted and discriminated against African American voters. They said that it did so with precision, Mr. Speaker.

There is a fallacy that goes around that says that there is voter fraud rampant in America. Well, I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that voter fraud does not exist in the volumes by which Americans think they do. A very recent poll by The Washington Post-ABC came out and said that over 50 percent of Americans believe that there is voter fraud.

Well, I will have you know, Mr. Speaker, that study after study, including that by the Brennan Center, have shown that there are very few cases of voter fraud. In fact, their study, between the years of 2000 and 2014, a 14-year period, only showed 31 cases of voter impersonation. And I want you to know that many of those were, in fact, errors, errors in folks' names, when the III or the Junior of a person's name was confused with the Senior of that same name.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that voter fraud is not rampant, so I am not really sure why States like Alabama have instituted these photo ID laws. My State not only instituted a photo ID law but, last summer, my State, due to "budgetary reasons," closed down more than 31 DMVs, mostly in areas that were disproportionately African American.

So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, if photo IDs are required, and the most popular form of the photo ID is a driver's license, how can that very State also close down opportunities, foreclosing opportunities for those citizens of that State to get a photo ID?

My State also says that that photo ID is free. Well, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that they may say it is free and, in fact, it is free if you can come along on those rare days in which the mobile goes through your city.

But I want you to know that many of my constituents, many of whom were born in rural Alabama, many of whom were born over 80 years ago by midwife, those constituents don't have birth certificates. And those that do, well, in order to acquire a birth certificate, that costs money. You have to still be able to produce a birth certificate in order to get this "free" ID from the State of Alabama. So I submit to you that it is not free. I also submit to you

that it is unfair that we put up such barriers.

I am humbled every year by the pilgrimage that JOHN LEWIS takes with many of the Members of Congress in this body. Every year, for the past 18 years, he has taken a pilgrimage through my district. He goes back in time and allows those Members who travel with him to actually retrace his footsteps 50-plus years ago. We go to Birmingham, we go to Montgomery, and we end up, on that Sunday, reenacting Bloody Sunday, that moment in history, that seminal moment in history, in which he was bludgeoned on Edmund Pettus Bridge for the simple right to vote.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it does not go unnoticed by me, as I drive across the Edmund Pettus Bridge each time I go home to Selma to visit my parents, the sacrifices that ordinary Americans did in order to achieve what ultimately was an extraordinary feat.

When you think of the fact that a young JOHN LEWIS, who was in college at the time, and so many who were out there marching for the right to vote were children, and when you think about the fact that ordinary Americans, collectively working together, achieved this extraordinary feat, it makes you realize how fragile the right to vote really is.

I don't know how any of us can join hands with JOHN LEWIS and walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge and not understand how important it is to rededicate ourselves to the fight that he once led. We, as elected Representatives of this great Nation, owe it to our own constituents to make sure that every eligible American has the right to vote.

I have to tell you that one of the most moving opportunities for me, as a Member of Congress, was in 2015, when I got a chance to be in my hometown and to welcome over 100 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, two Presidents, Barack Obama and George W. Bush, to my hometown. It was to celebrate America's promise, a promise that became reality through the sacrifice, blood, sweat, and tears of average Americans.

We all came on that beautiful day, March 7, 2015. It was glorious, but it was a kumbaya moment in time. We owe more to the sacrifices of those foot soldiers like JOHN LEWIS than a gold medal. Although, I was proud to put forth that bill, and even prouder to be able to bestow the gold medal to those foot soldiers that did march in the Selma-to-Montgomery March. It was a great day.

But, Mr. Speaker, we came back to this body, to this House of Representatives, and we did absolutely nothing to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965. There have been several bills that have come forth. There has been the Voting Rights Amendment Act that had bipartisan support, both from Congressman CONYERS and from Congressman SEN-SENBRENNER of Wisconsin. That bill didn't get more than 30 cosponsors.

Then, of course, there is my bill, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, which has over 187 sponsors.

We have to meet in the middle, Mr. Speaker, because voting rights are so essential. And on this, less than 50 days before we have a Presidential election, it is simply unacceptable that we go without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

What do I mean by that? What is at stake really by not having those full protections?

Well, we witnessed, in the primary in Arizona in Maricopa County—this was a county that was covered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but, because of the Shelby decision, there was no more preclearance. And so, this county in Arizona went from a height of 400 polling stations down—that was in 2012—down to 60 polling stations in 2016.

There were long lines, Mr. Speaker, in Maricopa County. People had to wait hours for the right to vote.

I would venture to guess, had the Shelby decision not occurred, and we had the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, that there would be no way that Maricopa County, Arizona, would have been able to change those polling stations and reduce the number of the polling stations to 60 from 400 had there been preclearance.

□ 2100

So what is at stake really is the integrity of our democracy. What is at stake is the fact that we in America should not have to wait hours to vote. We in America should not have to produce documents that we do not have to vote. I think it is ironic that in many of these States you can present a gun permit license with a photo and be able to vote, but you can't produce a student ID from a State university and vote.

I believe that what is at stake right now is the integrity of our democracy, and that all of us should be outraged if even one person is denied the right to vote. This is a very important, very important issue that I, again, submit to you is neither Republican nor Democrat. It is truly bipartisan, and that is the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my colleague.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Congresswoman SEWELL, for organizing this very important Special Order hour today to talk about something that is really timely, especially with elections coming up. I want to be able to stand here today with my colleagues to bring awareness to the injustice—the injustices really—that are oppressing the most vulnerable members of our democracy.

I want to start with some history from the 1960s, and then some more recent history. As you know, in 1965, the Voting Rights Act sought to ensure that voters would never again face intimidation or unnecessary obstacles in exercising their right to vote as Amer-

ican citizens. But in 2013, *Shelby County v. Holder* gutted the 1965 Voting Rights Act and set in motion what many feared: the subjection of minorities, seniors, and low-income Americans to unfair, punitive barriers that make it hard for them to vote—make it hard for people to exercise their very basic right as an American citizen.

As a native of Texas representing the Dallas and Fort Worth area, I have seen firsthand the effects of these suppressive laws that have been put in place in 33 States since the Supreme Court issued in *Shelby County v. Holder*. Some of the tactics in Texas that were used—and you heard Representative SEWELL talk about it a little bit earlier. If you have a license—a school ID from Texas A&M University or the University of Texas or Prairie View A&M or Texas Southern University, any of our State universities, these are the same IDs that students can use. Let's say they are on campus and they are doing something they are not supposed to do, they can use those IDs to identify themselves to law enforcement authorities on the campuses there; but if they were to try to come home and use that ID, they would be denied the right to vote. But, again, if you are the owner of a handgun and you have a concealed handgun license, you can use that particular ID to vote. It is almost unfair. You can see how everything is stacked against the everyday voters.

With the requirement that a photo ID be used to vote, some individuals without an ID had to travel great distances to get them or struggled to pay for the supporting documents they needed in order to get the ID to vote. You heard Representative SEWELL talk about that a little bit earlier.

Let me give you an example of that. In Texas we have 254 counties. Everybody knows that Texas is a big State. Some of those counties don't even have driver's license centers or ID centers where people can get their voter ID cards or their driver's license or their State ID or the other documentation that is needed to be able to vote. So that is why I got involved as the lead plaintiff in *Veasey v. Abbott*, which was the voter ID case, to overturn the law.

Our case has been heard before three—literally three—Federal courts, including what is considered the most conservative appellate court in the entire country, which is the Fifth Circuit. In July 2016, the full Fifth Circuit ruled in favor of Texas voters. That ought to tell you something that the Fifth Circuit was even like, hey, this thing has some real, real problems.

That same month, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit struck down North Carolina's restrictive voting laws, and the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin invalidated portions of their voting law there that was designed to prevent individuals from casting their right to vote.

The courts have found what we have always known to be true, and that is

that these restrictive voter ID laws intentionally discriminate against minority voters and disenfranchise eligible American voters.

These victories are a few of the major victories, but we have also had victories in non-Southern States. It is mentioned that it is the Southern States where a lot of these issues have historically been a problem, but we know that even outside of the South there have been issues—Ohio, Kansas, and Michigan—and so far the courts continue to rule in the favor of the voter. I hope they will continue to do so in the future.

But while we see these victories, we also continue to face challenges. Some of you recently have heard that Judge Ramos in the Texas case, who issued the interim voting rules in the Texas case, had to actually order the attorney general, the Governor, and the secretary of state to stop sending out misleading and confusing election materials to try to confuse people about the voter ID ruling.

That worries me a lot because what is that saying is going to happen to this upcoming election in November in 2016? Are we getting a sneak preview of some of the dirty tricks that may take place around the country?

The fact that a Federal judge issued these guidelines and State officials tried to send out misleading information from a Federal judge is scary. Those are dirty tricks that we have to watch out for in this November 2016 election.

We know that the attorney general, because he said so, is going to appeal this case to the Supreme Court. But until we see an end to barriers to voting and the distribution of misinformation to discourage eligible citizens from casting their ballots, we will not stop fighting. Every day, my colleagues and I, led by the Democratic Outreach and Engagement Task Force and the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus, will continue to fight to have these suppressive laws invalidated. Even in the face of lengthy court battles, we welcome the challenge because it means we have to protect the right to vote.

One of the things that I did to continue to shed light on this issue is I actually introduced a resolution last week to designate September as National Voting Rights Month. This year, Americans will cast their ballots in one of the most important general elections that this country has ever seen. The designation of September as National Voting Rights Month will serve to assist in spreading information and awareness about voter registration dates and voting dates, early voting, polling place locations, how to maintain voter rolls, and some of the suppressive tactics that are being used. We want to inform people about that as well because it would be an affront, Representative SEWELL, to our predecessors to allow suppressive tactics to deny Americans the right that many have fought and died for.

That is why Congress must continue to lead the charge in restoring the right for all Americans to vote by fixing the Voting Rights Act and by encouraging participation in, again, what is our most sacred right as Americans, and that is the right to vote.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative VEASEY for his tireless effort not only as a plaintiff in the Texas case courageously fighting against the injustices against voters, but I want to also thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Congressional Voting Rights Caucus and for his participation in tonight's Special Order hour. We are all with the gentleman in his efforts to make sure that all Americans have the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I introduced a bill called the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I would like to talk a little bit about the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 in an effort to really encourage the rest of my colleagues here in this august body to join with me in passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

What the Voting Rights Advancement Act does is it provides a modern-day formula, exactly what the Supreme Court asked of Congress. By striking down the old formula in the Shelby decision, the Supreme Court issued a challenge to Congress to come up with a modern-day formula. That is exactly what we do in this bill. This bill doesn't look back to 1940, 1950 or 1960. Oh, no. This bill looks at 1990 going forward. It is a 25-year lookback. If a State has had five or more statewide violations, then it will be a covered State. So it is a modern-day formula looking at any incidents of discriminatory practices since 1990 going forward.

Mr. Speaker, you should not be surprised that even in looking at modern-day barriers or instituting this modern-day formula that you would still have 13 States that have had five or more statewide violations in the last 26 years. Those States include Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Arizona, California, New York, and Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it includes Arizona, it includes California and New York, not just Deep South Southern States.

In the last 26 years, these States have had five or more statewide violations of voting rights. I have to tell you that this goes to show you that there is a need for us to have continued full protections of the Voting Rights Act. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we can only rely on those lawsuits on section 2 which occur after the election has occurred. We need the efforts to be able to stop the discriminatory practices before they have the discriminatory effect. That is exactly what the Voting Rights Act of 1965 does and what the Voting Rights Advancement Act, H.R. 2867, would do. It would put teeth back into the preclearance provision.

Now, we call it the Voting Rights Advancement Act because it also talks

about discriminatory effects and practices on tribal lands. Back in 1965, we didn't protect tribal lands and the right to vote of those Americans. It is critically important that we modernize the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and make sure that we cover all Americans, including those who live in tribal lands.

The Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 would allow Federal courts to immediately halt questionable voting practices until a final ruling is made. This provision would recognize that, when voting rights are at stake, prohibiting a discriminatory practice after the election has concluded is too late to truly protect voter rights.

This bill would also give the Attorney General authority to request that Federal observers be present anywhere in the country where discriminatory voting practices pose a serious threat. This bill would also increase transparency by requiring reasonable public notice for voting changes.

So, Mr. Speaker, if this bill had been in effect during the primary in Arizona, there would be no way that the election officials in Maricopa County, Arizona, would have been able to shrink the size of the number of polling stations—the populations stood the same or grew, and yet they shrunk the number of polling stations from 400 in 2012 to 60 in 2016, in 4 years. There is no way that that would have stood. You cannot tell me that that did not have a discriminatory impact on voters. Those lines being so long, I can't tell you—we will never know how many people got discouraged, how many working mothers or working family parents had to leave the line in order to go pick up their children or be able to provide for their family. We don't know how many people didn't get the chance to vote.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the integrity of the democracy that is being questioned by not having the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

So I ask my colleagues to join me and the 187 other cosponsors of the Voting Rights Advancement Act and let us put teeth back into the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by coming up and approving, passing, this modern-day formula. I believe that a lookback of 1990 going forward is ample evidence of voter discrimination and discriminatory practices and that States that have had five or more statewide violations should be a covered State.

□ 2115

This bill would allow them to be a covered State for 10 years. Now, obviously, during this 10-year period, if the State remedies itself, it can no longer be a covered State. There are ample provisions to allow for States to be opted in and opted out. I think that what, ultimately, we all want is that the full integrity of our democratic process be preserved, and that is exactly what would happen with this Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD witness testimony from the voting

rights townhall hosted by Representatives JEFFRIES, MENG, and VELÁZQUEZ in New York.

[From LatinoJustice]

TESTIMONY OF JUAN CARTAGENA PRESIDENT & GENERAL COUNSEL LATINOJUSTICE PRLDEF ON FRAGILE AT 50: THE URGENT NEED TO STRENGTHEN AND RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Good morning Congresswoman Velázquez, Congressman Jeffries, and Congresswoman Meng. On behalf of LatinoJustice PRLDEF—formerly known as the Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Education Fund—I respectfully submit this testimony at the forum Fragile at 50: The Urgent Need to Strengthen and Restore the Voting Rights Act.

My testimony will center on the historical significance of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in the three formerly covered counties of Bronx, Kings and New York for both general compliance problems and bilingual assistance problems.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The historical foundations of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in New York City—a subject that has been a focus of my previous research and publications, I submit, provides the context for the Act's salience today.

Two important lessons emanate from this history. The first is that New York City was in effect, the laboratory of bilingual voting assistance for language minority citizens in the entire country—and it all started with Puerto Rican voters. The second is that Section 5 arguably had its most direct and prophylactic effects for minority voters as a tool against discriminatory voting schemes beyond redistricting plans. I now turn to those two historical episodes.

Section Five's application to three counties in New York stems directly from the previous application of Section 4(e) of the Voting Act which is colloquially known as the Puerto Rican section of the Act. While the VRA was historically and rightfully aimed at restoring the dignity of the African-American vote, it was never just black and white, not even in 1965. Section 4(e) was championed in a bipartisan manner by Senators Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits. It drew support from Puerto Rican icons like Herman Badillo, Gilberto Gerena-Valentin and Irma Vidal Santaella who testified in Congress against the notion that one can only be a productive and effective voter in New York only if literate in English. Their testimony led to Section 4(e) which outlawed any English-only literacy test that would deny voter registration to any Puerto Rican who achieved at least a 6th grade education in Puerto Rico's schools. The remedy was bilingual voter registration and bilingual ballot access. The litigation spawned by this law—all of it filed by the Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Education Fund—set the stage for major court decisions declaring that English-only election systems deprived citizens of a meaningful right to vote and were discriminatory under the VRA. Those decisions, especially *Torres v. Sachs*, were used by the NAACP to argue that Section 5 coverage of New York City—previously certified but exempted by a separate court at the State's urging—should be reinstated. That argument prevailed and Section 5 became a reality directly because of the discrimination against Puerto Rican voters.

The impact of Section 4(e) did not stop there, however. During the 1975 congressional deliberations to create bilingual assistance provisions of the Act to cover all Spanish-language, Asian language and Native American language voters the House clearly recognized that bilingual voting structures were both viable and effective.

They cited New York City as the example that bilingual voting could not be deemed radical as it had been in place for a decade under Section 4(e). In sum, Puerto Rican voters challenged the discriminatory nature of English only systems and won, to their benefit and the benefit of all other language minority citizens nationwide.

The second major lesson of Section 5 coverage in New York City stems from its powerful effect of stemming discriminatory practices beyond redistricting plans. Redistricting, continued to be at the heart of the importance of the VRA in New York. In 1981 the councilmanic redistricting plan was passed but never precleared as required by law. This led to multiple suits by black and Latino voters that resulted in suspending the entire citywide primary elections just two days before the September election day. This victory put teeth into Section 5 and forced the City to justify the fact that they refused to create additional black and Latino council districts despite major demographic change. Weeks later the Department of Justice interposed an objection under Section 5 and the map was redrawn clearing the way for the eventual majority of black, Asian American and Latino council men and women in this decade. From 1982 through 2006—the year Section 5 was reauthorized by an overwhelming bipartisan vote in Congress—additional objections were interposed by the Department of Justice to discriminatory redistricting plans including a 1991 objection to the NYC City Council plan and a 1992 objection to the NYS Assembly plan.

Section 5 objections also addressed other practices beyond redistricting including switching the form of voting of community school board members in 1999; replacing elected school board members with appointed trustees in 1996; the creation of additional judgeships for state courts in 1994; failure to accurately translate names and instructions in the Chinese language in 1994; and failure to provide appropriate language assistance to Chinese voters in 1993.

VRA compliance activity was not limited to Section 5 actual objections in the decades in which the City was covered. The Department of Justice continuously deployed Federal Observers to monitor the City for language assistance compliance for both Spanish and Asian languages. Indeed, from 1985 to 2004 alone 881 Federal Observers were dispatched to ensure compliance with the VRA. Moreover, Section 5 had a strong prophylactic effect in the City as measured by the impact of More Information Request letters issued by the Department of Justice to the City. These letters often stemmed discriminatory practices when the City withdrew its request for preclearance upon receiving the More Information Request letter—a regular occurrence throughout other Section 5 covered jurisdictions. One study by Luis Fraga and Maria Ocampo found that in the City alone from 1990 to 2005 113 letters were issued and 53 resulted in the equivalent of interposing an objection.

THE EFFECTS OF A RENEWED VRA TODAY

It is clear that the recent episodes of purging voters in Brooklyn and mis-deployment of Spanish language interpreters in the Congressional Democratic primaries in Congressman RANGEL's district in Washington Heights would have been ameliorated if not completely avoided had Section Five been in effect after the Shelby County decision. The historical context described above demonstrates that these episodes of potentially discriminatory practices would have been addressed by the power of Section Five. Accordingly, its absence is sorely felt in the City.

I end, however, with an example of the power of Section 5 in New York City in 2014

just months after the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* earlier that year in June. The scene is a press conference in September 2014 on the steps of City Hall after the New York City Council voted to pass the Community Safety Act after then Mayor Bloomberg had vetoed the measure weeks before. Speaker Quinn was not in favor of the bill and noted her reservations. After considerable pressure from the minority members of the Council she allowed the bill to come to a vote. The legislation was intended to address some of the worst features of the notorious Stop & Frisk practices of the New York Police Department that by the end of the Bloomberg administration skyrocketed to over 4 million stops, predominantly directed at black and Latino residents of the City with such a level of ineffectiveness that minimally 86% of those stopped were never charged with a crime or violation. The Mayor and Police Commissioner Raymond Kelley insisted on preserving the practice going so far as painting a doomsday scenario or rampant violent crime if the practice were curbed. References to retrogressing to the Dinkins' administration—another example of Dog Whistle Politics—were all over the tabloids. The black and Latino members of the Council knew better. They listened to the voices of the victims of this abuse, they spearheaded hearings on the matter, they debated the efficacy and unjustness of the practice in the tabloids. In short they were being responsive to the needs of black, Latino and Asian-American voters.

The Council voted that day to overcome the mayor's veto and enact that portion of the Community Safety Act. It was the first time in New York City history that the Council overcame a mayoral veto! The historical significance of the vote was not lost on me as I commented to the press how critical that vote became on a quintessential minority issue because it was directly attributed to the strength of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. It was Section 5 that permitted council districts to be drawn to fully reflect black, Latino and Asian American voting strength going back to the 1980s when Section 5 was used to stop a discriminatory councilmanic redistricting plan. And it was Section 5 that preserved that minority voting strength in all subsequent decennial redistricting plans. *Shelby County v. Holder* may have taken that tool away but its importance was nonetheless evident months later.

I respectfully submit, that this is why Congress must restore this aspect of the Voting Rights Act.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as I close out this Special Order on voting rights, I would be remiss if I didn't say that, as a daughter of Selma, I can think of no more noble thing for me to fight for than voting rights and the full restoration of those voting rights. After all, it was because of the blood, sweat, and tears in my district and in my hometown that we have so many elected officials that are of color.

It is no small wonder why we are seeing such efforts to go out and make sure that people don't have a right to vote when elected officials say in their remarks as they are introducing legislation for restrictive voting photo IDs, make comments like, "Well, the people that we are restricting will only be Democratic voters." That just suggests to me that the reason why these restrictive voting photo ID laws were being promulgated was to do exactly

that—suppress certain groups of voters. That is absolutely unacceptable and un-American.

I could also tell you that one of the greatest moments for me on this House floor was when I had an opportunity to escort, as my State of the Union guest in 2015, Miss Amelia Boynton Robinson, who was 104 when she came to the State of the Union in 2015.

You see, Miss Amelia Boynton Robinson, on Bloody Sunday in 1965, was bludgeoned on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, along with Congressman JOHN LEWIS. But at 104 years old, she was so excited to come to this august body and to hear President Barack Obama's State of the Union Address. She was excited not because she would get an opportunity to meet the first African American President, but she was excited because she got a chance to see this elected body at work.

She told me that one of her proudest moments was not only casting a ballot, but she told me that one of her proudest moments was to be the first African American woman to be on the ballot in the State of Alabama running for Congress. She ran, Mr. Speaker, for this seat, the Seventh Congressional seat that I am so fortunate to have. She ran for that seat in 1964.

So when I think about Miss Amelia Boynton, I not only think about Bloody Sunday and her sacrifice on that bridge, but I also think about her courage, the courage of this African American woman to have the audacity to think that she could be a Member of Congress from the great State of Alabama in 1964.

I know I get to walk these hallowed Halls and I get to stand here today and speak with you, Mr. Speaker, because of her courage and her sacrifice. It is not lost on me that she is looking down now wondering what that sacrifice truly meant to America, that we could 50 years later have a Court case that totally dismantled the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Now, when Miss Amelia Boynton Robinson came to the State of the Union, we had an opportunity to meet and talk with President Barack Obama before his speech. I will never forget being in the holding room, if you will, behind this Chamber. As many of the members of his Cabinet would come into the room, they would say the same thing: "Miss Boynton, we stand on your shoulders." "Miss Boynton, we are so glad that you made those sacrifices on that bridge because we get to do what we do now because you made those sacrifices. We stand on your shoulders."

I can tell you that person after person—Secretary of State, Secretary of Transportation, Secretary of HUD—they were all saying the same thing. By the time the Attorney General came up to her and said, "Miss Boynton, I stand on your shoulders," she looked up at him and said, "Get off my shoulders. Do your own work." Yes, Mr. Speaker, at 104 years old, she had

the temerity to say, “Do your own work.”

It is not enough that we stand on the shoulders of giants like Amelia Boynton Robinson and JOHN LEWIS; we have to do our own work. And so I say to this body that we can do our own work by protecting that sacred right to work, and that we should do our own work, as we dedicate ourselves to the proposition that these average, ordinary Americans had the nerve, the audacity to fight for. If they could fight for it over 50 years ago, we can fight for it today.

I am grateful to have the opportunity to lead the Special Order hour on voting rights not only as a native of Selma, Alabama, but as a very proud, proud beneficiary of the strength and power of the right to vote and of their sacrifices.

I say in closing, I hope that my fellow colleagues will join us by signing on to H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I urge all of my colleagues to do so. It is in some way, some small way, with a huge impact potentially, that we can ensure that this great democracy lives on. After all, if one American is denied access to the ballot box, it does, in fact, go to the integrity of all of the election process.

So much is at stake not only in this Presidential election, but in every election, because in every election, Americans use their vote as their voice. So when you don't have a vote, you don't have a voice in this great democracy. No vote, no voice; we should remember that as elected officials.

As we grapple with the opportunity that we have to come up with a modern-day formula, I would be willing to sit with any of my Republican colleagues to come up with a modern-day formula that would work in both Houses and by both parties. I think it is critically important that we do this work. I think that there is no greater work that we could be doing than to restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I am also reminded of what Mrs. Boynton said when she finally did meet the President. It was quite a moment for all of us who were present when she finally walked into that small holding room, and he knelt beside her and he took her hand and he said, “Mrs. Boynton, I don't know how to say thank you enough. I get to give a speech as a President of the United States in a few minutes, and it is because of your sacrifice.” And Mrs. Boynton, at 104, without missing a beat, looked up at our President and said, “Make it a good one.” Yes, she said, “Make this speech a good one.” Why? Because of the sacrifices that she and so many brave Americans had on that bridge.

We, as Americans, who are beneficiaries of that amazing legacy, owe it to them to make every day a good one, to make everything we do good because people sacrificed for us to have the rights that we have. So I remember

“Make it a good one,” and I say to my colleagues, let us make it a good one right here in this august body by passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 and fully restoring the voting rights protections of all Americans.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this November, voters across our country are faced with the likely prospect of heading to the polls without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act.

Signed into law in 1965 by President Lyndon Johnson, the Voting Rights Act broke down state and local laws that kept minorities from exercising their constitutional right to vote.

That fundamental right of our democracy was severely undermined by the 2013 Supreme Court decision in *Shelby County vs. Holder*.

That misguided decision gutted Section 5, the heart of the Voting Rights Act, which barred states and localities with a history of discriminatory policies from implementing new voting changes without the approval of the Department of Justice.

Based on the Supreme Court ruling, states are now free to pass and enforce laws that create obstacles to voting.

That is exactly what many states are doing: in fact in the 2014 mid-term election and in this year's presidential primaries numerous voters were denied the ability to participate in our democratic process.

A report from the NALEO Educational Fund, estimates these restrictive voting changes, could result in more than 875,000 eligible Latinos finding it more difficult to vote this year than in 2012.

In other words, without the protections of The Voting Rights Act this presidential election will be the first in over 50 years in which American voters of color will be faced with new and renewed obstacles to voting. According to the Brennan Center for Justice, 14 states will have new voting restrictions in place for this year's presidential election. These new laws include strict photo ID requirements, cutbacks to early voting, and new registration restrictions.

To help our constituents gain a better understanding of the negative impact of the Supreme Court decision, this past May, like many of my colleagues, I hosted a forum titled “Protect Your Future: Restore the Vote.” My co-chairs were Representative LINDA SANCHEZ, Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus; Representative JUDY CHU, Chair of the Asian Pacific American Caucus; and special guest, Representative KAREN BASS.

Members from our communities heard expert testimony from the NAACP, the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, Asian Americans Advancing Justice and NALEO.

Panelists gave examples of the concerted assault on minorities at the ballot box and testified to the undeniable value of Congress restoring the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5 by passing H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

I thank our panelists for sharing their expertise and will submit their testimony into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

On a positive note, as we rapidly approach the 2016 presidential election, critical victories are being won as courts continue to strike down racist and discriminatory voting laws.

In July of this year, the Texas U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, found that the state's voter ID law discriminated against African-American and Latino voters. Days later, judges of the 4th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in North Carolina found that North Carolina state law targeted black voters, and I quote, “with almost surgical precision.”

While these are important victories it is nevertheless a tragedy to our Democracy that so much time and money has been spent for American voters to win back a right already granted to them under the Constitution of the United States.

The ability to vote is not a Democratic or Republican right. It is an American right and the cornerstone of our democracy.

Today, I join my colleagues in urging the Republican leadership to join Democrats to live up to their Constitutional responsibility to protect every American's right to vote by passing H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

The ability to vote is one of the most fundamental rights. That right is not a Democratic or Republican right. It is an American right and the cornerstone of our democracy.

I include in the RECORD the following testimony:

TESTIMONY OF STEWART KWOH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND PRESIDENT, ASIAN AMERICANS ADVANCING JUSTICE-LOS ANGELES, MAY 20, 2016

HON. CONGRESSMEMBERS: Thank you for inviting me to this critical subject of voting rights.

My name is Stewart Kwoh, and I am the Executive Director and President of Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Los Angeles. We are the largest civil rights organization in the nation dedicated to issues affecting the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) communities. As a civil rights organization, we have a voting rights project working to ensure that systems and policies do not dilute the AANHPI votes and that language assistance is provided under federal and state laws. We are part of a national affiliation with offices in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Atlanta, and Washington D.C.

On July 18, 2013, our entire affiliation filed a joint statement with Asian Americans Legal Defense and Education Fund before the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice Committee on the Judiciary United States House of Representatives at the hearing on “The Voting Rights Act after the Supreme Court's Decision in *Shelby County*.” My plan today is not to repeat our joint statement. Instead, I will first provide a brief overview of what the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision means for Asian Americans nationally. I will then briefly outline issues faced by Asian American voters in California and close with the importance of the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

IMPACT OF SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER DECISION

Immediately prior to *Shelby*, there were 15 states that were covered in whole or in part under Section 5 (not including states in which the state or localities terminated coverage through bailout). Over half of these states are among the top 20 states having the largest Asian American populations in the country.

Former Section 5 jurisdictions are also home to the most rapidly growing Asian American populations. From 2000 to 2010, the country's Asian American population grew by 46%, making Asian Americans the fastest-growing racial group in the nation. Notably, in over two-thirds of former Section 5 states,

the Asian American population grew at a more rapid rate than this.

The following list illustrates this point:

California (partial coverage for Kings, Monterey and Yuba Counties)—5.6 million Asian Americans, largest Asian American population by state, 34% growth since 2000

New York (partial coverage for Bronx, Kings and New York Counties)—1.6 million Asian Americans, second-largest Asian American population by state, 35% growth since 2000

Texas (statewide coverage)—1.1 million Asian Americans, third-largest Asian American population by state, 72% growth since 2000

Florida (partial coverage for Collier, Hardee, Hendry, Hillsborough and Monroe Counties)—over 570,000 Asian Americans, eighth-largest Asian American population by state, 72% growth since 2000

Virginia (statewide coverage)—over 520,000 Asian Americans, ninth-largest Asian American population by state, 71% growth since 2000

Georgia (statewide coverage)—over 360,000 Asian Americans, 13th-largest Asian American population by state, 83% growth since 2000

North Carolina (partial coverage for 40 counties)—over 250,000 Asian Americans, 15th-largest Asian American population by state, 85% growth since 2000

Arizona (statewide coverage)—over 230,000 Asian Americans, 19th-largest Asian American population by state, 95% growth since 2000

The termination of Section 5 coverage for these states comes at a pivotal moment for Asian American communities, which in recent years have begun to emerge politically in these states as they increase in size. As our nation has historically witnessed, when groups of racial minorities move into an area, or outpace the general population growth in an area, the result is often racial tension and sometimes racial discrimination, including voting discrimination.

CONTINUING BARRIERS TO VOTING

Asian Americans in California continue to face barriers in the electoral process. While a number of jurisdictions meet their obligations to provide language assistance under Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act in commendable fashion, enforcement actions to bring jurisdictions into compliance have been necessary in some instances. In the past decade, the U.S. Department of Justice brought Section 203 enforcement actions against San Diego County (2004), the City of Rosemead (2005), the City of Walnut (2007), and Alameda County (2011), for non-compliance with respect to Asian language requirements.

In 2013, the Asian Americans Advancing Justice affiliation released a report that examined Asian language assistance in Section 203-covered jurisdictions across the country, including the eight counties in California covered for Asian American populations. Drawing upon poll monitoring carried out at nearly 900 election precincts during the November 2012 election, the report shows that some jurisdictions are making use of good practices to provide written and oral assistance. At the same time, the report found low visibility or no display of translated materials at 45% of poll sites monitored and a lack of bilingual poll workers at nearly a quarter of poll sites monitored.

In the vote dilution context, Asian Americans are confronted with racially polarized voting that impairs their ability to elect candidates of choice, perhaps not in every area of the state where Asian Americans are concentrated, but at least in certain areas of the state. Leading up to the post-2010 Census

redistricting, Asian Americans Advancing Justice-Los Angeles worked with a political scientist to assess the existence of racially polarized voting against Asian Americans in the San Gabriel Valley and South Bay regions of Los Angeles County. In his analysis of 13 elections, the political scientist found that in all elections Asian American voters demonstrated cohesive voting patterns in favor of Asian American candidates. Non-Asian Americans tended to vote against the candidates preferred by Asian American voters; in ten of the elections, non-Asian Americans gave less than 50% of their vote to candidates preferred by Asian Americans.

IMPORTANCE OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

On June 24, 2015, the Voting Rights Advancement Act (Advancement Act) was introduced in the Senate (S. 1659) and the House (H.R. 2867). The Advancement Act has received broad and vocal support from the civil rights community because it responds to the unique, modern-day challenges of voting discrimination that have evolved in the 50 years since the Voting Rights Act first passed. The Advancement Act recognizes that changing demographics require tools that protect voters nationwide—especially voters of color, voters who rely on languages other than English, and voters with disabilities. It also requires that jurisdictions make voting changes public and transparent. The Advancement Act would modernize the preclearance formula to cover states with a pattern of discrimination that puts voters at risk, ensure that last-minute voting changes will not adversely affect voters, protect voters from the types of voting changes most likely to discriminate against people of color and language minorities, enhance the ability to apply preclearance review when needed, and expand the effective Federal Observer program and improve voting rights protections for Native Americans and Alaska Natives.

Since the Shelby decision, 17 states have implemented or adopted new voting restriction laws which are in place for the first time for the 2016 presidential election. Many of these restrictions, such as ID requirements, proof of citizenship, and limitations to early voting, are practices that would require preclearance by the Department of Justice under the Advancement Act. These are known practices which often result in the disenfranchisement of voters, particularly voters of color and low-income voters.

Some of the known practices disproportionately affect naturalized citizens, and in the United States, 63% of Asian Americans who are U.S. citizens and 18 or older are naturalized citizens. Proof of citizenship, in particular, has a disparate impact on naturalized citizens. Unlike birth certificates, naturalization certificates cannot be copied without lawful authority. When Arizona implemented its proof of citizenship requirement (which was later found to violate the National Voter Registration Act), some counties accepted copies of the naturalization certificate, others did not. In the counties that did not, a naturalized citizen without a passport would have to register in person at the election official's office during normal business hours. Moreover, duplicate or replacement copies of the certificate can take over a year and costs \$345 to obtain a copy. For those without the funds to obtain a duplicate copy, the proof of citizenship requirement is a denial of the right to vote. Even for those who are able to afford the fee, many elections can occur during the time it takes to obtain a duplicate. It is, therefore, crucial for the Department of Justice to have the authority to critically review proof of citizenship requirements linked to voting.

Earlier this year, we saw the implementation of North Carolina's new photo ID law. As noted above, North Carolina has the 15th largest Asian American community by state. Rudy Ravindra, a resident of North Carolina, wrote an op-ed for Raleigh's *The News & Observer* recounting his March 2016 early voting experience. According to Mr. Ravindra, after giving his driver's license to the poll worker, the poll worker required Mr. Ravindra to spell his name as he (the poll worker) typed it into the system. Mr. Ravindra reported that his wife had the same experience on election day. In both situations, poll workers simply looked at the white voters' identification cards and did not ask them to spell their names. While the Advancement Act focuses on policies before implementation, the Department of Justice might have blocked North Carolina's ID law in the first place.

Another known practice that would be subject to preclearance by the Advancement Act is changes that reduce, consolidate, or relocate voting locations. In Arizona's March primary, the election official in Maricopa County consolidated precincts into large vote centers but failed to provide enough staff support. Each vote center was assigned 21,000 voters. News coverage reported voters having to wait 4 to 5 hours to vote. As noted above, Arizona saw 95% growth in the Asian American population since 2000, and Maricopa County is home to 82,000 Asian American eligible voters. Oversight by the Department of Justice could have stopped the closure of neighborhood precincts and prevented the disenfranchisement of the voters who could not stand in line for hours.

In the three years since the Shelby decision, Congress has failed to restore the Voting Rights Act, and voters have been disenfranchised due to new laws and practices implemented post-Shelby. While the three Congressmembers holding this roundtable have been champions in advocating for the Voting Rights Advancement Act, the time is now for the full Congress to take up and debate the bill. Congress must come together, as it has each time the Voting Rights Act has been before it, to restore the protections found in the Voting Rights Act to ensure a stronger democracy.

Thank you again for the invitation to testify before you today.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it's ironic that, as a country, we consistently advocate for other countries to support democratic traditions and institutions—and empower their citizens.

Sadly, because of the Shelby decision, we are not living up to our own standards.

But, we cannot lay all the blame on the Supreme Court. The Court was clear in their ruling. While they invalidated the mechanism used to determine what jurisdictions required preclearance—they also suggested that Congress could come up with a standard that passes constitutional muster.

Sadly, thanks to Republican inaction, we have failed in that task.

Now, we are about to have the first Presidential election—in five decades—without the very basic protections that were enshrined in the Voting Rights Act.

What does this mean? It means that some of our most vulnerable populations—communities of color, young people, students and women—are more likely to encounter obstacles to exercising their most basic right.

And, let's be absolutely clear—there remain serious challenges and problems when it comes to protecting voters. By no means are the protections in the VRA out-of-date or no longer necessary.

We saw a stark example of this earlier this year—in Brooklyn. In April, some 120,000 voters from the rolls in Kings County—the largest county in the state—were improperly purged from the voter rolls.

And, an analysis by local media outlets found those affected were disproportionately Latino voters—mostly in working class neighborhoods like Sunset Park, East New York, and parts of Bushwick and Williamsburg.

Now, let's recall that Kings County was previously covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Would these voters have been removed if the VRA were still intact? The fact is we do not know.

But we do know this—our democracy and our system of voting is not perfect—and to argue that voters are no longer disenfranchised is simply false. We've seen that clearly in Brooklyn.

And, let me make one other observation—those who argue that we need more stringent voter ID laws to prevent “voter fraud” are making a dishonest argument. Every credible expert who has examined the data has concluded this—voter fraud is exceedingly rare, if not completely nonexistent.

Voting rights should not be a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. We should all be passionate about defending and upholding this most basic right—for all Americans.

Yet, this Congress—thanks to the Republican Leadership—has failed to do the necessary work to restore the protections in the Voting Rights Act.

Earlier this year, my colleagues HAKEEM JEFFRIES, GRACE MENG and I hosted a forum on the Voting Rights Act. We heard from local experts about the need to restore these protections.

Let me conclude simply by saying this—it is shameful this Congress has not addressed this issue. But it is also not surprising. As this House has not acted on gun violence and has not yet allocated appropriate funding to address Zika, or dealt with the Flint water crisis—this is yet one more example of how House Republicans are simply not doing their job.

So, I call on my colleagues—do your job. Let's do the hard work of reinstating these democratic protections so voters are not disenfranchised.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Voting Rights Advancement Act, H.R. 2867, introduced by my friends and colleagues Representatives TERRI SEWELL, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, and JUDY CHU. It is long past time that we take up their bipartisan bill, which would restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it surprises few of us that following the Supreme Court's misguided decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, the right to vote has been increasingly attacked in states across the country. The court's decision invalidated the coverage formula in the Voting Rights Act by which certain states and jurisdictions with a history of discrimination were required to preclear election changes with the U.S. Department of Justice. The results have been grave. Since 2010, twenty-two states have implemented new voting restrictions that make it more difficult for students, seniors, those with disabilities, and minorities to vote. This past summer alone, federal courts struck down new prohibitive voting laws in five different states. Federal protections, such as

preclearance, prevent these pernicious laws from being passed in the first place, and this recent surge of court cases only underscores the importance of restoring the Voting Rights Act. Disenfranchisement and voter discrimination are realities that Americans face across the country, including in my district in New York City.

To further investigate the effects of voter discrimination, I hosted a Voting Rights Forum this past May through the leadership of the Democratic Outreach and Engagement Task Force with my colleagues Representatives VELÁZQUEZ and JEFFRIES. We were fortunate to host voting rights experts to talk about the effects of the Shelby County decision on our constituents.

I invited Jerry Vattamala from the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund to talk about the particular barriers that the Asian-American community faces to participating in the electoral process, and why Congress needs to restore the Voting Rights Act. I include in the RECORD his testimony from the event:

STATEMENT OF THE ASIAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND JERRY VATTAMALA, ESQ. DIRECTOR, DEMOCRACY PROGRAM HEARING

“FRAGILE AT FIFTY: THE URGENT NEED TO STRENGTHEN AND RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT” BEFORE HON. NYDIA VELAZQUEZ, HON. GRACE MENG AND HON. HAKEEM JEFFRIES, NEW YORK CITY

MAY 20, 2016

The Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF) is a 42-year-old national civil rights organization based in New York City that promotes and protects the civil rights of Asian Americans through litigation, legal advocacy, and community education.

Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) has been critical in preventing actual and threatened discrimination aimed at Asian Americans in national and local elections. As a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, Asian American voters have suffered a serious rollback in their right to vote. AALDEF submits this testimony to elucidate the precarious landscape of Asian American voting rights in wake of the decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

AALDEF has monitored elections and conducted annual multilingual exit polls since 1988. Consequently, AALDEF has collected valuable data that documents the continued need for the VRA's protections. In 2012, AALDEF dispatched over 800 attorneys, law students, and community volunteers to 127 poll sites in 14 states to document voter problems on Election Day. The survey polled 9,298 Asian American voters. In 2014, AALDEF surveyed 4,102 Asian American voters at 64 poll sites in 37 cities in 11 states.

Many voting problems that we observed in 2012 have persisted through 2014 and beyond. Operating without the preclearance provisions, the most effective tool of the VRA, the Department of Justice has lost its ability to block voting changes before they occur. As a result, AALDEF and other organizations and individuals have had to engage in more affirmative litigation to protect the fundamental right to vote.

AALDEF has previously submitted testimony to Congress, filed amicus briefs in the Supreme Court of the United States, and released detailed reports regarding Asian American voting problems and the continued need for the full protections of the VRA, including Section 5 preclearance.

Asian Americans continue to face pervasive and current discrimination in voting, particularly in jurisdictions that were previously covered for Section 5 preclearance. For example, in the 2004 primary elections in Bayou La Batre, Alabama, supporters of a white incumbent running against Phuong Tan Huynh, a Vietnamese American candidate, made a concerted effort to intimidate Asian American voters. They challenged Asian Americans at the polls, falsely accusing them of not being U.S. citizens or city residents, or of having felony convictions. The challenged voters were forced to complete a paper ballot and have that ballot vouched for by a registered voter. In explaining his and his supporters' actions, the losing incumbent stated, “We figured if they couldn't speak good English, they possibly weren't American citizens.” The Department of Justice (DOJ) investigated the allegations and found them to be racially motivated. As a result, the challengers were prohibited from interfering in the general election, and Bayou La Batre, for the first time, elected an Asian American to the City Council.

Also in 2004, New York poll workers required Asian American voters to provide naturalization certificates before they could vote. At another poll site, a police officer demanded that all Asian American voters show photo identification, even though photo ID is not required to vote in New York elections. If voters could not produce such identification, the officer turned them away and told them to go home.

Overt racism and discrimination against Asian Americans at the polls persists to the present day and will worsen without Section 5 to combat such behavior. Prior to the Supreme Court's decision, voting rights advocates used Section 5 to protect Asian American voters in redistricting, changes to voting systems, and changes to polling sites. The following are recent examples of harmful actions against Asian American voters that were stopped by Section 5. Now that the coverage formula has been struck, and many jurisdictions are no longer covered by Section 5, Asian Americans are once again vulnerable to nefarious discriminatory actions such as these that will weaken their voting rights and power.

For example, redistricting plans continue to be drafted with discriminatory intent in states with large Asian American communities. As shown in *Perry v. Perez*, 132 S. Ct. 934 (2012), the Texas Legislature drafted a redistricting plan, Plan H283, that would have had significant negative effects on the ability of minorities, and Asian Americans in particular, to exercise their right to vote.

Since 2004, the Asian American community in Texas State House District 149 has voted as a bloc with Hispanic and African American voters to elect Hubert Vo, a Vietnamese American, as their state representative. District 149 has a combined minority citizen voting-age population of 62 percent. Texas is home to the third-largest Asian American community in the United States, growing 72 percent between 2000 and 2010.

In 2011, the Texas Legislature sought to eliminate Vo's State House seat and redistribute the coalition of minority voters to the surrounding three districts with larger non-minority populations. Plan H283 would have thus abridged the Asian American community's right to vote in Texas by diluting the large Asian American populations across the state.

In addition to discrimination in redistricting, Asian American voters have also endured voting system changes that impair their ability to elect candidates of choice. For example, before 2001 in New York City, the only electoral success for Asian Americans was on local community school boards.

In each election—in 1993, 1996, and 1999—Asian American candidates ran for the school board and won. These victories were due, in part, to the alternative voting system known as “single transferable voting” or “preference voting.” Instead of selecting one representative from single-member districts, voters ranked candidates in order of preference, from “1” to “9.” In 1998, New York attempted to switch from a “preference voting” system, where voters ranked their choices, to a “limited voting” system, where voters could select only four candidates for the nine-member board, and the nine candidates with the highest number of votes were elected. This change would have put Asian American voters in a worse position to elect candidates of their choice.

Furthermore, the ability of Asian Americans to vote is also frustrated by sudden changes to poll sites without informing voters. For example, there have been numerous instances of sudden poll site closures in Asian American neighborhoods in New York City, where the Board of Elections failed to take reasonable steps to ensure that Asian American voters are informed of their correct poll sites. Voters have been misinformed about their poll sites before the elections or have been misdirected by poll workers on Election Day, thus creating confusion for Asian American voters and disrupting their ability to vote.

In 2001, primary elections in New York City were rescheduled due to the attacks on the World Trade Center. The week before the rescheduled primaries, AALDEF discovered that a certain poll site, I.S. 131, a school located in the heart of Chinatown and within the restricted zone in lower Manhattan, was being used by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for services related to the World Trade Center attacks. The Board chose to close down the poll site and no notice was given to voters. The Board provided no media release to the Asian-language newspapers, made no attempts to send out a mailing to voters, and failed to arrange for the placement of signs or poll workers at the site to redirect voters to other sites. In fact, no consideration at all was made for the fact that the majority of voters at this site were limited English proficient, and that the site had been targeted for Asian language assistance under Section 203. With Section 5 no longer applicable in most jurisdictions, disruptive changes to polling sites, voting systems, and redistricting plans can now occur unfettered, wreaking havoc on Asian American voters' ability to cast an effective ballot.

American citizens of Asian ancestry have long been targeted as foreigners and unwanted immigrants, and racism and discrimination against Asian Americans persist to this day. These negative perceptions have real consequences for the ability of Asian Americans to fully participate in the electoral and political process. Section 5 of the VRA was an effective tool in protecting Asian American voters against a host of actions that threaten to curtail their voting rights. However, the Supreme Court's recent decision dismantling the coverage formula has left a large gap in protections for Asian American voters that requires Congressional action. We look to Congress to work in a bipartisan fashion to respond to the Court's ruling and strengthen the VRA, as it did during the 2006 reauthorizations and each previous reauthorization. We respectfully offer our assistance in such a process.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in just three days, the National Museum of African American History & Culture will officially open its doors to the public. One hundred years in the making, the museum explores the richness

and diversity of the African American experience.

As a former public school history teacher in Charleston, South Carolina and a lifelong student of history, I have always worked to improve our understanding of the past. History frames our views on current events and has been called the study of human nature by using examples.

The struggle for the right to vote is an important part of that history. It's a history that I know quite well—having lived through some of it. I met my wife while in jail for helping to organize one of the biggest student demonstrations in the South. More than one thousand students from South Carolina State and Claflin University assembled to march to downtown Orangeburg in March 1960. 388 of us were arrested.

A few months later, in October 1960, I met John Lewis and Dr. King on the campus of Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. We were seeking the right to vote.

When the Voting Rights Act was signed into law in August 1965, it restored the promise of the 19th amendment. It prohibited racial discrimination in voting and has been called the most successful piece of civil rights legislation in American history.

It was reauthorized by Congress on a strong bipartisan basis in 1970, 1975, 1982, 1992 and, most recently, in 2006.

I testified before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights in support of extending Section 5, with its strong preclearance requirements, in 1981. I was South Carolina's Human Affairs Commissioner at the time. At the time, the preclearance requirements were necessary to prevent states with a history of discrimination from engaging in further discriminatory practices. They were necessary again in 1992, in 2006, and they still are necessary today.

With no coverage formula in place for the last three years, states have been free to engage in nefarious schemes to suppress minority turnout, dilute the voting strength of communities of color, erect new barriers to the ballot box and make it harder for millions of Americans to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

And they have.

When Americans go to the ballot box in less than fifty days they'll find new voting restrictions in place in 17 states for the first time in a presidential election.

Nearly 8 million Latino voters living in previously covered jurisdictions will be vulnerable to voting discrimination and changes in election administration.

Five federal lawsuits involving Native American voting rights in ND, UT, SD, AZ and AK have been filed since *Shelby County v. Holder*.

North Carolina's legislature got to work within hours of the *Shelby County* decision on its “monster” voting law which imposed strict photo ID requirements and cut back early voting. The state has spent more than \$5 million defending the law—which the 4th Circuit said, “target[ed] African Americans with almost surgical precision” and “impose[d] cures for problems that did not exist.”

Six former preclearance states have closed voter registration offices and moved or closed polling places. And six local jurisdictions have redrawn districts or changed the rules to dilute minority votes.

In Georgia alone, 372,000 voters have been purged or removed from the voter rolls in the last two years with little or no awareness. And in Hancock County, one in twenty voters—virtually all African-Americans—were removed from the voting rolls and sheriff's deputies began showing up at their homes commanding they defend themselves at board meetings as a so-called “courtesy.”

Texas has spent more than \$3.5 million defending its discriminatory photo ID law and just yesterday, was ordered by a federal court to stop purposefully misleading voters about the requirements to vote.

A recent study from 2006–2014 found that the racial turnout gap doubles or triples in states with strict voter ID requirements. They concluded that “strict voter identification laws substantially alter the makeup of who votes and ultimately skew democracy in favor of whites and those on the political right.”

I'm not reading from a history book. This is happening right now—in the United States of America in 2016.

This Congress—Republicans in this Congress—have done little more than pay lip service to voting rights for the last three years. As we approach the upcoming election, I cannot help but feel as if the lessons of history are creeping up on us. Let us not be doomed to repeat it.

Congress must restore the Voting Rights Act. We can do it immediately and we should.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the fifty plus years since the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., articulated the dream of a generation, this nation has seen inspiring progress toward the ideal of equality under the law. Nowhere has this progress been more dramatic than in the arena of voting rights. The passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 heralded a new era of political opportunity for African-Americans not seen since Reconstruction.

At the state and local level, Section 5 of the Act—which required jurisdictions with a history of voting discrimination to obtain advanced approval for voting changes—was especially important in leveling the playing field by shifting notice requirements and the burden of proof to jurisdictions with a history of discrimination, rather than relying on traditional litigation which would have taken years and countless costs to root out patterns of discrimination in voting. More than any other provision of the Act, Section 5 can be credited with the sustained progress to voting equality.

The Supreme Court, in its 5–4 *Shelby County v. Holder* decision from 2013, has suspended implementation of the Section 5 preclearance program by invalidating the formula used to designate covered jurisdictions. This decision has seriously undermined the nation's progress toward equal voting rights by allowing discriminatory voting measures to evade streamlined review and requiring minority voters to engage in costly protracted litigation.

In the wake of a divided Supreme Court, many former Section 5 covered states have enacted harsh “second generation” obstacles to voting rights, such as restrictive voter ID laws, limits on early voting and voter registration, and bans on ex-offenders from being able to regain their voting rights. Most of these voter suppression measures have a disproportionate impact on minorities, seniors, young people, and other historically-disadvantaged individuals. Not surprisingly, an ever increasing number of voters on election day are

plagued by long lines at the polls, confusing voter rules, and restrictions intended to deter them from voting.

Literally days after Supreme Court issued the Shelby County ruling, formerly covered jurisdictions enacted discriminatory voting practices that would have been blocked by Section 5 or not even attempted passage of legislation. Texas implemented its restrictive photo ID law, which had been previously blocked by Section 5. The North Carolina state legislature passed a law that imposed a strict photo ID requirement, significantly cut back on early voting, and reduced the window for voter registration. Alabama moved ahead with its law requiring strict photo ID to vote. And Mississippi officials moved to enforce its photo ID law, which the state submitted for preclearance but was never allowed to implement.

In 2013 and 2014, at least 10 of the 15 states that had been covered in whole or in part by Section 5 introduced new restrictive legislation that would make it harder for minority voters to cast a ballot. These have passed in two states: Virginia (stricter photo ID requirement and increased restrictions on third-party voter registration) and North Carolina (the above-discussed omnibus bill, which included the ID requirement, early voting cutbacks, and the elimination of same-day voter registration).

Further, seven other formerly covered states also passed restrictive legislation in 2011 and 2012, prior to the Shelby County decision in anticipation of victory.

Section 5's loss perhaps has been felt most acutely at the local level. The great majority of voting law changes that were blocked as discriminatory under the Voting Rights Act were enacted at the local level: counties, municipalities, and other state sub-jurisdictions. We have witnessed local jurisdictions step into the void left by Section 5 to pass all manner of discriminatory voting procedures: discriminatory local redistricting plans; closing polling places and DMV's in minority communities and changing election dates, just to name a few.

Though Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is still available to challenge these discriminatory practices, the time and expense of litigation leaves these practices in place to do years of damage and places a substantial burden on the rights of minority voters. It took years of litigation to roll back the challenged practices mentioned earlier in Texas and North Carolina.

We will enter a Presidential election without Section 5 protection for the first time in 50 years. The danger to our democratic process cannot be overstated. Already, we have heard political candidates discussing voting intimidation tactics and we must focus on the status of federal observers under the law.

As a staunch proponent, and a remaining member of Congress who voted for the Act in 1965, I joined Representative SENSENBRENNER to introduce H.R. 885, the Voting Rights Amendment Act, which is designed to restore the vitality and effectiveness of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Though we have made progress in the courts over the past several weeks in overturning some of these voter suppression measures, the states and some localities have been quick to re-enact substitute measures. This tactic was the very reason for the enact-

ment of Section 5 in the first place and evidence of the need for reauthorizing legislation.

In addressing these calculated voter suppression tactics, we cannot forget those who have lost their voting rights and have no voice in government. Currently, nearly 4 million of disqualified voters are not in prison, but on probation or parole. Nearly 3 million of the disenfranchised have completed their entire sentence, including probation and parole. I believe that such prohibitions on voting undermine the fundamental rights of people with felony convictions.

To correct this injustice, I have introduced H.R. 1459, the Democracy Restoration Act which declares the right of a U.S. citizen to vote in any election for federal office shall not be denied because that individual has been convicted of a criminal offense.

Just as the Brennan Center has observed in their report on voting rights post-Shelby County, "For all the real progress Section 5 facilitated, the nation and its voters now lack a critical tool to protect those earned advances. Bad laws with lasting, harmful consequences now lack a review mechanism, the method of fighting these laws is now limited to costly and time-intensive litigation, and the public has lost the one centralized means to track the thousands of changes annually that affect Americans' right to vote."

Just as Congress ignored political headwinds and set partisan differences aside five decades ago to prohibit discriminatory voting practices, this Congress must again muster the political courage to enact legislation to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3076. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish caskets and urns for burial in cemeteries of States and tribal organizations of veterans without next of kin or sufficient resources to provide for caskets or urns, and for other purposes; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5936. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, to make certain improvements to the enhanced-use lease authority of the Department, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5985. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 22, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5995. A bill to strike the sunset on certain provisions relating to the authorized protest of a task or delivery order under section 4106 of title 41, United States Code (Rept. 114-779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2315. A bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States (Rept. 114-780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 879. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 114-781). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5982. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes (Rept. 114-782, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Rules discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5982 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 6091. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify aliens who have served, or are serving, in the Armed Forces of the United States when those aliens apply for an immigration benefit or are placed in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 6092. A bill to amend section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow certain alien veterans to be paroled into the United States to receive health care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6093. A bill to establish naturalization offices at initial military training sites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HILL, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. BARR, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 6094. A bill to provide for a 6-month delay in the effective date of a rule of the Department of Labor relating to income thresholds for determining overtime pay for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 6095. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a program to increase access to prekindergarten through grade 12 computer science education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6096. A bill to provide for the reconsideration of claims for disability compensation for veterans who were the subjects of experiments by the Department of Defense during World War II that were conducted to assess the effects of mustard gas or lewisite on people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 6097. A bill to amend section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the conditions on the detention of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 6098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the withholding of income and social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 6099. A bill to support the establishment and improvement of communications sites on or adjacent to Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture through

the retention and use of rental fees associated with such sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 6100. A bill to prevent proposed regulations relating to restrictions on liquidation of an interest with respect to estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes from taking effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 6101. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the Medicare accountable care organization (ACO) 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. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6102. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Smart Technology Traffic Signals Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 6103. A bill to provide standards for physical condition and management of housing receiving assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 6104. A bill to establish a deadline for approval of claims made under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 6105. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate certain parts of United States Route 264 and the Eastern North Carolina Gateway Corridor as future parts of the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 6106. A bill to establish a single export promotion agency in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 6107. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with public and private entities to provide pro bono legal services to homeless veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CURBELO of Flor-

ida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SWALLOW of California, Mr. BLUM, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 6108. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that certain veterans receive in-patient psychiatric care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 6109. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the affordability and enrollment procedures of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. PERRY (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 6110. A bill to amend section 412(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require ratification of a plan with respect to a refugee by the legislature of a State before the refugee may be initially placed or resettled in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a partial exclusion from the excise tax imposed on heavy trucks sold at retail for alternative fuel trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 6112. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to make information relating to lenders making covered loans publicly available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6113. A bill to restrict the authority of the Attorney General to enter into contracts for Federal correctional facilities and community confinement facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 6114. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish caskets and urns for burial in cemeteries of States and tribal organizations of veterans without next of kin or sufficient resources to provide for caskets or urns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6115. A bill to fulfill the land conveyance requirements under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act for the Alaska Native Village of Canyon Village, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution recognizing the International Day of Peace; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution condemning the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the 1988 massacre of political prisoners and calling for justice for the victims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H. Res. 880. A resolution expressing support for a uniform adoption process of children

from foster care and promoting the enactment by all States of the Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children to ensure more children in the United States are placed in safe, loving, and permanent homes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. BEYER (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 881. A resolution recognizing the 55th anniversary of the Fulbright-Hays Programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. VARGAS:

H.R. 6091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following section of the U.S. Constitution:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 6092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following section of the U.S. Constitution:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

(5) 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 6093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following section of the U.S. Constitution:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution;

(3) To provide and maintain a navy, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 13 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(4) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 6094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 6095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;”

Clause 3

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;”

Clause 8

“To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;”

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 6096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 6097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that “Congress shall have the power . . . to establish a uniform rule of naturalization,” and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that “Congress shall have the power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any officer or department thereof.”

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 6098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the Sixteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 6099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all otehr Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 6100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: Since valuation rules affect the collection of taxes, laws determining their use are constitutional under Congressional authority to lay and collect taxes.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 6101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 6104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 6105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses:

1) The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

3) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

7) To establish Post Offices and post Roads

18) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 6106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes . . .”

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 6107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 6108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution which grants Congress the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 6109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.”

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 6112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 1 and 8

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 6114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 167: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 188: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 213: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 592: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 704: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 746: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 932: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1006: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1025: Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1089: Mr. KIND and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 1095: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1142: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1151: Mr. LUTKEMEYER.

H.R. 1153: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1185: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1283: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1319: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1492: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1516: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1550: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1687: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1728: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1733: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1861: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1941: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2287: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2290: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 2434: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2441: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2521: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2597: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2660: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2698: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2715: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2858: Mr. KIND and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2972: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3084: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3099: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3280: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 3323: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3381: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3522: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3546: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3599: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3660: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3886: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 3892: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 3929: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 4140: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 4151: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 4211: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4298: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4475: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 4488: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 4505: Mr. POCAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4559: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4592: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 4622: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4657: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 4760: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 4784: Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4796: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4907: Mrs. LOVE and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4919: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4927: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4932: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5008: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 5061: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5082: Mr. MARINO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 5122: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 5167: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 5180: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 5235: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5251: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 5256: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 5263: Ms. DELBENE and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 5373: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 5392: Mr. LUTKEMEYER.

H.R. 5410: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 5418: Mr. YOHO, Mr. YODER, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5428: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 5436: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5466: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 5474: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5499: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 5549: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Ms. NOR-TON.

H.R. 5560: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5579: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 5600: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KLINE, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 5622: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 5624: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5682: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5691: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 5720: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 5721: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 5732: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 5768: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 5790: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5813: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5814: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 5816: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 5817: Mr. BONAMICI and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 5829: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 5853: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 5864: Mr. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 5904: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5932: Mr. KING of New York and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5942: Mr. KUSTER.

H.R. 5953: Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 5961: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5978: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 5980: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 5999: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 6003: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 6010: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 6015: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 6017: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 6039: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 6045: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 6049: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 6059: Mr. PETERS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 6061: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 6066: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 6072: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 6073: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 6087: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 6088: Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.J. Res. 98: Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. SALMON.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 346: Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 831: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Res. 840: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 845: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 848: Mr. KATKO.
H. Res. 850: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 851: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H. Res. 853: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 854: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 861: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. LOFGREN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The amendment to H.R. 5931 (Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act) that I filed with the Committee on Rules, listed as amendment number one in that committee's report on the bill, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.