



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2016

No. 144

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 22, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER 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.

ACA IS WORKING

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and ask you to consider where we were before the Affordable Care Act: premiums were rising three times faster than wages, eating up much more of Americans' hard-earned paychecks; millions more families were drowning in medical debt; Americans had to pay for critical preventive services like flu shots, yearly checkups, and birth control; many young 20-somethings went without insurance; your suffering child

could be denied coverage due to a pre-existing condition; the so-called "doughnut hole," or gap in Medicare part D coverage, was forcing many seniors to choose between buying food to put on the table or livesaving prescription pills; women were charged more than men for coverage simply for being women; insurance companies could set annual or lifetime dollar caps on benefits, sticking American families with the remainder of the bill.

Thankfully, in the 6 years since the ACA was enacted, 20 million Americans have insurance for the first time in their lives, and the uninsured rate is the lowest it has been in American history, currently at 8.6 percent. The ACA has helped 105 million Americans, including 39.5 million women and nearly 28 million children, by preventing healthcare plans from capping benefits.

We have also seen that the marketplace is working better in States where elected officials collaborated to implement the ACA rather than trying to undermine it. In States that chose to expand Medicaid, insurance rates are an estimated 7 percent lower. In contrast, Governors and legislatures in 19 States have blocked Medicaid expansion, even as millions of their lowest income residents go without insurance coverage.

Unfortunately, over the past few years, it has been popular around here to say that the ACA is a failure, that it has socialized medicine, it is driving down the quality of American health care, and that we need to "repeal and replace" it because ObamaCare isn't working. This mindset is all wrong because, I am happy to report, the ACA is working. However, faster progress has been prevented due to obstruction and politics.

Since being signed into law in 2010, my colleagues across the aisle have voted to repeal all or parts of the ACA over 60 times. This has prevented funding needed for implementation and

necessary fixes to the law. It is time, once and for all, for Congress to accept the ACA as the law of the land and begin working to improve the law, not repeal it.

Now, I understand there are challenges as the law continues to take deeper roots throughout the healthcare industry. As they prepared for ACA, some insurance companies set prices too low, and they are now adjusting them in response; but I want to remind everyone that the insurance marketplace was dynamic before the ACA and will continue to be dynamic.

The ACA calls for a more innovative approach to health care, and many insurance companies have adapted so that they can focus on coordinated care and care management, for example. When insurance companies were still able to discriminate based on pre-existing conditions, they excluded or undervalued expensive patients—the same people who had the most healthcare needs. Now that actual data is available, the market is undergoing a natural correction to bring prices in line with costs.

It is important to note that shopping on the marketplace has proven to help all consumers find the best price for coverage. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, almost half of returning healthcare.gov consumers switched plans and saved an average of \$42 per month.

I understand that challenges with the ACA remain. That is why HHS is taking steps to address these problems. Congress has a duty to look for policy solutions that improve everyone's access to the best care available and to make that care affordable. There are real ways that Congress can provide stability to the healthcare marketplace, and I urge my colleagues to bring some of these solutions to the floor.

□ 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.

H5803

I was proud to vote for the ACA, and when the majority is ready to get serious, I will be proud to vote for commonsense improvements and reforms to the law. The American public have spoken, and they will not return to the days before healthcare reform. It is time for Congress to listen to the American people.

SUICIDE PREVENTION AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the fact that September is Suicide Prevention Awareness Month. This gives all of us a chance to come together to promote awareness about the issue of suicide prevention and how we can all help others talk about suicide. For many families in communities across the country, loved ones are gone far too soon because of suicide.

Suicidal thoughts and action certainly know no bounds. They affect people of all ages, races, sexes, and religions. The statistics are startling. Suicide has become the third leading cause of death among young people and is the 10th leading cause of death here in the U.S. Each year, more than 40,000 Americans die by suicide—more than 100 per day, on average.

A week and a half ago, I was in Kalamazoo's Bronson Park for the Gryphon Place Suicide Prevention Walk. A beautiful young woman by the name of Kait stood before a crowd of more than 100 and read a stirring poem about being bullied and, as a result, how she harbored thoughts of suicide.

Hearing her deeply personal story certainly broke everyone's heart. It really did. As a father of two young adults, my thoughts quickly turned to them and their school experiences. Bullying is a very serious problem in our schools and can lead to depression, psychological issues, and, of course, suicide.

When she finished, I followed up with her and told her that she is not alone. Anyone considering suicide or having suicidal thoughts should know the same. You are not alone, and there are always help and options available.

In our communities, we have got to do more to stop bullying the minute it rears its ugly head. We should do more to reach out to those vulnerable to suicidal thoughts and tendencies, particularly young people, as they grapple with the pressures of growing up. We should also do more to treat mental health issues that can lead to suicide.

Here in the House, we recently were able to pass a very strong bipartisan piece of legislation sponsored by Dr. TIM MURPHY, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to do just that. We voted to give a much-needed upgrade to our mental health system and deliver real reforms that are going to make a difference for folks suffering with mental health illnesses.

In July, it was advanced through our committee 53-0, and then on the House floor by a 422-2 vote. This landmark vote marks the most significant reform to our Nation's mental health programs in decades, and I was proud to shepherd this important piece of legislation and now work with the Senate to get it done.

Suicide prevention is deeply personal to me. I don't talk about it often, but my uncle, my daughter's college roommate, and my son's dear girlfriend's sister all committed suicide. Those losses have left an indelible impression on my life.

Suicide is not an issue that can linger in the shadows. We have got to confront it and the underlying issues behind it together.

I include in the RECORD Kait's message of hope and inspiration. It can also be found on my Web site, upton.house.gov.

MY (SURVIVAL) STORY

I tried to start writing my story, but all that became of it was complicated comparisons and meaningless metaphors.

I thought that's just what I had to do, to connect with people.

Tell some confusing story about a lion and a lamb, or a turtle and a hare with some hidden cliché reworded moral of a story, explaining how the inferior character always wins in the end, and people would just get what I was trying to say.

But, you see, in reality, I didn't know which character I was supposed to play and so I played someone different every single day.

You see it's hard to stand up for yourself, when you don't even know who you are, and in school, if you didn't define yourself, others had no problem doing it for you.

So my name tag read Kait, but the names people called me sounded nothing like that.

slut, queer, trash, worthless, nothing.

I call them names, because that's what I became. At least in my mind, so it kept me in line.

for seven years in the hall I looked at the ground, I thought people wouldn't kick me if I was already down.

And if I didn't look up, I couldn't see the mirror, that way you and I could both pretend I wasn't even there.

And they decided that popcorn looked even better in my hair, but when I hid in the bathroom stall during lunch, they said I was throwing up my food.

Which, I was.

because I was too big, too small, too short, too tall, too skinny, and too fat.

I was big foot and man hands, with gorilla arm hair.

I took up other people's air and might as well go die in a hole because no one even wants me here.

But that was okay, I didn't want to be here either.

My mom still thinks I fractured my hand from catching it in the door, but I had the locker slammed on it because if you cry, that means you're asking for more.

And I didn't know how to face her, or the fact that I was a failure.

And even though I just graduated, I still feel I owe her apologies.

for the messages everyday the principal left on her phone, for the days she had to

get me, because I couldn't drive myself home, for the permanent art work on my arms that wouldn't ever be hung on fridge, for always playing too close to the ledge.

Because I couldn't pass math, but I could calculate just how many pills it took me to get sick without passing out so I didn't have to go to school the next day.

42.

I'm sorry.

Even once they were done with me, I felt like I owed them an apology.

Like they could hit me in the face, and I would apologize for standing in the way of their hand.

There were times I didn't believe I would be here today.

But look at me now, look where I stand.

Never did I realize that my own two hands had to the power to control my life. or end it.

My own principal, looked at me and said there was nothing he could do, unless I was seriously hurt.

Like to actually be noticed, I'd have to be dead in the dirt.

Because he thought that even if I walked away crying, as long as I was still alive and walking, it wasn't his problem.

His position of power told him he could decide when I was in pain, but he wasn't the one who had to stand in the rain.

Look in my eyes, look at my arms, read my poetry, can you still see me?

I lost myself halfway between my current normalcy and my makeshift reality.

Drowning in a sea of ideas that unless I became just another number in data about bullying, that I wouldn't actually make a difference.

because in a world where we focus on problems like gun control, we over look the fact that people can cause just as much damage with their words.

An issue is defined as a topic that can be debated or discussed, Like the "issue" I had with bullying was something that could be compromised.

Like my own life, was a thing that could be compromised.

It's like if you see a lamb being slaughtered, you just let it continue, because you too are a lamb, and it very well could be you.

I think in a way that's kind of the worlds view, like if I don't change a number or a statistic. There's nothing I actually went through.

Tell me why no stories ever make the news, about being a survivor of bullying.

but if my story was told, after I was six feet under, it would actually mean something.

It doesn't take 50 cents a day, it literally costs nothing to be a decent human being, or to simply treat each person like they have some meaning.

they say charity begins at home, but I think that's where the love should start too because those that know hurt are the ones that hurt you and my brothers and sisters who have walked in my shoes, i'm sorry if it gave you blisters for the longest time I tried to wear a pair that didn't fit, when I tried to be a she, that wasn't me.

Bullying is not just a consequence, the effects I still live with are alive and real, sometimes they are more real than I feel.

You can not push me under the rug because I am still here.

I am not just another bullying story.

And I am not just my bullying story.

Put a name to my face and call me, survivor.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to visit and volunteer at the Philadelphia region's largest hunger relief center, Philabundance.

Philabundance, a member of the Feeding America network of food banks, aims to drive hunger out of local communities with an eye toward eradicating hunger altogether. Each week, Philabundance serves 90,000 people in the Philadelphia area through partnerships with 350 agencies and food distribution programs. Incredibly, last year alone, they distributed almost 30 million pounds of food to neighbors suffering from hunger and food insecurity in nine counties.

I was impressed by the innovative strategies Philabundance employs to feed hungry people in its region. The Philabundance Community Kitchen equips those looking to reenter the workforce with valuable life and kitchen skills, while also providing meals to those in need.

Philabundance also opened the Nation's first nonprofit grocery store called Fare & Square in Chester, a city that faced a serious economic downturn due to the loss of manufacturing jobs. Fare & Square provides affordable and healthy food to the community, as well as discounts to those who qualify.

Food banks across our country like Philabundance and places like the Worcester County Food Bank and Food Bank of Western Massachusetts, which are both in my congressional district, do incredible work to reduce hunger in surrounding communities. They employ innovative strategies to fight hunger and increase access to nutritious food for our most vulnerable neighbors.

But the truth of the matter is we know that food banks and our charitable organizations can't do it alone. Some in Congress have proposed cuts and other restrictions to our Federal antihunger and nutrition programs. We often hear from them that charities, not the government, should be responsible for eradicating hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that food banks and food pantries and other charitable organizations are incredible on-the-ground partners in our effort to end hunger. They are often the first line of defense in emergency situations. But charities cannot do everything. That is just a fact.

Charities do face limitations. Many are small and only open on limited schedules. Most are run with the support of dedicated volunteers, some of whom have other full-time jobs. Often, these charities operate out of small places like basements or closets at houses of worship. Importantly, they rely on donations from members of the community as a primary source of food to distribute.

Our charities are doing an incredible job on the front lines, but ending hun-

ger will take a strong partnership between these organizations and Federal, State, and local governments. For our part, the Federal Government must continue to invest in our preeminent food and nutrition programs like SNAP, WIC, and The Emergency Food Assistance Program, known as TEFAP, just to name a few, and fight any attempts to cut or weaken them. TEFAP is especially important to our food banks, as they rely on this Federal funding to serve those in need.

We know that strong Federal investments in these critical safety net programs reduce hunger, improve the diets of low-income households, and save billions of dollars in healthcare costs. So the next time any of my colleagues try to score political points by demonizing Federal hunger programs, I ask you to think of these programs and the impacts they are having on constituents in each of our districts. I urge you to visit local food banks and charities and see all the incredible work they are doing to reduce hunger in our communities. Ask these organizations how the Federal antipoverty programs support their efforts to bring food to those most in need.

I urge all my colleagues to remember this fact:

Today, in the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world, over 42 million of our fellow citizens are hungry. They are kids, senior citizens, people who can't find work, and many people who are, in fact, working. They defy stereotypes. But all of them are our brothers and sisters, and we should care. We should absolutely do more than we are doing right now to end hunger in America.

The Federal Government, working with charities and local partners, has, within its grasp, the power to end hunger now; what we lack is the political will. Let's at long last create the political will and guarantee that, in our country, no one ever has to struggle with food insecurity or hunger. We can end hunger now.

□ 1015

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN BILL BARRETT

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of former Congressman Bill Barrett. He passed away earlier this week in his hometown of Lexington, Nebraska.

Mr. Barrett devoted his life to service. From his speakership in the State legislature to the years he spent in Congress, he was known for being true to his word and bringing people together to get things done. Serving Nebraskans was his top priority, and his dedication to the Third District and our State set a lasting example for me and all who have sought to fill his shoes.

Mr. Barrett was an influential conservative leader and a champion of agriculture. The Third District is now the top-producing agriculture district in the country, and we owe much of that to Mr. Barrett's tireless work.

His former staff have recounted how he would always ask: "Does this help the Third District?"

He was a true statesman who sought to serve others rather than himself. He worked so hard representing the 60-plus counties of the Third District for the 10 years that he served.

I extend my condolences to Mr. Barrett's wife and tremendous teammate, Elsie, and their family.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to request a moment of silence.

CONGRESSIONAL INABILITY TO PASS THE NDAA

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, this is a sage-grouse. I found out that the sage-grouse have poor eyesight, so they often collide with barbed wire fences and other obstructions that are difficult to see. And these collisions are often fatal.

But the sage-grouse looks like a keen-eyed hawk compared to Congress. That is because the sage-grouse recently collided with the National Defense Authorization Act, and the near-sighted bird won. Hopefully this time it won't be fatal.

We were supposed to vote to send the NDAA to the President this week, but a disagreement between the House and the Senate Republicans about the sage-grouse got egg all over the deal. That is right, a bill that authorizes over \$600 billion in spending on wartime operations, weapons acquisition, service-member benefits, and many other provisions critical to the defense of our country was taken down by a bird. But unlike the plane that landed in the Hudson River, Congress doesn't seem to have a Captain Sully to rescue it from bird-induced mayhem.

Don't get me wrong. The NDAA has many problems. It redirects billions in critical funding towards a program the Defense Department does not want. It sidesteps the Bipartisan Budget Act compromise by requiring supplemental funding just to keep the Pentagon running. It contains a myriad of poison pill riders, from allowing contractors to engage in discrimination against the LGBTQ employees, to releasing tens of thousands of handguns into our communities with no background checks.

All of these reasons are why I voted against the bill in committee and on the House floor. Nonetheless, the conference report is a compromise between the Senate and the House on complex issues ranging from funding operations against ISIS to military healthcare reform, a compromise on everything but this pesky bird.

House Republicans stubbornly refuse to remove language that would prohibit the sage-grouse from being placed

on the Endangered Species List, despite the fact that no one is trying to list it. Placing an animal on the Endangered Species List is a scientific decision not within the purview of Congress, and the administration has promised not to list the bird anyway, thanks to a compromise conservation plan. So the provision that is holding up the entire bill not only blatantly prioritizes politics over national security policy, it is legally meaningless.

I think Speaker RYAN put it best earlier this month when he said that playing politics over the NDAA is “shameless, and it threatens more than five decades of bipartisan cooperation to enact a national defense bill for our troops. The men and women who defend our country deserve better.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, then your party is chicken for prioritizing talking points over national security.

The sage-grouse is such an important issue to House Republicans that it makes you wonder what they will do next to contain the serious national security threat. Perhaps we will soon hear calls to build a wall on the Canadian border to prevent sage-grouse from sending their chicks across the border, even though some, I assume, are good hatchlings.

We may then hear about a plan to prevent sage-grouse from entering the country altogether until we find out what is going on. Maybe the Republicans will ban sage-grouse mating dances as breeding grounds for—well, if not terrorism, then, at least more sage-grouse.

But, seriously, colleagues, is this really what our constituents are most concerned about?

It is time to focus on passing a bill that provides accountability on defense spending to taxpayers and is in line with the Bipartisan Budget Act. Our inability to overcome this pointless provision is just further evidence that this Congress is for or, in this case, against the birds.

UNHCR'S BASH ISRAEL DAY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, world leaders are gathering in New York for the United Nations General Assembly, and throughout this whole process we are reminded yet again of just how broken the U.N. system really is.

Nowhere is this more evident than at the U.N. Human Rights Council. What a misnomer. This body that is supposed to promote and defend human rights worldwide has become a tool used by human rights abusers. And the office that provides support to the Council, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, OHCHR, is no better, as it is overrun with an anti-Israel bias and an anti-Israel agenda.

We see this play out each time the Council meets for its Bash Israel Day—

yippee—a day dedicated to permanent Agenda Item 7, the only agenda item of the Council devoted to a single country, Israel.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Council. In those 10 years, Mr. Speaker, there have been over 70 resolutions condemning Israel and about 65 resolutions for all of the other countries combined. Seventy on Israel, 65 for every other country. Countries like China, Russia, Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Cuba use the Council as a way to detract attention from their abuses and play upon the natural anti-Israel bias at the Council and the OHCHR.

So tomorrow, when the Council meets to discuss Agenda Item 7, it will be another Bash Israel Day that the administration failed to prevent. It will be another example of how this administration's influence fails to protect our friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Instead of continuing to legitimize this sham of a body, Congress must withhold all contributions and participation at the Council and to the OHCHR, and call for the dissolution of the Council. The administration must press the High Commissioner to denounce Agenda Item 7 and work against the inherent anti-Israel bias of the Council and the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights.

Earlier this year, Canadian Professor Michael Lynk was appointed as the Special Rapporteur for the Palestinian territories, despite his obvious bias and conflicts of interest, which we now know he lied about in his paperwork. This selection was so egregious that Canada's Foreign Minister from Professor Lynk's home country urged the U.N. to reconsider his appointment. The administration should echo those calls, but, instead, it has been silent.

The administration should also lead an opposition to the upcoming reelection next week of Jean Ziegler as an adviser to the Council. Ziegler is a notorious puppet of the Castro regime and an avowed defender of dictators and apologists for Islamic extremist groups and had no business being elected the first time around, let alone being reelected.

The Obama administration had an opportunity to block his candidacy while serving as the coordinator for the Western European and Others Group this year at the Council, but failed to do so; and now it looks as if Ziegler's reelection is a done deal, thanks to the administration's failure to act.

The administration, Mr. Speaker, continues to argue that only by being engaged and only by being full members of the U.N. can it advance our interests and protect Israel. Yet, next month, UNESCO is set to adopt a resolution that seeks to whitewash the Jewish and Christian religious and historical ties to Jerusalem. And while we might not be voting members of the full UNESCO body, this administration is an active member of UNESCO's exec-

utive committee, where this resolution was first approved.

Where was our influence then?

We can't even prevent a resolution that wipes away Jewish and Christian ties to Jerusalem, despite these being historical facts. It is very apparent that either the administration has no influence at the U.N. or the administration has no desire to upset the entrenched and damaged status quo.

That is why it is up to Congress, Mr. Speaker, to force the change at the U.N. I urge all of my colleagues to take a long, hard look at the Human Rights Council as a representation of all that is wrong and bad with the U.N., and to make reforming the U.N. a priority going forward. It will be up to us.

COMMEMORATING THE 1956 HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my very able colleague from Florida, Congressman DENNIS ROSS. And perhaps as we begin, we can welcome into our midst the very able Ambassador from Hungary to the United States, Ms. Reka Szemerkenyi.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding. And I do wish to say hello to our good friend from Hungary, Ambassador Szemerkenyi.

I am grateful, quite frankly, to have this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution and Freedom Fight.

Sixty years ago this October, Hungary stood tall in the shadows of communism and said: Enough is enough—eleg volt. Hungarian schoolchildren and college students took up arms against the totalitarian government and its Soviet policies.

On October 23, 1956, approximately 20,000 protesters convened next to the statue of General Jozef Bem, a national hero of Hungary. Despite orders to disband, protestors tore down a 30-foot bronze statue of Stalin near the city's Heroes' Square.

The following morning, power was consolidated and a new multiparty government was formed. The Hungarian Revolution spread like wildfire throughout the countryside.

On November 1, Prime Minister Imre Nagy announced Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and a declaration of neutrality. Embarrassed by the uprising, the USSR sent Soviet tanks and troops across the Hungarian border. Unfortunately, thousands of Hungarian civilians were killed, and the communist-backed government in Budapest was reinstalled.

In the months that followed the Hungarian Revolution, more than 20,000

Hungarians were imprisoned, 229 were executed, and more than 200,000 were forced to flee across the world.

Many of the Hungarians, named "56ers" because of the year that this happened, sought new lives in the United States with the help of Hungarian Americans, many of whom live in my good friend, Ms. KAPTUR's district.

My own parents were married in the Hungarian Catholic Church, St. Emeric, also located in Ms. KAPTUR's district. And as a child and grandchild of Hungarian Americans who helped 56ers, I am honored to sponsor this resolution with my good friend from Ohio in commemoration of the 60th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution.

I would like to thank my Hungarian American Caucus co-chairs: Ms. KAPTUR, ANDY HARRIS, and DAVID JOYCE.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this event this morning, and I wish to also say that the 1956 Hungarian Revolution was a breakpoint historical event that marked a turning point in the cold war.

It took great courage by those who participated during that unforgettable period as freedom fighters in Budapest and across that country stood tall in opposition to the communist-installed Hungarian people's false government and its Soviet-imposed repression.

□ 1030

You can travel to Budapest, Hungary, today, and you can see the bullet holes and the tank markings in some of the old, old buildings in that country. We know over 2,500 Hungarians died, 20,000 were imprisoned, and over 200,000 more fled as refugees.

Congressman ROSS has referenced certain individuals in my own region. Some of those refugees came to Ohio, including men like Reverend Martin Hernady, who ministered his entire life in Ohio serving the Hungarian diaspora, and the Ujvagi family of Toledo, whose compassion, patriotism, and genius have meant so much to our community and to me, personally.

In October and November of 1956, the country at the heart of the European Continent underwent 3 weeks of political turmoil that shook the region and exposed the ideological fissures behind the Iron Curtain.

The movie, "Torn From the Flag," I recommend to all of our colleagues. It gives people living today a sense of what happened during that fateful period.

During the 60th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and its freedom fight, we commemorate tens of thousands of Hungarians who took to the streets to protest the heavyhanded invasion by the Soviet Union. Their heroism is legendary, and it has made a difference in world history. They showed a united front and one that called upon their government to promote democratic ideals and unification.

This moment in time was encapsulated in a statement by the then-director of the Hungarian News Agency just before his untimely death in the revolution. He said: "We are going to die for Hungary and for Europe."

In the years since the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, Hungary has made progress toward democratic reform and has since become a member of the European Union and NATO. Its award of Nobel Prizes in every single scientific and cultural field is a testimony to the talent and to the abilities of the people of that country.

So like Congressman ROSS, as co-chair of the Congressional Hungarian Caucus, I remain dedicated to continuing channels of cooperation to further these efforts and to ensure that the principles of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution are fully realized.

I think the Partnership for Peace initiative between our respective militaries is a foundation stone to build our continuing relationship forward and support the revolution recognizing this important moment in world history in the 20th century.

May I say, long live liberty and long live Hungary.

I thank the gentleman, all the members of our Congressional Hungarian Caucus, and, again, I thank the Ambassador from Hungary for being here with us today and all of our colleagues for listening.

FATHER PATRICK RYAN

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life and work of Father Patrick Ryan.

Father Ryan, the pastor of Saints Peter and Paul's parish in Chattanooga from 1872 to 1878, was a shepherd who gave his life in ministering to his flock. He died a martyr's death in the yellow fever epidemic of 1878 when he was only 33 years old.

Perhaps his most notable accomplishment in the Chattanooga community was the opening of Notre Dame Academy, under the direction of the Dominican Sisters, which is the oldest private school in the city. The school had been in operation for little more than 2 years when it had to be converted into a hospital and orphanage because of the terrible yellow fever scourge in the city.

Although many people left the city as the disease spread, Father Ryan and Jonathan W. Bachman, pastor of the First Presbyterian church, were among the 1,800 people remaining in the city. They were good friends, and when Father Ryan was stricken, he was visited by Dr. Bachman.

Father Ryan is described by an eyewitness as "going from house to house in the worst infected section of the city to find what he could do for the sick and needy." He continued ministering

to his flock, after he himself had contracted the dreaded disease, to within 48 hours of his death.

In 1901, when the Chattanooga Council of the Knights of Columbus was organized, it was named the Father Patrick Ryan Council in honor of the priest who, by his high ideals, his devotion to duty, his spirit of sacrifice for his congregation and his city, seemed to exemplify the aims and purposes of the new order.

Several letters have been written in support of the cause of beatification and canonization of Father Patrick Ryan, including the Notarial Act of the Bishop of Knoxville, the Most Reverend Richard Stika; the letter naming Reverend J. David Carter as Episcopal Delegate and Promoter of Justice for the Cause of Beatification and Canonization; and a letter naming Deacon Gaspar DeGaetano as Vice Postulator for the Cause of Beatification and Canonization.

I believe it is most appropriate to honor a man who sacrificed himself to provide comfort to the people in Chattanooga who were afflicted with yellow fever so long ago.

BLACK LIVES MATTER

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a crisis in our communities and our country. I have watched in horror, day after day, as people of color are shot by the police officers sworn to protect them.

Now, we all know that the vast majority of law enforcement officers are committed to serving their communities, and many do incredible work despite dangerous and sometimes life-threatening conditions. I commend all of those speaking out and working against the injustices of some. Tragically, as we have witnessed in Dallas and Baton Rouge, innocent police officers have been the victims of violence as well. However, these tragedies do not change the underlying reality that our criminal justice system is broken.

Since Michael Brown was shot in Ferguson 2 years ago, 2,195 people have been killed by police in our Nation. As a mother of two Black men and the grandmother of five Black grandchildren, I worry that someone I love could become number 2,196.

Each time we lose a precious life to fear, distrust, and prejudice, the list of things that will get you killed as a Black person in America gets a little longer. Today I want to spend a little time going through that list.

Now you can get killed for going to buy a bag of Skittles, like Trayvon Martin; or even get killed for riding on New Year's Day, for instance, in the subway in the Bay Area like Oscar Grant. This is a subway card. Or maybe you can get killed for selling cigarettes, like Eric Garner. Or you can get killed for selling CDs, like Alton Sterling. This is a CD. You can also be

killed reaching for your wallet, like Philando Castile.

It doesn't matter if you are a child. If you are a Black boy, you can be killed playing with a toy gun. That is a toy gun. Now, that was what happened to Tamir Rice; he was 12. That is what happened to Tyre King last week; he was 13.

Or you can be killed for a missing front license plate like Samuel DuBose.

Heaven help you if you are driving a car. You can be killed for not signaling a lane change, like Sandra Bland, or for having a broken brake light, like Walter Scott, or for breaking down on a highway, like Terrence Crutcher.

Now, should any of this warrant a death sentence? Is this the America you want to live in? In 2016, when you are Black, too often you are seen as a threat first and a person second.

When my boys were young, I had some tough conversations with them about how to interact with police. I taught them that Black boys don't get the benefit of the doubt. I told them, to some, it doesn't matter who you are—it just matters what you look like.

I shouldn't have had to have these conversations with them. This is America. Parents shouldn't have to live in fear that one day they will have the same call that Michael Brown's mother got, that Sandra Bland's mother got, that Dontre Hamilton's mother got, or that Oscar Grant's mother got.

We need action here on the floor of Congress and in communities across the country. Enough is enough. We cannot stay silent while these murders continue unchecked. We must act now. That is why, today, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will march to the Department of Justice to demand action—because Black lives do matter.

OPIOID ADDICTION WEEK

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, opioid and drug addiction are wreaking havoc in communities and States across the Nation. Hospitals and first responders are stretched to the limit. Families and friends are trying to get their loved ones the help they so desperately need.

The disease of addiction has become all too common in our States and in our neighborhoods, but it is still hidden behind a stigma, a fear of asking for help. That is why we are marking this week as Prescription Drug and Opioid Epidemic Awareness Week, to spread the word and to encourage those struggling with addiction to get the help that they need. My district in West Virginia has some of the highest drug overdose rates in the Nation, but I want to highlight how our cities and counties are fighting back.

On August 15, my hometown of Huntington faced a true crisis as call after

call came in of people who had overdosed on heroin. It has become far too common in Huntington for first responders to go out on a few calls a day for people who have overdosed, but this August day was unlike any other. Within a few hours, 28 people overdosed, likely from just one batch of heroin—28 people in 5 hours in a city of less than 50,000 people.

Our first responders—EMTs and police—carry an opioid-reversing drug and rushed to their aid. Time and time again, they brought people back from the brink of death. Without the tireless work of the first responders and our healthcare workers, Huntington would have lost many more lives.

Possibly the most victimized of all the victims of the drug crisis is a newborn baby having to suffer through withdrawal after birth from exposure to drugs during pregnancy. Along with a group of passionate healthcare professionals and community leaders, a facility called Lily's Place was opened. For more than a year now, over 100 newborn babies have received the care they need to get through the effects of withdrawal.

Another story of a community coming together to combat the drug crisis is from Mercer County. Mercer County Fellowship Home focuses on treating men suffering from substance abuse, working to make them productive members of society again. A current resident said that, thanks to the help he received there, he now has the confidence to stay employed and to further his education.

The director of Mercer County Fellowship, Jim McClanahan, said it best when he told me:

Opiates are ruining and taking lives. We are giving them opportunities so that no one person or family has to continue living life scared and feeling as if they don't count or matter.

Centers like the Mercer County Fellowship Home offer those addicted to drugs and opioids a chance to change their lives and their communities.

These are just three examples of how our cities and towns are making a difference. Sometimes it is our first responders saving lives of those who have overdosed, giving them an opportunity to get the help they need, or a caring group of healthcare professionals and community leaders developing a new model of care so drug-exposed babies can have the best chance at a healthy start in life. Other times the help comes in the form of a welcoming group of people who are committed to recovery.

We can stop the opioid epidemic and heal our cities, our towns, and our States. In these tough times, we must come together and find solutions. Here in the House, we have shown what we can do working together. We passed CARA with overwhelming bipartisan support.

There is hope in West Virginia, and there is hope in the United States. There is help available for those in

need. Together, we can make a difference.

□ 1045

CONGRATULATING MAINE-ENDWELL LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the young men of the Maine-Endwell Little League team on their outstanding victory at the Little League World Series championship game.

With an ending score of 2-1, the Maine-Endwell Little League team triumphed over South Korea to become the first American team to win the overall title since 2011, and the first New York team to win the title since 1964. The game was played in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, with a reported 23,211 people in attendance. It was a perfect ending to Maine-Endwell's undefeated season of 24-0.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the Maine-Endwell team today, the 2016 Little League World Series champions. On behalf of the United States Congress, and the 22nd Congressional District of New York, I congratulate each of you for a job well done.

To the team members—Jude Abbadessa, Billy Dundon, Jayden Fanara, James Fellows, Ryan Harlost, Jack Hopko, Michael Mancini, Jordan Owens, Brody Raleigh, Conner Rush, and Justin Ryan—congratulations to each and every one of you. To the coaches—Scott Rush, Joe Hopko, and Joe Mancini—congratulations, again, from a grateful community and a grateful country.

LET'S SEE TO IT THAT JUSTICE IS COLORBLIND

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic week in the United States as we dedicate and open the National Museum of African American History and Culture.

It starts with a story of African Americans being brought to this country as slaves from Africa, not citizens but property, and considered such until they were freed, some through the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, and others through an amendment to the Constitution. Even after that, they weren't really considered full citizens, as there was Jim Crow segregation, and that continued for over 100 years.

Today, we see African Americans are still threatened. I woke up Tuesday morning to the shocking video of Mr. Crutcher being shot while his hands were up and on a car, following apparent instructions from police, and was shot to death. It is one of the most shocking videos I have seen. There is

no way to defend what happened. At best, it was gross negligence; at worst, it was murder.

This has been happening too often in the United States. I support police. My first job out of law school was an attorney for the police department. I worked 3½ years for the police. I understand their importance, and I support them. But police who are not well trained are doing a disservice to their profession and to the United States.

This morning on “Morning Joe,” former Congressman Joe Scarborough, a Republican Member of this House, said two things are necessary in light of the shootings, and particularly the Crutcher shooting in Tulsa, Oklahoma. One is body cameras and cameras on all police vehicles so we can see, as we did in Oklahoma, exactly what occurred. And, secondly, independent prosecutors, prosecutors from outside the jurisdiction to see to it that justice is served.

There is a bill in this Congress that LACY CLAY, myself, every member of the Congressional Black Caucus, and nearly 90 Members of this House are cosponsors of. That is a bill that will require police training towards racial sensitivity and understanding of different cultures, independent prosecutors for States to determine how they would set it up, and a requirement for States to have independent prosecutors in law enforcement killings of American citizens. This is necessary for people to believe and to know that justice is, indeed, blind and justice is being meted out.

There is no way to look at Tulsa, but to see there was either inadequate training or there was racial profiling and insensitivity that ended in the death of Mr. Crutcher.

It is so sad as we open the National Museum of African American History and Culture to see that African Americans still are not being treated the same as others in our Nation.

It is not a mere coincidence that every shooting by a police person videoed has an African American victim. Nobody can say that Mr. Crutcher was resisting arrest or possibly had a gun or brandished a pistol. None of those things occurred. He was following instructions.

I ask my Republican colleagues, none of whom are sponsors of my bill, to consider coming on to the bill. The bill is important for justice in America. It is important for people to know there is justice. And in this week, as we look to the National Museum of African American History and Culture opening and the recognition of rights that people have, and the understanding that they are human beings and part of America, who built America, literally built America as slaves and built this building, we need to go forward and see to it that justice is colorblind and justice is meted out.

CHANGING OUR BROKEN SYSTEM

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about embarrassment.

Next week, the Congress of the United States will once again have to refer on and go back to funding our Federal Government with an ad hoc continuing resolution. Federal law requires the Congress of the United States to pass a budget each year. It requires the Congress of the United States to pass 12 appropriations bills each year by September 30, which is coming up next week.

I came to Congress in 2011, Mr. Speaker. Since then, we have passed zero regular order appropriations out of the 72 required by law—zero. And yet, we have been able to find some way to pass 20 short-term continuing resolution appropriations bills that have no reforms to spending, they have no reforms to policy, and we have passed five 2,000-page omnibus spending bills. Somehow we were able to do those two things, but we weren't able to pass 12 simple appropriations bills to properly manage the taxpayers' money.

I have heard it said that Americans are disappointed with Congress. In fact, I am a little surprised that we have an 18 percent approval rating right now. Maybe we have a lot of family members or some folks back home who aren't paying attention to what is going on here.

We wonder why out of the \$3.8 trillion of taxpayer dollars that we have received here in the Congress of the United States each year are not being managed correctly by the only body that can actually manage it. Why in the world aren't they fixing this problem and passing their spending bills in regular order in front of the American people where they can see it and do it instead of these ad hoc spending bills?

Mr. Speaker, each year that I have been in Congress, I have authored a bill that would change our broken system and begin to fix this system that doesn't work. I would propose to you that 0 out of 72 is not a very good batting record. It is called the Biennial Budgeting and Enhanced Oversight Act. In fact, today, it has 237 cosponsors of the majority in this House. When I introduced the bill last year, I introduced it with 108 original cosponsors that signed on with me when we introduced it.

That represents, by the way, Mr. Speaker, 50 percent of the whole House of Representatives. It represents 63 percent of the elected Republican leadership in this House. It represents 29 percent of the minority party. Fifty Democrats have joined with Republicans and said: we need to fix this broken system.

Seventy-two percent of the majority party support this reform. Sixty-eight percent of committee chairmen support this reform. Sixty-seven percent of subcommittee chairmen support this

reform. Sixty-five percent of the Republican Steering Committee, the leadership of this House of Representatives, support this reform.

It was referred to the Budget Committee where 56 percent support this reform. It was also referred to the Rules Committee where 54 percent support this reform. And yet, there has been no vote on this in the House. 237 cosponsors represent 168 million American people whose voices have been squashed and been silenced by our lack of inaction.

Mr. Speaker, I started by saying I want to talk about embarrassment. I am embarrassed for the Congress of the United States. I am proud of the effort that has been done here, and I am proud of the people and Members of Congress who have stood up to finally fix this broken system and said: enough is enough.

I am proud of Senator ENZI and Senator INHOFE over in the U.S. Senate trying to advance the same types of reforms there. But I am embarrassed for the Congress of the United States. I am embarrassed for our leadership. I am embarrassed because we haven't been able to do what is right, even though the majority of us agree that this is better than what we have, that this is a step forward.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what I am more than embarrassed about. I am disappointed. Because the only people in the country that can fix this is the Congress of the United States.

Since 1974, when the Budget Act was put in place, the Congress of the United States has failed to pass its budget and its appropriations bills required by law every single year for 42 years. They have not been able to do it on time even once. Some people will argue that this isn't the best fix and may not be the perfect fix, but I will tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, it is better than 0 out of 72 for sure.

I call on the Speaker of the House to bring this bill to the floor and let 168 million Americans finally be heard.

COLOMBIA-FARC PEACE DEAL

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, the sovereign people of Colombia will decide, in a historic referendum, whether to approve or reject the agreement reached between the Colombian Government and the terrorist Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, commonly known as FARC.

I have made it a priority to hear from stakeholders on either side of this issue, and I remain concerned about the impact the deal could have on Colombia, as well as its broader effects on the region, especially given the drastic increase in coca production in recent years. My concerns are shared by many Americans of Colombian descent who

call south Florida home, and who I am proud to represent in this body.

Throughout the process, the FARC has demanded immunity, impunity, and political legitimacy, but we cannot ignore the thousands viciously murdered by this terrorist organization—people who were innocent victims and who demand justice that goes beyond special tribunals that offer relatively mild punishments.

Throughout the decades, the FARC recruited children to serve its corrupt cause. American citizens were kidnapped and victimized by them. It is hard to believe that the FARC was an honest partner in the peace process, and allowing them to participate in the political process has been viewed as a generous and perhaps dangerous concession.

The Colombian people will be voting on the deal next month after more than half a century of war. This is a decision exclusively for the Colombian people to make. However, those of us who cherish the U.S.-Colombia relationship, who care deeply for Colombia and its future, and who are privileged to represent many in our country's Colombian-American community must be sincere and, with respect, express our concerns, while at the same time renewing our commitment to the strong partnership between our two nations.

ADDRESSING THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss one of the most serious issues facing the United States—the staggering Federal deficit, which is expected to be one-third larger this year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, our Federal budget deficit will be \$590 billion, compared with a \$438 billion deficit last year.

Future projections don't appear to be optimistic either, with OMB reports stating that the deficit will rise to 4.6 percent of GDP by 2026. For comparison, the average deficit as a share of GDP from 1966 to 2015 was 2.8 percent. These figures make it abundantly clear that Congress must work toward solutions that will address our Nation's deficit and get our fiscal house back in order.

Every day, families in south Florida sit around the dinner table and make tough decisions on how they will spend their money. They stick to their budgets, and their government should be no different.

Last October, I was proud to support a 2-year bipartisan budget agreement that implemented new caps on discretionary spending for both fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

□ 1100

Too often, enormous sums are wasted due to unpredictable budget cycles and government shutdown threats. With the adoption of this 2-year budget, Congress was able to reduce wasteful government spending by providing certainty to agencies as they plan for the future. The budget also contains real reforms to entitlement programs,

which is the largest percentage of national debt. It is important that we protect programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—the invaluable safety net for those who need the help—while working to implement reforms to make these programs solvent for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance solutions that will reduce our Federal deficit. It is our duty as elected officials to leave our children and grandchildren with the same economic opportunities as my generation, and that is my main priority in Congress.

A "BETTER WAY" AGENDA

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the House Republicans' Better Way agenda to reform the way Congress does business by promoting solutions that will benefit Americans across the country. I am proud to have supported numerous bills within the Better Way agenda, including two education bills that are expected to pass the House this week.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, of which I am an original cosponsor, provides students with the tools to succeed in a variety of fields, including the technology and healthcare sectors, by simplifying the process of applying for Federal funds. This legislation also increases transparency, ensuring effective programs that allow students, teachers, and parents to attain their goals.

This year, I had the opportunity to serve on the Poverty, Opportunity, and Upward Mobility Task Force and suggested that we focus on the most vulnerable in our communities—at-risk youth. I am proud the Better Way agenda included a plan to reduce poverty for children and was proud to introduce the bipartisan Supporting Youth Opportunity and Preventing Delinquency Act. This legislation sets kids up for long-term success by giving State and local leaders the flexibility to better meet the specific needs of at-risk children in their communities.

ADDRESSING THE MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from which I am going to read some excerpts. This includes a letter that we are sending to Majority Leader MCCONNELL and Minority Leader REID in the Senate. Let me read a few excerpts from this.

We are asking the Senate to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act before the district work period break. Delays in enacting this into law will contribute to more crime, violence, homelessness, and the daily deaths of 959 Americans as a result of mental illness.

We know that there is a critical shortage of qualified providers. There are only 9,000 child and adolescent psychiatrists for 17 million children, and we need 30,000. African Americans are half as likely to receive psychiatric care, and for Hispanics with a mental disorder, fewer than 1 in 11 sees a mental health specialist. Fifty-five percent of counties in America do not have a practicing psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker.

The average time between the onset of the first symptoms of psychosis and the first treatment is 80 weeks. There is a nationwide shortage of 100,000 psychiatric beds, which means people are often diverted to jails, are boarded in emergency rooms, or are released without treatment. There is no oversight, monitoring, or enforcement of the 10-year-old parity law, and persons with eating disorders still cannot get coverage for their treatment.

The Federal Government spends about \$130 billion annually by 112 agencies across eight separate departments, but the GAO exposed that these have nearly no coordination and do not require evidence-based practices.

In terms of violence, those with untreated psychosis are 15 times more likely to be violent or not in treatment. With regard to jail, over 50 percent of those in jail have a mental illness. Mentally ill inmates cost taxpayers three times more than those without a mental illness, and individuals with a mental illness are four to six times more likely to be victims of sexual violence.

With regard to homelessness, over one-third of homeless Americans have a serious mental illness, and people with serious mental illness are three times more likely to be in poverty.

Having a serious mental illness is worse for someone's health than is chronic heavy smoking, and those with serious mental illness tend to die 10 to 25 years prematurely, meaning over 350,000 Americans will die this year as a direct or indirect result of mental illness. So far this year, over 255,000 have died.

H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, is the most transformational crisis mental health reform bill in 50 years. It passed the House with near unanimous support on July 16, 2016, with a vote of 422-2.

It reforms the Federal Government approach to mental health by establishing the critically important leadership position of Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders, who must be a doctor and who will bring accountability, effectiveness, and coordination to the Federal Government's programs and will develop a national strategy to increase the mental health workforce.

It increases the number of psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric nurses to treat serious mental illness. It provides funding for tele-mental health to increase access in underserved areas. It provides additional

psychiatric beds. It requires the oversight and enforcement of parity laws and extends coverage to people with eating disorders.

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act has been endorsed by more than 40 professional organizations, by 77 newspapers, and has 207 bipartisan cosponsors.

We write with the vital request that the Senate take up and pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act in order to fix our Nation's mental health system. It must take priority over any partisan divide. We, respectfully, ask that the Senate advance this bill to provide treatment before tragedy and to provide desperately needed and fully deserved help.

Along these lines, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to also contact my office to cosign this letter that pleads with the Senate to please move this bill quickly so that we don't have to see more tragedy, so that we can provide treatment, so that we can relieve Americans of this terrible scourge of mental illness without treatment, and so that we may provide quick and life-saving action because, where there is no help, there is no hope.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, September 22, 2016.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: We are in the midst of a mental health crisis in America. One in five Americans will experience mental illness this year. There are 10 million adults with a serious mental illness (SMI), but nearly 40% do not receive treatment. The reasons for this are a critical shortage of qualified providers, a dearth of crisis psychiatric beds, failed mental health parity implementation, and most importantly the absence of strong federal leadership. We are asking the Senate to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act before their district work period break. Delays in enacting this into law will contribute to more crime, violence, homelessness, and the daily deaths of 959 Americans as a result of a mental illness. The level of this crisis was learned during the 4 year long House investigation, the major findings of which are listed below.

CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF QUALIFIED PROVIDERS

There are 9,000 Child and Adolescent Psychiatrists for 17 million children with a mental health condition, but there is a need for 30,000;

African Americans are half as likely to receive psychiatric treatment;

For Hispanics with a mental disorder, fewer than 1 in 11 see a mental health specialist;

55% of counties do not have a practicing psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker;

72% of states have a shortage of psychiatric nurses;

Over the last decade the total number of physicians has increased by 45% but the number of psychiatrists has only increased 12%;

The average time between onset of first symptoms of psychosis and first treatment is 80 weeks.

DEARTH OF PSYCHIATRIC CRISIS BEDS

There is a nation-wide shortage of 100,000 crisis psychiatric beds;

In 1955 there were 550,000 psychiatric beds, but today there are only 40,000;

Only one state (Mississippi) has enough beds to meet the minimum standard;

When patients are in crisis they are often diverted to jails, boarded in Emergency Rooms, or released without treatment.

PARITY

It has been nearly a decade since parity became law, yet there is no oversight, monitoring or enforcement;

Americans with eating disorders still cannot get coverage of their treatment.

FAILED FEDERAL LEADERSHIP

In the area of mental health, the federal government spends \$130 billion annually by 112 agencies across 8 separate departments;

In a stunning and groundbreaking report the GAO exposed that federal mental health programs have nearly no coordination, few evaluations, and four out of five do not require evidence-based practices;

55% of Medicaid funding goes to 5% of the Medicaid population and nearly all of those patients have a mental health condition.

VIOLENCE

While individuals with a mental health condition are NOT more violent than the general public, those with untreated psychosis are 15 times more likely to be violent when not in treatment;

80 percent of violent acts committed by those with untreated psychosis are attributable directly to their illness.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Of those Americans in local jails 64% have mental illness, 56% in state prison, and 45% in federal prison;

Mentally ill inmates cost taxpayers three times more than those without a mental illness;

Incarcerating someone with a mental illness is 20 times more expensive than community treatment;

Over 70% of people in jails with serious mental illness also have a substance use disorder;

Individuals with a mental illness are 4 to 6 times more likely to be the victim of sexual violence.

HOMELESSNESS AND POVERTY

Over one-third of Americans experiencing homelessness have a serious mental illness.

People with serious mental illness are three times more likely to be in poverty.

PREVENTABLE DEATHS

Having a serious mental illness is worse for someone's health than chronic heavy smoking;

Those with a serious mental illness die 10-25 years prematurely;

There are 43,000 suicides, and 90% of those suicides have mental illness as a contributing factor;

350,000 Americans die each year as a direct or indirect result of a mental illness.

H.R. 2646

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, the most transformational crisis mental health reform bill in 50 years, passed the House with near unanimous support on July 16, 2016 by a vote of 422-2. Our legislation delivers treatment before tragedy and fixes the problems above identified by the House investigations. The legislation:

Reforms the federal government approach to mental health by establishing the critically important leadership position of Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders (who must be a doctor) to replace the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration;

The Assistant Secretary will bring accountability, effectiveness, and coordination

to the federal government's 112 mental health programs, and develop a national strategy for increasing the mental health workforce;

Increases the number of providers for SMI by supporting postdoctoral psychologists, authorizing minority fellowships, allowing doctors to volunteer at federally qualified community health centers, and provides funding for tele-mental health to increase access in underserved areas;

Provides additional psychiatric hospital beds for those experiencing an acute mental health crisis and in need of short term immediate inpatient care for stabilization;

Requires oversight and enforcement of parity and extends parity coverage to eating disorders;

Establishes a National Mental Health Policy Laboratory to set objective and scientific outcome measures for mental health spending;

Authorizes the Suicide Prevention Hotline; Incentivizes states to provide community-based alternatives to jails, prisons, and institutionalization.

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act is the product of years of collaboration between dedicated members of Congress, as well as numerous organizations, who came together to offer feedback and suggestions. The bill has also been endorsed by more than 40 professional organizations, 77 editorial boards and newspapers, 207 bipartisan Members of Congress, and hundreds of individual physicians, patients, and families.

Given the urgency of the mental health crisis in America, we write with the vital request that the Senate take up and pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act before you break for district work period. We understand the nature of the short schedule during the month of September, but we maintain that fixing our nation's mental health system must take priority over scheduling or any partisan divide. We know that every day more than 900 lives are lost in our nation due—directly or indirectly—to mental health. That translates to over 70,000 preventable deaths since the House passed H.R. 2646 in July.

At a time when thousands of lives are on the line, delays and politics cannot overrule compassion and common sense. We respectfully ask you to advance this bill to provide treatment before tragedy, and H.R. 2646 will provide desperately needed, and fully deserved, help. We call on you to pass H.R. 2646 because where there is help, there is hope.

Sincerely,

TIM MURPHY,
Ph.D.
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
R.N.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S BORDERS

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a simple yet important piece of border security legislation that I hope to see signed into law shortly. This legislation will help to secure our borders, save taxpayer dollars, and help the men and women who have served our Nation honorably to continue to serve and protect America in much-needed, technologically advanced positions.

My legislation makes a simple fix that would allow the Customs and Border Patrol Commissioner to waive the polygraph requirement for soon-to-be

veterans who seek employment as UAV pilots within the Department of Homeland Security who come from the Department of Defense with current security clearances. The DOD typically invests a significant amount of training and career development resources in these men and women, and to lose their talent due to a lapse in interdepartmental communication is a detriment to our country.

Under the current system, when soon-to-be veterans who are unmanned aerial vehicle, or UAV, pilots wish to apply for a UAV position at the DHS, they are placed on a wait list until more money and time is used to determine if these veterans meet DHS security guidelines despite having already passed similar security background checks performed by the Department of Defense. This creates a near impossible bottleneck where veterans can be stuck for months or years in waiting on redundant procedures, forcing most to drop their applications and go elsewhere to find employment.

The result of this bureaucratic inefficiency is that veterans who have valuable skills that can help protect our Nation and in whom we have invested millions of dollars in training are lost to other jobs. This leaves DHS Border Protection positions unfilled and our borders more vulnerable. The country's security, veterans, and taxpayers all lose in this equation.

This legislation works to solve three key problems by creating job opportunities for veterans, securing the borders, and saving taxpayer dollars. It is just plain common sense, and I urge the full consideration and adoption of this measure.

A GREAT MINNESOTA LEADER

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Hormel Foods CEO Jeffrey Ettinger on his upcoming retirement.

Hormel is a recognized Minnesota leader in food processing. The company started in Austin, Minnesota, in 1891 and is best known for giving us the famous canned ham—Spam.

Jeffrey's career at Hormel Foods has now spanned nearly three decades. From starting out as a corporate attorney in 1989 to eventually becoming the CEO in 2005, Jeffrey has played a crucial role in Hormel's success. Jeffrey encouraged a focus on new product innovation, and under his leadership, Hormel has continued to grow and thrive. During his time with Hormel, Jeffrey has even been recognized as one of the world's best CEOs by Barron's—a true tribute to his work ethic and excellence. While he is retiring as CEO, Jeffrey's leadership at Hormel will go on, as he will continue to serve as chairman of the board.

Congratulations on your retirement, Jeffrey, and thank you for all of the

work you have done for Hormel Foods so that it remains a leading company in the food industry both in Minnesota and in our great country.

TOP HONORS FOR ANOKA-RAMSEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate Minnesota's very own Anoka-Ramsey Community College, which has recently been named one of the top 10 community colleges in the United States. This placement has made Anoka-Ramsey Community College a contender for the 2017 Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence.

It is no surprise to me that Anoka-Ramsey, the sole Minnesota contender to be recognized, has been chosen for this prestigious award given its stellar reputation throughout our community. This fine higher learning institution is well-known for affordable tuition, a high success rate of students who graduate, as well as high achievement rates for students of every ethnicity and background. A good education can open doors in life.

Thank you, Anoka-Ramsey, for handing our students the key. Good luck in the competition, and congratulations on your success.

A PARENT'S LOVE

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate Joy and Matthew Molitor, from Minnesota's Sixth District, who received an Angels in Adoption Award this year.

The Molitors' adoption story began in 2011. While on a trip to Haiti, they decided to adopt two young children, Wilson and Catherine. For the next 3½ years, the Molitors visited Haiti 15 times while patiently waiting to take their children home.

In 2015, the Molitors received the devastating news that their paperwork was no longer valid and that the Haitian Government was no longer allowing simple adoptions. This did not stop them.

For the next 4 months, Joy walked from one government agency to the next, despite the unstable political environment in the country. She was determined not to leave Haiti without her children. As a result of Joy's resolve, she eventually retained the visas for her children, and they were able to go home to Minnesota together.

Joy and Matthew Molitor are the perfect example of the lengths one will go because of a parent's love. I am proud to recognize them today.

Thank you, Joy and Matthew, and congratulations on your Angels in Adoption Award.

CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, September is Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. It is time to bring awareness to this heartless disease and to the demands and challenges of the families affected.

Childhood cancer is an especially important topic in our office. My deputy chief of staff, Robert Boland's daugh-

ter, Abigail, was diagnosed with retinoblastoma, which is a rare cancer that affects the eyes, when she was only 2 months old. Thankfully, Abigail survived her cancer and is a happy, growing little girl. Abigail and her parents are fortunate, but they, like all families who deal with childhood cancer, had many a sleepless night.

No parent should ever have to watch a child fight a life-threatening disease. Unfortunately, that is not the case for many. Every year in the United States, there are more than 15,000 children who are diagnosed with cancer. Statistics show that 80 percent of childhood cancer cases are diagnosed only after the disease has already metastasized and spread. This makes research absolutely necessary. That is why we must spread the word and raise awareness.

All children deserve a future, and it is vital that we do everything in our power to help give them that chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD K. "DICK" BLAKE

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, an honor and a pleasure to recognize the lifetime achievements of Richard K. "Dick" Blake, who is retiring after 40 years of service on the Rockledge City Council. He is the longest serving elected official on Florida's east coast and is a true servant heart leader.

The grandson of freed slaves, Dick Blake was one of 10 children growing up in Rockledge, Florida. He attended Cocoa's African American Monroe High School, where he became an all-star athlete and model student.

After graduating from Florida A&M University, Dick returned to Monroe High School to coach basketball and football and also to teach biology and math. While coaching during the era of segregated education, he gained statewide notoriety as his basketball teams dominated the Florida Interscholastic Athletic Association.

□ 1115

In fact, Dick helped pave the way for integration in Brevard County by arranging exhibition basketball games, which helped to foster race relations by bringing children, families, and communities together under the spirit of sports competition. In so doing, he touched the lives of so many talented players and students.

In 1966, Dick became the first Black assistant principal at Cocoa High School, and later became the principal, serving in that position for 22 years.

A staunch believer in the power of education, Dick earned a bachelor of science degree from Clafflin University, a master of science degree from Columbia University, and a master of science degree from Florida A&M University.

In July 2011, the city of Rockledge named a park in honor of Dick's legendary accomplishments as an athlete and sports official, educator, school administrator, elected community servant, and leader in civil rights and racial equality issues.

I have served with Dick in local government and in many volunteer efforts over the years, and he is someone I and literally thousands and thousands of others greatly admire.

Over the course of his life, he has witnessed injustice, but Dick has always remained positive. Dick is the type of person that if he encountered lemons, he made lemonade.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Dick Blake's achievements and his service to our community and our country.

May God continue to bless Dick Blake and the United States of America.

AMERICAN PHARMACISTS MONTH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October 2016 as American Pharmacists Month. During the month of October, we recognize the pharmacists across America who work each day to guarantee that Americans have access to important and often lifesaving medications.

As the only pharmacist in Congress, I am proud to recognize the work that pharmacists across America are doing to ensure our Nation's health. Every day, pharmacists counsel patients on prescriptions and over-the-counter medications, helping to relieve patients' pain, and provide vaccines for a number of illnesses. Further, pharmacists are considered one of the top three most trusted professionals in America.

During this month, as well as throughout the year, I encourage everyone to visit your pharmacist, ask questions about your prescriptions, receive advice about preventative care, and simply get to know the person who provides your medicine and helps to keep you healthy.

To my fellow pharmacists, thank you for what you do. Please know your work is appreciated and you are an important part of keeping our Nation healthy. It is an honor to be your voice in the United States Congress.

REMEMBERING JACK DAVIS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable life of Jack Davis, a beloved and brilliant cartoonist from St. Simons Island.

Mr. Davis' passion for cartoons began at the age of 12 when he read his first cartoon magazine. As his talent in drawing cartoons flourished, he created astonishing artwork for the University of Georgia, depicting action-packed football scenes in a very unique style.

Nationally, he may have been best known for his work with MAD maga-

zine and his artwork of the magazine's star character, Alfred E. Neuman. Executives at MAD magazine say there wasn't anything that Jack couldn't do.

In addition, Mr. Davis designed for other companies, including DreamWorks, ESPN, Paramount Pictures, Indianapolis Speedway, and The Varsity drive-in in Atlanta.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Jack Davis, and I could not speak more highly of his talents. He will truly be missed by the First District of Georgia, the Bulldog Nation, and everyone who knew of him and his artistic gift.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Georgia as well as its impressive students, faculty, and staff.

On September 12, the U.S. News and World Report ranked UGA the eighteenth best university in America. This is clearly not an easy feat. UGA continues to work tirelessly to provide the best education for its undergraduate students, and its hard work is being noticed.

One example of UGA's commitment to its students involves its emphasis on experienced-based learning. UGA is the Nation's largest public university to include this type of learning in its overall curriculum. From internships and study-abroad options to research projects, the opportunities at this great university are endless.

In addition to these possibilities, UGA has also strengthened its faculty and course options by adding 50 new faculty members and expanding the course selection by 300 classes in high-demand subjects. UGA has truly created a small-class experience in a very large university.

Congratulations to the University of Georgia on these accomplishments, and Go Dawgs.

CONGRATULATING MATT KUCHAR

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Matt Kuchar of St. Simons Island, Georgia.

Mr. Kuchar competed in the 2016 Rio Olympics and won a bronze medal in the men's individual golf competition. He completed his fantastic Olympic week at 13 under par with a final round of 63, describing it as the round of his life.

This great week does not come simply by chance for Mr. Kuchar. He has worked tirelessly over the past years to improve his game and has consistently been near the lead in many important tournaments.

In 1997, he began his stellar career as an All-American at Georgia Tech. Then in 2000, he turned to the professional ranks.

In his 16 years as a pro, he has had 12 professional wins, including important tournaments such as the 2012 Players Championship, the 2013 Memorial Tournament, and the 2014 RBC Heritage.

Mr. Kuchar's smile and personality is an inspiration to all golfers. He is notoriously one of the nicest players on the

professional circuit. It is an honor to recognize him today.

Mr. Kuchar, you made Georgia's First Congressional District very, very proud.

FIDELITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS TO LAUNCH VC FINTECH ACCELERATOR

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important collaboration that is taking place in central Arkansas.

The Venture Center in downtown Little Rock has been working with the publicly traded financial services company, Fidelity Information Systems, or FIS, to launch the VC FinTech Accelerator, a program that will bring innovators and entrepreneurs from across the world to Little Rock, where they will have formation opportunities for their early-stage organizations. They will work through a curriculum designed to engender creativity, development, and potential.

Through this program, we are able to invest in the future of our State and ensure that our economy and our business environment in central Arkansas will continue to thrive and expand.

I recently had the opportunity to visit The Venture Center with the gentlewoman from Missouri, Representative ANN WAGNER, and was impressed with the success of the center's accelerator program. It is providing a 12-week rigorous program to assist FinTech startups, providing them with quality business development services. Ten FinTech companies were chosen to participate in this first accelerator program, and it will relaunch in 2017.

This FinTech sandbox is producing transformational opportunities for both FIS, the innovative entrepreneurs in Little Rock, and for future consumers of these services. While this exciting program has only been active for a short time, it is already proving that it has the ability to assist in our efforts to grow the technology economy across our region.

Little Rock's storied history and the evolution of FIS makes it a perfect site for this accelerator. I greatly appreciate the choice of Little Rock as the location to implement this source of future economic growth.

I am grateful for the farsighted leadership at FIS, our chamber of commerce leadership team, and all those involved in making this program a success for central Arkansas.

THOUSAND-YEAR FLOOD IN LOUISIANA

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, August 20th of this year was a Saturday, and I was in Denham

Springs, Louisiana. I was gutting a home, ripping out Sheetrock, tearing out floors, throwing out furniture, throwing out photo albums, appliances, and family heirlooms. Mr. Speaker, I did it in a home and literally stripped out every foot of Sheetrock in the house, from the floor to the ceiling and ripped out all the floors. Everything in the house was gutted down to the studs.

This was a house where a woman, who recently retired in June or July of this year, was living. She has been living there since the early 1970s. Never has she had even a single foot of water in her house or a single inch of water in her house. Yet, on the floods that we had in south Louisiana around August 11th, this home received over 6 feet of water in the entire home, everything.

Outside the house, we stacked up piles of debris from 6 to 8 feet high. I call it debris, but in reality it was memories. It was that woman's life that was piled up in the street. Everything that she owned was thrown out.

Mr. Speaker, we had a storm that was a 1,000-year event. We experienced over 31 inches of rain in some of the peak areas in 36 hours. To translate that to snow, you are talking about 25 feet of snow. To my friends from the North, that is what we experienced the equivalent of in just 36 hours. This is on track to be the fourth most costly flood disaster in United States history, and, again, it was a 1,000-year storm.

Now, this happened in south Louisiana last month, but this could happen anywhere. Whether it is a snowstorm, it is a blizzard, it is a tsunami, it is an earthquake, it is a tornado or it is a terrorist attack, it could happen anywhere in this country.

Now, historically when these catastrophic events have happened, the country has stepped up to provide assistance. Whether it is September the 11th, Hurricane Sandy, Hurricane Katrina or other disasters, the Nation has stepped up whenever these disasters have crossed over into catastrophic territory.

In this instance, we have had over 100,000 homes and businesses flooded. So that story I told about the home that we went in and stripped and gutted—one of many homes that we worked in—you can multiply that same exact scenario tens of thousands of times over.

Now, in this particular case, this house is probably worth \$150,000, maybe. It is probably going to cost them \$80,000 to rebuild the house to get it back. It is going to cost them \$30,000 to replace the car that they lost. It is going to cost them \$20,000 to replace their clothes and contents of the house.

Because this home is in a floodplain—at the time when it was built, it was not, but now it is—it is going to probably cost them \$100,000 to elevate that concrete slab and lift it up to the higher-base foot elevation. You can do the math. You are talking about over \$200,000 just to get themselves back to

where they were the day before this storm.

I am going to say it again, Mr. Speaker, this is happening in south Louisiana. While the water has receded, their lives remain upside down, and it is hundreds of thousands of households.

This is a parochial issue to me. It is my hometown. It is my community. It is my neighbors. It is my relatives. But the next disaster, whether it is next week, next year, next month, next decade, it is going to be in your town. It is going to be in your home. It is going to be your relatives, your neighbors.

The American people need to know that when we have a catastrophic disaster like this, that the country is there to offer a hand up. Let me lay out this financial scenario. I talked about the \$200,00 for this one homeowner, not including the other businessowners and others that are affected by this disaster. Because of HUD rules and some of the rules put in place by the mortgage companies, folks are going to have to make a decision on whether they are going to have their home foreclosed upon or they are going to try to get out of this financial predicament that they are in by the beginning of November.

A \$2.6 billion budget request has been made to offer a hand up to these people that rescued themselves, sheltered themselves, cooked for themselves, and gutted their own homes. Now is the time for America to offer a hand up, just like we have done in the past and just like we need to let other Americans know we are going to do for them in the event of a crisis like this.

Mr. Speaker, lastly I want to say this: This was somewhat unique in that the Federal interstate held 6 feet of water back, therefore, further inundating people. The Comite River project and other flood control projects, which the Federal Government failed to construct after 30 years, and coastal land loss also contributed to this flood disaster.

Now is the time for us to act. November, December timeframes are too late. This needs to be part of our negotiations right now to offer certainty and to assure Americans in the future that we are going to be there to offer them a hand up.

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 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

You fulfill Your promises day by day and lead Your people to greatness. You are the One who asks each of us to live a life worthy of our calling.

By embracing the responsibilities of our station in life, each of us is to perform our duties with humility, meekness, and patience with the help of Your grace. By bearing with one another with understanding, we are to make every effort to preserve the unity we have been given by Your Divine Providence and seek peace at every turn of events.

On this day, bless the Members of this people's House with a surfeit of grace, that good policy might emerge to the benefit of our Nation. Also, on this day, comfort all who mourn the passing of one of our most beloved House staffers, Jacqui Ellis. May she rest in peace.

May all that is done today be for Your greater honor and glory.

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 Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ASHFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING THE VILLAGE OF KEY BISCAYNE ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

(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, I rise today in celebration of the 25th anniversary of one of Florida's most beautiful communities, the Village of Key Biscayne.

Incorporated in 1991, this majestic barrier island paradise is located between the Atlantic Ocean and Biscayne Bay and is centered between two beautiful parks to the north and the south.

Although small in size, the Village of Key Biscayne is a proud, tight-knit community of islanders filled with a mix of longtime locals, business leaders, professionals, as well as international visitors and residents.

In celebration of its founding, the city and its residents, or key rats as they like to call themselves, will join together this Saturday, September 24, for the anniversary gala.

I am truly honored to represent this south Florida treasure, and ask my congressional colleagues to join me in congratulating the Village of Key Biscayne residents on this momentous occasion. The Village of Key Biscayne, island paradise, indeed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN SODORO

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional life of John Sodoro, a lifelong resident of my hometown, Omaha, Nebraska.

John was a respected lawyer and a loving father, grandfather, and husband. Many in the community knew him for his congenial personality and compassion for his clients.

Before following his father's footsteps in the legal profession, John graduated from Creighton Prep, and later, in true Omaha fashion, he earned his undergraduate and law degree from Creighton University.

Over the course of his career, John made a difference in the lives of many, successfully helping his clients through a wide variety of difficult times. The Omaha community has lost a great man and true public servant. May his work be remembered and his life always celebrated.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the Sodoro family.

OUR NATION FACES AN INCREASING THREAT OF TERRORISM

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the recent attacks in New York, New Jersey, and Minnesota all underscore the increasing threat our Nation faces from terrorism.

The House Homeland Security Committee just reported that already this year, individuals have been arrested in 13 different States for some connection to terrorism, and there have already been 30 ISIS-linked plots in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as events in Paris and Brussels demonstrate, this is not a challenge we face alone. Across the world, terrorism is on the rise.

Just this past weekend, an Indian Army base near Pakistan was attacked by heavily armed militants who killed 18 soldiers. Our two nations, the United

States and India, have worked closely to combat terrorism, and, more than ever, we must increase those counterterrorism efforts with our partners in India and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, we must be honest about the evolving terror threat in front of us and confront this challenge with strong leadership and unwavering resolve.

DEMS ARE THE FACTS

(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, most modern businesses today use metrics to help them establish best practices.

So I offer this chart based on the published, peer-reviewed research of two respected Princeton economists, Dr. Blinder and Dr. Watson, that reveal some very important metrics and measures. It shows the annual growth of the U.S. economy for each Presidential term going all the way back to World War II.

Democratic Presidents are in blue, and Republicans are in red. So whether it is 7½ years where President Obama outperforms the economy of his predecessor or 70 years, as you can see, there is a huge difference between how the economy performs between a Republican v. a Democratic President.

In fact, going back 16 Presidential terms, the economy does significantly better by almost every measure under Democratic administrations.

So, as President John Adams famously said: "Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our . . . inclinations . . . they cannot alter the . . . facts . . ."

And the fact is, the blue, the Democrats, do better than the Republicans on the economy when a Democrat is President.

CHAIRMAN RANDY FORBES 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, along with chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, RANDY FORBES, and chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, JEFF MILLER, both of whom are completing their House service this year.

Since being elected to the House, Chairman RANDY FORBES has been a crucial member on the House Judiciary Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, where he serves as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces. He

also founded the Congressional Prayer Caucus, promoting religious freedom worldwide.

I have been privileged to work along with Chairman RANDY FORBES during our service in Congress. He is a true advocate for peace through strength and has been a leading voice on defense and national security issues. A Trump administration would have a dynamic Secretary of the Navy.

I am grateful for the successful service of Chairman FORBES. He and his wife, Shirley, have served the citizens of Virginia's Fourth Congressional District with honor, making a difference for American families.

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

Our sympathy to the people of India.

CONGRATULATING THE BUFFALO NIAGARA RIVERKEEPER

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Buffalo Niagara Riverkeeper, and its executive director, Jill Jedlicka, winner of the Thiess International Riverprize awarded by the International River Foundation.

As Buffalo's industrial economy faded, we were left with a river so polluted that the Environmental Protection Agency declared that the Buffalo River was biologically dead and ecologically destroyed.

So western New Yorkers decided to do something about it. They formed the Friends of the Buffalo River, which became the first organization to receive Federal authority and funding to manage a remediation project in the Great Lakes.

Now, thanks to the Riverkeeper, the Buffalo River has come back to life, with over \$80 million in private investment as Buffalonians reclaim their land at the water's edge.

I congratulate the Riverkeeper on this recognition, and I thank it for the legacy it has left to our community, one of the greatest environmental success stories in Western New York's history.

NOT ANOTHER DOLLAR TO IRAN

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act, the House's legislative response to the administration's shady cash transfer to the Iranian regime; a cash transfer resulting in the release of American hostages, which the administration denies was a ransom but acknowledges the cash was used as leverage. The American people are much smarter than that.

Either way the administration or media try to spin it, a ransom was paid. For years and years, the United States Government has held a long-standing policy of not paying ransom for prisoners, but our legacy has quickly diminished.

The President continues to invest our trust and money into Iran, a country that is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Why in the world is our President rewarding Iran for its bad behavior?

This cash transaction sets a dangerous precedent for Americans abroad and our national security. I won't stand for this type of deceit by our Commander-in-Chief. That is why I urge my colleagues to support and pass the Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act. The name of the bill says it all.

COMMEMORATING THE HISTORIC SEASON OF THE BALTIMORE ORACLES

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the historic season of the Baltimore Oracles, my staff's congressional softball team and the victors of the 2016 Congressional Softball League championship. I was going to bring the trophy down, but it is much too big and much too heavy to carry.

Mr. Speaker, the Oracles vanquished their opponents this season, achieving an astounding 19-1 record. Led by co-captains Peter Gelman and Katie Teleky, and shadow-captain Raymond O'Mara, the team was a perfect blend of stout defense and potent offense.

Mike Pulver, Anna Killius, Paul Kincaid, and Lucinda Lessley held down the infield, while Andy Allen, Max Frankel, Brian Kaissi, and Zach Weber roamed the outfield. Big bats littered the lineup, but the batters were always ready to oblige the team's heart and soul, Tim O'Neil, and hit just a single.

Other contributors integral to the team's success include Kate and Adrienne Star, Evan Horn, Jake Barr, Will Pisano, Julia Kandel-Krieger, James Howard, Becky O'Mara, Alex Bond, and Winston, the team's ever-chipper mascot.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Oracles are champions, and that is truly world class.

IMPLEMENTING THE VETERANS CHOICE PROGRAM

(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, more than a year ago, Congress passed and the President signed into law an overhaul of veterans' health care. The Vet-

erans Choice Program nominally gave our Nation's veterans more health provider and service options. However, despite having more than a year to implement it, local VA facilities are refusing to work with new providers to get veterans the care they need. The VA claims its hands are tied, but by what?

Through the Veterans Choice Program, the men and women who have served our country are entitled to vital home care services that are critical to follow-up care and medication adherence assistance, especially for disabled veterans and those without access to transportation.

My conversations with the VA have yielded only excuses. Our vets deserve results.

I ask again, how many veterans are waiting for physician visits? How can the VA sit on its hands while our Nation's veterans wait and suffer?

I ask my colleagues to join me. Let's be a voice for our veterans and demand the VA give these heroes access to and reimbursement for the care they need and deserve.

□ 1215

PRESERVING CASTNER RANGE

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 110th anniversary of the Antiquities Act, 100 years of our National Park Service, and to thank our current President and administration for doing more than any administration before them to strengthen these two assets that we have in our country.

But I also ask this administration to set the standard for the next 100 years to ensure that public places like Castner Range in El Paso, Texas, fully tell the national story of the first Americans who were here more than 8,000 years ago who left their impressions of this great land and to ensure that every American has the chance to enter our public lands like the fourth and fifth graders at Collins Elementary who, under the direction of Mrs. Guay, left their impressions of Castner Range. This is a class that is 93 percent Mexican American, 75 percent below the poverty line, and precisely the population that we want to see in our national lands and public parks going forward.

Preserving Castner Range forever is a means to set the stage for the next 100 years of success for our national parks and our national lands.

CELEBRATING UNC CHARLOTTE'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the University

of North Carolina at Charlotte as we commemorate its 70th anniversary.

I am proud to be among the 122,000 living alumni of UNC Charlotte and to be the first elected to Congress, though I am sure I won't be the last.

My alma mater was founded by the visionary Bonnie Cone in the wake of the Second World War as a service to returning veterans pursuing higher education. The lasting legacy that continues to guide the university is best expressed in one word, "opportunity."

Opportunity characterizes the futures being built each day on campus. Opportunity describes the powerful economic impact this university has on one of the Nation's fastest growing regions. UNC Charlotte has grown into its distinctive role as a research university in areas like big data, energy, and cancer prevention, focused clearly on the opportunities and needs of the future.

Mr. Speaker, while still a relatively young university, UNC Charlotte is one of the leading American universities of the 21st century. I am pleased on behalf of the university family and all of Niner Nation to say the future is ours. Go Niners.

REMEMBERING JACQUI ELLIS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ninth Congressional District are in mourning this morning. We are saddened by the passing of our Chief of Staff, Ms. Jacqui Ellis. Mr. Speaker, she was more than a Chief of Staff. She was one of my dearest and closest friends. She was a mentor to many of the people on the Hill and especially those who worked with her in my congressional office.

She made a difference in the lives of people. She was there to be of assistance to those who needed help. And 1 minute will never give me enough time to express the love, the affection, and to thank all of the many people who have given their condolences and their sympathies, so we will have a Special Order next week at which Members of the House will be permitted to come to the floor, and we will make our comments then.

But I do want to say this: she met the measure of life that Ruth Smeltzer called to our attention:

Some measure their lives by days and years, Others by heartthrobs, passions, and tears. But the surest measure under God's sun Is what in your lifetime for others you've done.

Jacqui, we love you, and we thank you for what you have done for others in your lifetime. We know that while physically you are not with us, spiritually you will always be with us. God bless you.

HELP PREVENT VETERAN SUICIDE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, Colorado is home to over 400,000 of our Nation's veterans—men and women who have fought to protect our freedom in conflicts around the world. These men and women are often some of the most respected individuals in our communities, which makes it easy to overlook that they may be struggling to transition back into civilian life at the end of their service.

A study from the Department of Veterans Affairs found that 22 veterans tragically end their lives by suicide each day. This is a shocking and heart-breaking statistic.

September is National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month and a time when everyone can learn about helping to prevent veteran suicide. In our communities, we can all work to make sure that no veteran ever feels like suicide is their only option. I am honored to represent a district that works so hard to make sure our veterans are taken care of when they return home, and I am committed to advancing policies to ensure that we honor and serve the men and women who have so honorably served our country.

The next time you run into a veteran in the community, take a minute to let them know that you appreciate their service. None of us may ever know how far a thank-you may go in a person's life and what a big difference that could mean.

NATIONAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND SAFETY

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the last few months have been a rather frustrating time for many of us in Congress as well as the American people.

We first broke for some 7 weeks—the longest break from Congress in the modern era. We left without doing anything on Zika, without addressing our opioid epidemic in this country, and without doing anything for the families of Flint who have been suffering with their water for many years now.

Probably one of the most striking moments I have had as a Member here for the last year and a half was when the families from Flint came in front of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—the committee on which I serve—and talked about how they have been affected by this water crisis.

What response have they gotten so far from Congress, from the people's House?

Nothing. Zero. Instead, we went off for 7 weeks.

Now here we are about to break again without addressing Flint, without doing anything about the Zika crisis and the other challenges we are fac-

ing, not to mention our gun violence problem that many of us gathered right here on the House floor to address. It is time that we act now, and we should not break until we have addressed these problems.

TRUST IN MEDIA FALLS TO HISTORIC LOWS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans' trust in the media has hit a historic low, according to a recent Gallup poll. Gallup found that only 32 percent of Americans have a great deal or even fair amount of confidence in the media to present the news fully, accurately, and fairly. This represents an 8 point drop from just a year ago. It also is the lowest level of trust in the media that Gallup has ever recorded since it first asked the question 46 years ago.

Republicans' trust in media has dropped from 32 percent a year ago to 14 percent today. This is "easily the lowest confidence among Republicans in 20 years," says Gallup. Trust in the media among Democrats and Independents fell as well.

The historic distrust of the media will continue until the media stops telling Americans what to think.

ERADICATING BREAST CANCER

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1197, the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act.

I lost my father to cancer when he was just 52 years old, so finding cures for all types of cancer is personal for me. In Iowa alone, there will be approximately 2,200 new cases of breast cancer this year, resulting in about 400 unnecessary deaths. We must do more to cure this disease.

By passing this bill and setting a goal of eradicating breast cancer by 2020, we have a chance to make a real difference for women and their families.

I would also like to recognize my constituents, Christine Carpenter and Lori Seawel, for their selfless volunteer efforts to support this issue.

I encourage my colleagues in the House to support and pass this bipartisan legislation.

PEDIATRIC CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of September as Pediatric Cancer Awareness Month.

Pediatric cancer is the leading cause of disease-related deaths for children in the United States—43 are diagnosed with cancer every day.

While many adult cancers can be diagnosed early, pediatric cancers are more difficult to detect. In 80 percent of children, the cancer will have already spread to other parts of the body by the time of diagnosis.

For the children who do survive, their battle doesn't end. Ninety-five percent of childhood cancer survivors will develop chronic health conditions. Despite these facts, only 4 percent of the National Cancer Institute's funding goes toward pediatric cancer. Since 1990, only 10 drugs have been developed to treat pediatric cancer, compared to over 200 for adults.

My friend, Jonny Wade, is one of the many faces of pediatric cancer. Last Christmas Eve, his year-long battle with brain cancer tragically ended, but our fight to eradicate this disease has only begun.

Mr. Speaker, his parents, John and Kimberly Wade, sat in the gallery right in front of me when the President talked about his moonshot to eradicate cancer.

Mr. Speaker, 4 percent is not enough. I will continue to fight to get more than 4 percent, not for Jonny, but for his wish that no other kid should have cancer.

MATT AND SHERYL MOHR: ANGELS IN ADOPTION

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a remarkable couple, Matt and Sheryl Mohr from Hudson, as Angels in Adoption from Michigan's Seventh Congressional District.

I had the privilege of visiting with Matt and Sheryl yesterday, and their love and compassion for vulnerable children is truly moving. In the past 6 years, the Mohrs have opened their hearts and home to 26 foster children. Along with their five biological children, they have also adopted five children and are in the process of adopting two more. That will make a total of 12 children.

When asked what led them to begin fostering and adopting, Sheryl said: "I felt that I had a lot more love to give away."

Wow. Through their big hearts and unconditional love, Matt and Sheryl have forever changed the lives of so many children in Lenawee County. They are angels to the children they parent and incredibly deserving of this award.

PROHIBITING RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5931, legislation prohibiting future ransom payments to Iran.

In the midst of a global war on terror, it should be common sense that the United States of America should not be sending untraceable pallets of cash on an airplane to the leading state sponsor of terrorism. Apparently it isn't, though, because that is exactly what happened and what this administration engaged in.

We know now that \$1.7 billion in cash was given to Iran in exchange for the release of prisoners, violating America's longstanding policy against ransom payments.

Predictably, this administration has admitted that it cannot guarantee that this money did not go to fund current or future terrorism by Iran. In addition, all of this was done in secret, lacking transparency with the American people.

Today the House is taking action to end this practice. H.R. 5931 prohibits any cash payments to Iran regardless of the rationale or reasoning behind it. It also ensures the American people will be notified if a President ever attempts this sort of deal again.

America cannot be a country that sends cash to countries that fund terrorism. Period.

RECOGNIZING LOWE'S HEROES IN SYKESVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY

(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 in recognition of a group of men and women from the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania who recently volunteered their time and talents to help improve their community.

Lowe's Heroes is a companywide volunteer program for Lowe's that gives employees a chance to volunteer for local community improvement projects. In return, Lowe's provides the material and manpower to make those projects happen.

Just last week, men and women from the DuBois Lowe's store volunteered to help build a centerpiece for a town square project in Sykesville, a community only a handful of miles away from the store's location.

This is a long-awaited project in the community to transform a vacant lot into a beautiful park for community events and a place for people from across the community to gather.

In addition to the contributions of the Lowe's Heroes, the store is also donating the decorative and structural blocks for the town square's centerpiece, along with lighting for the area.

These men and women represent the best of what small towns across the United States represent. I commend them for their selfless efforts.

□ 1230

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 879 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 879

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. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, 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 Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-64. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that 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 amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 27, 2016, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. BYRNE. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 879 allows for the consideration of H.R. 5931, the Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act. The rule makes in order all five amendments submitted to the Rules Committee. The rule also provides authority for the House to expeditiously consider a continuing resolution.

On June 24, 2015, President Obama stood in the Roosevelt Room of the White House and said: "I am reaffirming that the United States Government will not make concessions, such as paying ransom, to terrorist groups holding American hostages."

This position shouldn't have been surprising. It has long been the position of the U.S. Government to not pay ransoms to terrorist organizations, for doing so only encourages further kidnappings and puts more American lives at risk.

Despite this reassurance from President Obama, on January 17, 2016, an unmarked cargo plane landed at a European airport. On this plane were wooden pallets stacked with unmarked foreign currency—\$400 million worth, to be exact.

Who was waiting at the airport to accept this money? The Islamic Republic of Iran.

On that exact same day, several Americans who had been held prisoner in Iran were released. That, Mr. Speaker, is a ransom payment.

Since then, we have learned that the full U.S. payment to Iran totaled \$1.7 billion. The money was related to a decades-old dispute about an Iranian arms sale. There are a lot of concerning issues at play here.

First, by giving money to Iran, the United States is supporting the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Iran uses their money and resources to support groups like Hezbollah, Hamas, and other radical terrorist groups in Iraq, Pakistan, and Afghanistan. Iran is no friend of the United States, and their efforts have resulted in the deaths of U.S. citizens and servicemembers. So why in the world is the United States sending them cash payments in the first place?

Second, the United States should never pay a ransom. I know they claim

that the \$1.7 billion payment was a “settlement,” but let’s get real here for a minute. The payment was made on the exact same day the Americans were released.

Let’s look in the dictionary for just a moment. “Ransom” is defined as “a sum of money or other payment demanded or paid for the release of a prisoner.” That is exactly what happened here.

Iran knows it was a ransom payment. An Iranian general was quoted as saying that, “the money was returned for the freedom of the U.S. spy, and it was not related to the nuclear negotiations.”

So Iran knows it was a ransom. The American people know it was a ransom. Well, how about the State Department? When pushed on this topic by the media, a State Department spokesman said that it wasn’t ransom but, rather, “leverage.” What is the difference? The American prisoners in Iran were not released until the cash payments occurred. You could try to hide the truth by calling it “leverage” or a “coincidence,” but the fact is this payment was a ransom.

Just ask the Obama Justice Department. Press reports indicate that Assistant Attorney General John Carlin raised the concern that the cash payment to Iran would send a signal to Iran and the world that the U.S. had changed its ransom policy. This isn’t some radical conspiracy theory we are talking about here. This is the exact same concern raised by the Justice Department under President Obama—the people he appointed.

Since this ransom payment occurred, Iran has detained several more foreign citizens, including Americans, French, British, and Canadians. Sadly, I expect our Iranian friends are already making their ransom demands.

The third major concern I have is that the payments were clearly done in a way to hide them from the American public. The payments were made in cash. According to an international body responsible for combating money laundering, known as the Financial Action Task Force, the “physical transportation of currency” is “one of the main methods used to move criminal assets, launder money, and finance terrorism.”

If this whole ordeal was public and on the up-and-up, then why did the U.S. make this payment in cash?

The Obama administration originally said that the payment had to be in cash because financial sanctions prevent us from engaging in wire transfers with Iranian banks. Well, it turns out that isn’t true. In fact, on at least two occasions, the U.S. has made wire transfers to the Iranian Government.

According to Politico, in July 2015, the U.S. sent Iran approximately \$848,000 to settle a claim over architectural drawings. The wire transfers didn’t stop there though. The U.S. wired Iran almost \$10 million in April of this year to pay for 32 metric tons of heavy water.

Here is another issue with the cash payments. Iran has a track record of money laundering, and making cash payments will result in it being even harder to track their illicit activity. Cash does not have an electronic signature, so the money could eventually become untraceable. This will make it almost impossible for law enforcement and intelligence agencies to track where the money is going. In other words, the cash could be transferred to a group like Hamas or Hezbollah and the United States may never know. This is deeply troubling.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation makes one thing crystal clear. The United States Government is not in the business of paying ransom. Specific to Iran, the legislation will prohibit future cash payments to Iran until the nation stops sponsoring terrorism and is no longer involved in money laundering.

To boost transparency and accountability, the legislation also requires 30-day congressional notification and review of any future settlements related to the U.S.-Iran Claims Tribunal. This way Congress will have an opportunity to review any future payments instead of them being secretly executed in the dark of night.

Ultimately, the United States cannot continue to give in to Iran. Whether it is their nuclear program or their kidnapping of U.S. citizens, we simply cannot keep making deals with Iran in which the Ayatollah benefits and the American people suffer.

We need to stop empowering Iran and, instead, start weakening them. We must stop giving in to Iran and start standing up to Iran. By putting our foot down, the American people and our allies in the Middle East will be safer and stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 879, so we can move forward with consideration of this important bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I rise today in opposition to the rule.

Let’s not parse words. This bill is a Republican attempt to politicize the recent payment by the United States to the Government of Iran.

The legislation equates the payment, which was made as part of a settlement of a 35-year-old dispute before the United States-Iran Claims Tribunal, as ransom. It prohibits any future payments. And I might add, Iran has 200 claims before the tribunal at this time, and all of the American claims have been settled before the same Algiers Accords tribunal. It prohibits any future payments to the Iranian Government and requires the President to submit to Congress a report listing and evaluating outstanding claims before the tribunal.

Mr. Speaker, let’s get something straight. The payment to Iran was not

ransom, and anyone who suggests it was is just trying to score some political points in the limited time we have left in Washington. The payment was part of a legal settlement to a long-standing 35-year dispute. It was money owed to the Iranian Government by the American Government, and the transfer was simply our government meeting its obligations.

As I indicated earlier, it may surprise those watching at home to learn that the tribunal has awarded roughly \$2.5 billion to American citizens in the past.

I understand that there are many in Congress concerned by the loosening of sanctions on Iran. I am one of them. As one of the few Democrats to publicly oppose the Iran deal, I know that Iran is, without question, not our friend, a state sponsor of terrorism, and I don’t think you will find anyone in this body who denies this.

But I am concerned by the trend we are seeing with individuals actively trying to undermine the deal rather than working to ensure it is made stronger and enact it with intended effect. It is similar to the actions—I forget the number, up in the sixties—that my Republican friends have attempted to do something about the Affordable Care Act. It has problems. The question is what are we going to do about it, because the American people need to have health care.

□ 1245

What we would rather do is repeal what exists. Don’t replace it with anything, but make political arguments that it needs to be replaced.

We are doing something very similar here. Rather than making this Iran deal stronger, we are continuing to do what we can to undermine it. The bill we are discussing today is a stark example of this and is an attempt to undermine the deal rather than to strengthen it.

The bill, if enacted, would hamstring us in the future as more than 1,000 Iranian claims before the tribunal have yet to be resolved. Prohibiting any type of future payment to the Iranian Government—and sort of as an aside, it is unfortunate, in this world that we live in, that we have to do business with bad people. I served on the Intelligence Committee when \$2 billion walked off in Iraq, and we still haven’t had accountability about that, but let’s don’t get too far off the track. The fact of the matter is, the bill does all of these things in order to prop up the false premise that the United States paid Iran ransom. This is just plain wrong, and it is a waste of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as I have often been throughout this Congress, that partisan measures such as this one are distracting our attention from measures that we absolutely must pass, including today. There are just 7 legislative days left until we break for another 44-day recess, and that is after the Republicans shut down Congress

for the longest summer recess in modern history. It gives the term “do-nothing Congress” a whole new meaning.

Once we recess next week, unless we do something different, we will leave Washington until after the election. Yet, as of today, despite considerable bipartisan concern, we haven’t gotten a clean Zika research funding bill, and we haven’t gotten a bill on gun violence—not a word on the subject except to threaten Democrats with punishment for protesting this body’s unconscionable inaction on the subject. We haven’t talked about flood relief for Louisiana. We haven’t gotten a bill on the water crisis in Flint, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) will address that in a few minutes. We are still dealing with an opioid epidemic. Let me underscore that again. We are dealing with an opioid epidemic in this country that is killing our children all over this Nation, and we have not done anything about it.

The appropriations process has come to a complete standstill. That is why we are out of here tonight. We are going to try to figure out what we are going to do to discharge our responsibilities that are scheduled for October 1; so we will be here next week. All of those out there in Congress who don’t know it, we will be here. We will be fiddling around. We will be doing suspensions. We will be doing one-House measures until the thing comes together, and it will. We will be threatened with “we will keep you here until Saturday, or we will keep you here until Christmas.” It goes on and on, kicking the can down the road.

House Republicans continue to ignore their responsibilities to the American people and waste time on partisan, go-nowhere bills—just like the one we have here today—while Americans are forced to face critical public health emergencies alone. In fact, in each public health crisis before America, House Republicans have chosen to obstruct the meaningful action and resources that are needed to save lives.

On the subject of Zika, this month, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention will run out of resources to fight the virus. More than 21,000 Americans have confirmed cases of Zika; yet Republican inaction has forced the CDC to divert research funding away from other diseases. They have had to take money out of the Ebola account, and Ebola has not gone away. They are taking money out of the flu account and out of the tuberculosis account, and those are not going away at any point in time. They are taking cancer research money in order to keep its Zika research program going, which is an immediate crisis. It is not just a Florida thing or a Central America or a South America thing. There are 22,000 Americans who have this virus, and the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito is not the only one that is carrying this virus. This has been researched since 2009. It didn’t just start yesterday, and it is not going to end tomorrow, but some-

thing needs to be done today about this particular crisis.

I quote CDC Director Tom Frieden. The Republican co-chair of the Florida delegation and I had a hearing of our Florida delegation, and Mr. Frieden came to testify before us. He said: “We are out of money, and we need Congress to act.”

I am not sure how much more plainly it can be said. We need a clean bill that provides adequate funding. Let’s stop playing games with the lives of women and infants and of the people in general who have contracted this virus. It has now shown that it can affect the mental stability of adults.

Mr. Speaker, we have some serious issues to tackle; so I am dismayed to be on the floor today focusing on yet another messaging bill. There will be headlines tomorrow. Members will go back home to their districts and will talk about “we stopped Obama and any future President from paying ransom money.” It was not ransom in the first place—it was Iran’s money. The prisoners who were released would have been released. Had we done it a month earlier, I wonder if they would have called it a ransom. Had we done it a month later, I wonder if they would have called it a ransom. Yet this messaging bill comes here.

I hope that my colleagues across the aisle, in the final week before we leave Washington, will let us address just some of the things that I mentioned.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the Obama administration admitted to transferring \$1.3 billion in cash to Iran after delivering a \$400 million cash payment on the same day that Iran released American prisoners. The Obama administration tried to walk back its actions by calling the first cash payment leverage, but the American people, frankly, know better. The cash payment to Iran was a ransom payment—I repeat, a ransom payment to Iran—plain and simple.

Let’s get one thing straight here: Iran is our enemy. It is not our friend. Iran is the enemy of our most important allies in the region and not their friend. Iran’s leadership has publicly promised to wipe out America and to wipe out Israel—right off the map. Those are not the words of a friend. Iran imprisons American citizens and taunts our Navy every single day. That is not a friend. Iran is one of only three nations our Department of State classifies as a “state sponsor of terrorism.”

Whether it is the Obama administration’s refusal to utter the phrase “radical Islam” or the word “ransom,” it has tried time and again to deceive the American people with its policies that have ultimately made America less safe. As the increasingly popular saying goes: our friends no longer trust us, and our enemies no longer fear us.

It is time for Congress to step in and block future cash payments to Iran. As an original cosponsor of this bill, I urge my colleagues to support the Prohibiting Future Payments to Iran Act.

In God we trust.

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

If this had been ransom, there is a person whom Iran has held prisoner and about whom Iran has denied a lack of information to the family—Robert Levinson, who has been in Iran for 9 years. I just can’t imagine that a ransom agreement or the meeting of a demand would not have included information about Robert Levinson. That would be, in my considered opinion, the height of ridiculousness; therefore, the obviousness of leaving Mr. Levinson out of what would be a proposed ransom strikes me as being strange.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up comprehensive legislation that provides the resources that are needed to help the families of Flint, Michigan, recover from the lead drinking water crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the children and families of Flint are facing lifelong damage as a result of lead exposure. It is long past time that this Congress acted. We have an opportunity right now to bring up legislation that would ensure the people of Flint will receive clean drinking water and to provide health and educational support for the children who are affected by the crisis.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a champion, among the champions of people who are here in Congress, is DAN KILDEE. I had the privilege of serving with his uncle for a substantial portion of my career. I had the privilege—and I have spoken with Dan about this—to visit with his uncle before this particular crisis of Flint’s and to discuss the plight of the people in Flint and Pontiac and that general area.

In this particular instance, I hope we don’t hear from people that this isn’t germane. This is the Democrats’ motion to recommit, and Republicans who care about the lead exposure that these children and families have been exposed to in Flint can simply vote for the motion to recommit, and we will be able to address this subject.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Flint, Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding and for all of his advocacy on behalf of the people of my community and, also, of the many forgotten people across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question in order to bring up a vote to finally help the people of my hometown of Flint, Michigan.

In 2 days, it will have been 1 year since Dr. Mona Hanna-Attisha released the results of her research that showed that blood levels of the children in Flint showed significantly elevated levels of lead—that the water that they had been drinking had poisoned them.

A year later, here we stand. This Congress has not yet acted to provide any relief to a community that is facing the greatest crisis—the greatest disaster—of its history. It has been a year since it was known that that water was too dangerous to drink. Members in this body have heard me speak about this before. It has been 2 years since, actually, the water contained lead. It took that long for the information, finally, to come to light; yet Congress has continuously failed to act.

We have a way to get this done. I just ask my Republican colleagues in the House to step out of the way and allow the bipartisan legislation that has passed the Senate to have a vote so that it may be included in the legislation that this body is considering. The House can do so by following the Senate's lead, which passed legislation to provide relief to Flint by a vote of 95-3. Let me just make this clear: the United States Senate voted 95-3 to provide support for the people of Flint—and yet nothing here in this House.

□ 1300

We have an opportunity with the continuing resolution to include that language in the continuing resolution and help the people of my hometown, again, people who yet today cannot drink their water without fear that it will poison them.

This is a fully paid-for provision. There was always debate about whether we should be able to spend in case of emergency without having an offset. In this case, we have an offset. So the argument has to be that the people of Flint simply don't deserve to have their Federal Government act in their moment of greatest need. I know from conversations that I have had with Members on both sides of the aisle that that cannot be the case.

I have had all sorts of expressions of sympathy. Many Members of Congress have traveled to Flint, Democrats and Republicans, and have expressed to me on an almost daily basis that they wish there was something they could do to help those poor folks. Well, you know what? Sympathy expresses sentiment, but it doesn't provide clean drinking water for the people of my hometown. We have a chance to act.

Now, when this came before this body, this Congress, in the form of hearings in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, many of my Republican colleagues—virtually every member of the Over-

sight and Government Reform Committee—spoke up and said what a shame it was that the Federal Government played a role in the crisis that Flint is facing, that the Federal Government bore some responsibility.

Now, we can argue about how much responsibility lands at the State. I think the majority of the responsibility is the State's, but I would agree that this is failure at every level of government. My Republican colleagues went so far as to call for a Cabinet member of the President to resign because the Federal responsibility was so great that a member of the President's Cabinet should step down because it was the Federal Government who bore responsibility, in part.

Suddenly, when it is time to actually do something to help the people of Flint, what do we have? All of a sudden, the narrative changes. All of a sudden, what was a Federal problem with clear Federal accountability and responsibility, universally demonstrated by my friends on the other side of the aisle, when it comes time to take up a paid-for piece of legislation that will not increase the deficit but will help these poor folks who cannot drink their water, what do we get? Shuffling of their feet. Stunned silence. Nothing. Nothing. Shame. Shame.

What would you do if it was your hometown? What would you do if it was your community?

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, you know what you would do. You would step to the floor of this House and you would make sure every single day you fought to get help for your community.

One of the first votes I cast when I came here was to help the victims of a storm that was nowhere near my home, and I was proud to do it because they were Americans who happened to be in need.

What is it about Flint? What is it about the people of Flint? Answer me. What is it that separates them, that has them in a position where their Federal Government can't come to their aid? When they can't drink the water, when the water that comes from their tap is poison and we have a chance to do something about it without increasing the Federal deficit with an offset that is already identified, I hear nothing. I hear nothing from the leadership of this House that gives any indication that the people of Flint matter at all. Shame. Shame.

We ought to act, and we ought to do it now—not maybe 3 months from now, not, "Oh, Flint, maybe we will get you in the next bill or maybe the next piece of legislation." Shame. We should bring it up now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

We are here today to talk about a bill that would address yet another foreign policy and national security failure by the Obama administration. The other issues that have been brought up are important issues, but that is not what we are talking about today in this rule.

The gentleman from Michigan knows probably far better than I do that there are a number of people around here working on the Flint issue. We could have a bill on the floor of this House as early as next week. That is certainly my hope and the hope of a lot of other people. I am not privy to all of what is going on there, but I understand that may be coming. That is not what we are here about today.

It is not unusual for me to stand up here when I am managing one of these rules and hear our friends on the other side want to bring up everything other than the topic of what is in the rule because they don't want to talk about the foreign policy and national security failures of the Obama administration. Well, the American people want us to do something about that. They are worried when they see somebody put bombs in trash cans in New York, when somebody stabs people to death in Minnesota. They want to see us doing something. We are trying to do something about that with numerous pieces of legislation that we bring forward in this House; and whenever we bring them up, we hear from the other side about everything else.

Well, today we are here to talk about stopping this President and future Presidents from sending pallets of cash to Iran. That is what we are talking about. So I want us to get back to that debate because that is an important debate for the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Earlier, I misspoke when I said that we could vote for the motion to recommit. I should have said—and I correct the RECORD now—the previous question was what I was speaking of. The simple fact of the matter is we can vote in support of the previous question, and then we would be able to address the Flint crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that this bill is nothing more than an attempt by the majority to make political hay of the recent payment to the Government of Iran, a payment that was a legal settlement. It seems to get ignored by my friends that the United States and Iran are participants in a claims tribunal that was established 35 years ago under the Algiers Accords because Iran had held our hostages, and we needed a methodology to be able to pay and have those hostages remunerated appropriately. That said, \$2.5 billion has been paid to American claims rightly. This framework is being followed, and what this legislation that is going nowhere would do, if it went somewhere, would be to fly in the face of that framework that was established.

By prohibiting any future payments to Iran, this bill could put us in the position of violating the Algiers Accords and owing even more money. It comes at the expense of addressing issues that really matter, like Flint, like Zika, like the opioid epidemic, like gun violence, like the Louisiana floods and the crumbling infrastructure of this Nation. The list goes on and on.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman said earlier in his remarks that there are times when the United States has to have interactions with bad people. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I understand that. We do. But we should be wise in doing so. He and I completely agreed about the ill wisdom of the deal that President Obama struck with Iran; nonetheless, he struck the deal.

He said that there are 200 Iranian claims pending. I have no idea if any of those claims are meritorious. But if even one of them is meritorious, I don't think he would agree—and I know I don't agree, and the vast majority of people in America don't agree—that you pay such a claim by sending pallets of cash. Why would they do that? Why would any President of the United States send pallets of cash to the leading state sponsor of terrorism? It is to hide what they were doing, and they have been found out. We should never do that with anyone, but particularly not with an enemy.

The other thing that this bill provides, besides a prohibition on that—and that is so common sense that I don't know how we could disagree about it—is it requires congressional notification. Don't we want the Congress, as a coequal branch of government, to know before we pay money to the leading state sponsor of terrorism? Don't we want to let the American people know what is going on?

This is a very commonsense bill. The people of the United States expect us to do nothing less than this. So while I appreciate some of the other things we heard about it, some of the other issues they mentioned, let's focus on this. Let's at least get this done so that this President and no President can ever, ever again pay ransom to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 879 and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 879 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 3. 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. 4479) to provide emergency assistance related to the Flint water crisis, 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 Energy and Commerce. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4479.

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. BYRNE. 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. HASTINGS. 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.

EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES THROUGH STOCK OWNERSHIP ACT

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 875, I call up the bill (H.R. 5719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5719

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 "Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act".

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED EQUITY GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ELECTION TO DEFER INCOME.—Section 83 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) QUALIFIED EQUITY GRANTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subtitle, if qualified stock is transferred to a qualified employee who makes an election with respect to such stock under this subsection—

"(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), no amount shall be included in income under subsection (a) for the first taxable year in which

the rights of the employee in such stock are transferable or are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, whichever is applicable, and

“(B) an amount equal to the amount which would be included in income of the employee under subsection (a) (determined without regard to this subsection) shall be included in income for the taxable year of the employee which includes the earliest of—

“(i) the first date such qualified stock becomes transferable (including transferable to the employer),

“(ii) the date the employee first becomes an excluded employee,

“(iii) the first date on which any stock of the corporation which issued the qualified stock becomes readily tradable on an established securities market (as determined by the Secretary, but not including any market unless such market is recognized as an established securities market by the Secretary for purposes of a provision of this title other than this subsection),

“(iv) the date that is 7 years after the first date the rights of the employee in such stock are transferable or are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, whichever occurs earlier, or

“(v) the date on which the employee revokes (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) the election under this subsection with respect to such stock.

“(2) QUALIFIED STOCK.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified stock’ means, with respect to any qualified employee, any stock in a corporation which is the employer of such employee, if—

“(i) such stock is received—

“(I) in connection with the exercise of an option, or

“(II) in settlement of a restricted stock unit, and

“(ii) such option or restricted stock unit was provided by the corporation—

“(I) in connection with the performance of services as an employee, and

“(II) during a calendar year in which such corporation was an eligible corporation.

“(B) LIMITATION.—The term ‘qualified stock’ shall not include any stock if the employee may sell such stock to, or otherwise receive cash in lieu of stock from, the corporation at the time that the rights of the employee in such stock first become transferable or not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture.

“(C) ELIGIBLE CORPORATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii)(I)—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible corporation’ means, with respect to any calendar year, any corporation if—

“(I) no stock of such corporation (or any predecessor of such corporation) is readily tradable on an established securities market (as determined under paragraph (1)(B)(iii)) during any preceding calendar year, and

“(II) such corporation has a written plan under which, in such calendar year, not less than 80 percent of all employees who provide services to such corporation in the United States (or any possession of the United States) are granted stock options, or restricted stock units, with the same rights and privileges to receive qualified stock.

“(ii) SAME RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES.—For purposes of clause (i)(I)—

“(I) except as provided in subclauses (II) and (III), the determination of rights and privileges with respect to stock shall be determined in a similar manner as provided under section 423(b)(5),

“(II) employees shall not fail to be treated as having the same rights and privileges to receive qualified stock solely because the number of shares available to all employees is not equal in amount, so long as the number of shares available to each employee is more than a de minimis amount, and

“(III) rights and privileges with respect to the exercise of an option shall not be treated as the

same as rights and privileges with respect to the settlement of a restricted stock unit.

“(iii) EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the term ‘employee’ shall not include any employee described in section 4980E(d)(4) or any excluded employee.

“(iv) SPECIAL RULE FOR CALENDAR YEARS BEFORE 2017.—In the case of any calendar year beginning before January 1, 2017, clause (i)(II) shall be applied without regard to whether the rights and privileges with respect to the qualified stock are the same.

“(3) QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE; EXCLUDED EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified employee’ means any individual who—

“(i) is not an excluded employee, and

“(ii) agrees in the election made under this subsection to meet such requirements as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to ensure that the withholding requirements of the corporation under chapter 24 with respect to the qualified stock are met.

“(B) EXCLUDED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘excluded employee’ means, with respect to any corporation, any individual—

“(i) who was a 1-percent owner (within the meaning of section 416(i)(1)(B)(ii)) at any time during the 10 preceding calendar years,

“(ii) who is or has been at any prior time—

“(I) the chief executive officer of such corporation or an individual acting in such a capacity, or

“(II) the chief financial officer of such corporation or an individual acting in such a capacity,

“(iii) who bears a relationship described in section 318(a)(1) to any individual described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (ii), or

“(iv) who has been for any of the 10 preceding taxable years one of the 4 highest compensated officers of such corporation determined with respect to each such taxable year on the basis of the shareholder disclosure rules for compensation under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (as if such rules applied to such corporation).

“(4) ELECTION.—

“(A) TIME FOR MAKING ELECTION.—An election with respect to qualified stock shall be made under this subsection no later than 30 days after the first time the rights of the employee in such stock are transferable or are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, whichever occurs earlier, and shall be made in a manner similar to the manner in which an election is made under subsection (b).

“(B) LIMITATIONS.—No election may be made under this section with respect to any qualified stock if—

“(i) the qualified employee has made an election under subsection (b) with respect to such qualified stock,

“(ii) any stock of the corporation which issued the qualified stock is readily tradable on an established securities market (as determined under paragraph (1)(B)(iii)) at any time before the election is made, or

“(iii) such corporation purchased any of its outstanding stock in the calendar year preceding the calendar year which includes the first time the rights of the employee in such stock are transferable or are not subject to a substantial risk of forfeiture, unless—

“(I) not less than 25 percent of the total dollar amount of the stock so purchased is deferral stock, and

“(II) the determination of which individuals from whom deferral stock is purchased is made on a reasonable basis.

“(C) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES RELATED TO LIMITATION ON STOCK REDEMPTIONS.—

“(i) DEFERRAL STOCK.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘deferral stock’ means stock with respect to which an election is in effect under this subsection

“(ii) DEFERRAL STOCK WITH RESPECT TO ANY INDIVIDUAL NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IF INDIVIDUAL HOLDS DEFERRAL STOCK WITH LONGER

DEFERRAL PERIOD.—Stock purchased by a corporation from any individual shall not be treated as deferral stock for purposes of clause (iii) if such individual (immediately after such purchase) holds any deferral stock with respect to which an election has been in effect under this subsection for a longer period than the election with respect to the stock so purchased.

“(iii) PURCHASE OF ALL OUTSTANDING DEFERRAL STOCK.—The requirements of subclauses (I) and (II) of subparagraph (B)(iii) shall be treated as met if the stock so purchased includes all of the corporation’s outstanding deferral stock.

“(iv) REPORTING.—Any corporation which has outstanding deferral stock as of the beginning of any calendar year and which purchases any of its outstanding stock during such calendar year shall include on its return of tax for the taxable year in which, or with which, such calendar year ends the total dollar amount of its outstanding stock so purchased during such calendar year and such other information as the Secretary may require for purposes of administering this paragraph.

“(5) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—For purposes of this subsection, all corporations which are members of the same controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563(a)) shall be treated as one corporation.

“(6) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—Any corporation that transfers qualified stock to a qualified employee shall, at the time that (or a reasonable period before) an amount attributable to such stock would (but for this subsection) first be includible in the gross income of such employee—

“(A) certify to such employee that such stock is qualified stock, and

“(B) notify such employee—

“(i) that the employee may elect to defer income on such stock under this subsection, and

“(ii) that, if the employee makes such an election—

“(I) the amount of income recognized at the end of the deferral period will be based on the value of the stock at the time at which the rights of the employee in such stock first become transferable or not subject to substantial risk of forfeiture, notwithstanding whether the value of the stock has declined during the deferral period,

“(II) the amount of such income recognized at the end of the deferral period will be subject to withholding under section 3401(i) at the rate determined under section 3402(t), and

“(III) the responsibilities of the employee (as determined by the Secretary under paragraph (3)(A)(ii) with respect to such withholding.”.

(2) DEDUCTION BY EMPLOYER.—Subsection (h) of section 83 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or (d)(2)” and inserting “(d)(2), or (i)”.

(b) WITHHOLDING.—

(1) TIME OF WITHHOLDING.—Section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) QUALIFIED STOCK FOR WHICH AN ELECTION IS IN EFFECT UNDER SECTION 83(i).—For purposes of subsection (a), qualified stock (as defined in section 83(i)) with respect to which an election is made under section 83(i) shall be treated as wages—

“(1) received on the earliest date described in section 83(i)(1)(B), and

“(2) in an amount equal to the amount included in income under section 83 for the taxable year which includes such date.”.

(2) AMOUNT OF WITHHOLDING.—Section 3402 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(t) RATE OF WITHHOLDING FOR CERTAIN STOCK.—In the case of any qualified stock (as defined in section 83(i)) with respect to which an election is made under section 83(i)—

“(1) the rate of tax under subsection (a) shall not be less than the maximum rate of tax in effect under section 1, and

“(2) such stock shall be treated for purposes of section 3501(b) in the same manner as a non-cash fringe benefit.”.

(c) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER DEFERRED COMPENSATION RULES.**—

(1) **ELECTION TO APPLY DEFERRAL TO STATUTORY OPTIONS.**—

(A) **INCENTIVE STOCK OPTIONS.**—Section 422(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following: “Such term shall not include any option if an election is made under section 83(i) with respect to the stock received in connection with the exercise of such option.”.

(B) **EMPLOYEE STOCK PURCHASE PLANS.**—Section 423(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“The preceding sentence shall not apply to any share of stock with respect to which an election is made under section 83(i).”.

(2) **EXCLUSION FROM DEFINITION OF NON-QUALIFIED DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN.**—Subsection (d) of section 409A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) **TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED STOCK.**—An arrangement under which an employee may receive qualified stock (as defined in section 83(i)(2)) shall not be treated as a nonqualified deferred compensation plan solely because of an employee’s ability to defer recognition of income pursuant to an election under section 83(i).”.

(d) **INFORMATION REPORTING.**—Section 6051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting a comma, and by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraphs:

“(15) the amount excludable from gross income under subparagraph (A) of section 83(i)(1),

“(16) the amount includable in gross income under subparagraph (B) of section 83(i)(1) with respect to an event described in such subparagraph which occurs in such calendar year, and

“(17) the aggregate amount of income which is being deferred pursuant to elections under section 83(i), determined as of the close of the calendar year.”.

(e) **PENALTY FOR FAILURE OF EMPLOYER TO PROVIDE NOTICE OF TAX CONSEQUENCES.**—Section 6652 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(o) **FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE UNDER SECTION 83(i).**—In the case of each failure to provide a notice as required by section 83(i)(6), at the time prescribed therefor, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect, there shall be paid, on notice and demand of the Secretary and in the same manner as tax, by the person failing to provide such notice, an amount equal to \$100 for each such failure, but the total amount imposed on such person for all such failures during any calendar year shall not exceed \$50,000.”.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to stock attributable to options exercised, or restricted stock units settled, after December 31, 2016.

(2) **REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE NOTICE.**—The amendments made by subsection (e) shall apply to failures after December 31, 2016.

(g) **TRANSITION RULE.**—Until such time as the Secretary (or the Secretary’s delegate) issue regulations or other guidance for purposes of implementing the requirements of paragraph (2)(C)(i)(II) of section 83(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section), or the requirements of paragraph (6) of such section, a corporation shall be treated as being in compliance with such requirements (respectively) if such corporation complies with a reasonable good faith interpretation of such requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and

ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 5719, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

America’s startup companies are a driving force behind our Nation’s dynamic and prosperous free enterprise system. Over the past century, bold, innovative Americans have taken risks and started businesses of all sizes that deliver opportunity for millions of middle class families and workers.

We should do everything we can to help America’s startups attract the talented, hardworking employees they need to put their breakthrough ideas into motion. One of the best things we can do is ensure that our Tax Code supports American innovators. Our Tax Code must support—not suppress—innovation, entrepreneurship, and economic freedom.

Today, I am honored to speak in support of legislation to do just that, Congressman ERIK PAULSEN’s Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act.

□ 1315

This bipartisan, bicameral legislation takes action to keep America at the forefront of innovation by supporting startups and the workers who help them thrive.

Right now many startup companies offer their workers stock options as a portion of their compensation. This helps startups attract top talent because they may not have the money to pay high salaries offered by larger businesses.

The problem is, many startup workers can’t exercise their stock options because they don’t make enough to afford the associated tax payment. In addition, many startups are privately held, so there may not be an available market for these workers to sell some of the stocks so they can pay the tax.

Ultimately, this means a portion of a startup worker’s compensation—sometimes a significant portion—can be essentially out of reach. So when a worker is considering whether to take a job at an exciting new small business, this issue can make the opportunity in that company a lot less attractive.

Congressman PAULSEN’s common-sense legislation fixes the problem. It allows startup workers to defer the tax

payment on their stock options for 7 years or until there is an ability to sell the stock, whichever comes first. Importantly, the bill includes provisions to ensure this tax relief can only be utilized by workers who need it. Those who hold large equity stakes in a startup or highly paid positions at the company won’t be eligible.

The bottom line is that by facilitating employee ownership, this bill will not only help startups attract talent, it will allow their workers to own a stake in that next breakthrough product or service.

Congressman PAULSEN is a long-time champion of employee ownership, free enterprise, and economic freedom—pillars of a strong American economy. I want to thank him for his leadership on this important bipartisan legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

The Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act is a smart, bipartisan solution to help ensure that American startups will continue to be a driving force behind American innovation, job growth, and prosperity.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

This bill addresses an issue that is worthy of being addressed. It surely would be taken up as part of overall tax reform. But this bill surely is not an emergency; and costing over \$1 billion, it is not paid for.

Today, as this House leaves, there has been no action on Flint. That is an emergency—poisoned water, children at risk—and it is being required that emergency funding for Flint be paid for. In contrast, action on this bill is in no way an emergency, and it is not being required to be paid for.

And still no attention to Zika. That is an emergency. It is spreading while some here in D.C. are stalling. I quote Anthony Fauci, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. This is what he told one writer:

“First, we took money from other infections. We borrowed money from ourselves from malaria and TB.

“When we ran out of that money, we started tapping into the Ebola funds that we really should not be tapping into because we still need them to keep the lid on Ebola.”

“When we ran out of that . . . Secretary . . . Burwell had to do something she really did not want to do. She had to take money using her transfer authority from cancer, diabetes, heart disease and mental health and give it to us to be able to continue to prepare the sites for the Zika vaccine trials that we will be performing.”

So Zika, that is an emergency. It is spreading here while we, as I said, in D.C. are stalling. Here we go once again on this legislation, not an emergency, not being paid for. I think the way the House majority is handling this legislation and other legislation, or the lack of it, is inexcusable and in some respects is immoral.

Let me read from the Statement of Administration Policy: "The Administration is committed to helping startups, boosting innovation, and growing the economy, and is willing to work with the Congress on fiscally responsible measures to achieve those goals. However, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 5719 because it would increase the Federal deficit by \$1 billion over the next ten years. Failing to pay for new tax cuts is fiscally irresponsible."

Mr. Speaker, working on stock options and the tax treatment of it is one thing. Zika and Flint are orders of a different magnitude. For these reasons and others, I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when you ask a small-business owner or an entrepreneur about the challenge of starting a new business, they will often tell you that the key to their success is keeping talented employees and recruiting talented employees to keep their company moving forward.

Today we have an opportunity to help startup companies. The Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act is a bipartisan initiative that focuses on two simple but very important concepts: keeping the United States on the forefront of innovation and promoting employee ownership. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his bipartisan leadership on this issue as well.

Mr. Speaker, today our Tax Code is forcing many mid- and lower-level employees at startup companies and businesses around the country to let a very promising investment opportunity pass them by. Unlike employees at larger, more established companies, startup employees are often offered compensation in the form of stock options, a significant part of their compensation. And it is a common practice for a business that is developing a new and promising technology but is not yet profitable.

More and more employees of startups these days aren't exercising their stock options, and that is because if they do, they get hit with a tax bill from the IRS, a tax bill that can be unaffordable because they don't have the cash available to make the tax payment which is due immediately. As a result, employees are letting their stock options expire, missing out on thousands and thousands of dollars that could help them send their kids to college or plan for their retirement.

So here is a simple solution today, Mr. Speaker. The Empowering Employ-

ees through Stock Ownership Act will let an employee defer their tax payment for a reasonable period—7 years—or until there is a market for their stock, which they could then sell to get the money needed to pay the tax bill.

Many employees are drawn to start-up businesses these days for the opportunity to work on shaping the future, the next innovative solution that can improve the lives of millions of people. It might be in health care, it might be treating cancer, or it could be in developing new mobile computer technology.

They are also drawn, though, to the chance and the opportunity to have some ownership over this new idea. However, some are now choosing to instead stay at or go to a larger, established company because they know at a startup business they could face a very unfortunate tax situation.

So to put it simply, Mr. Speaker, the Tax Code should not stand in the way of developing new, life-changing technologies. We should help these startups attract new employees and new talent and help those employees chase their dreams to seek new, creative environments that could lead to the next breakthrough innovation.

The legislation is also designed to promote employee ownership. Only those individuals at startup businesses where similar stock options are offered to 80 percent of their employees or more will be eligible for the tax deferral provided in the bill. This will encourage businesses to offer more of their employees an ownership stake, as well as serve as a very important guardrail to prevent companies that only offer stock options to a select few high-level employees from taking advantage of any provisions in the legislation.

Importantly, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act also contains several provisions to ensure that only those employees who truly need tax deferral are actually able to obtain it. Individuals that own more than 1 percent of a business, the CEO, the CFO, and the four highest paid employees at a business are not eligible for deferral.

Mr. Speaker, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act is part of Leader MCCARTHY's Innovation Initiative here in the House. It is endorsed by the Venture Capital Association, the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, and dozens of businesses around the country.

I include in the RECORD their three letters of support.

NATIONAL VENTURE CAPITAL
ASSOCIATION,
September 7, 2016.

Hon. ERIK PAULSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOSEPH CROWLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PAULSEN AND CROWLEY: On behalf of our nation's venture capital investors and the entrepreneurs they

support, I write to express our support for H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act, and to thank you for your leadership on this important issue. This legislation would allow startup employees to defer tax liability on income arising from exercised but illiquid stock options.

As you know, stock options are a critical tool for attracting talented individuals to work at our nation's startups. Employees are often compensated with stock options as a promise that if the startup succeeds, everybody shares in the gain. And, stock options are particularly important for startups who are often cash strapped and using all resources available to develop and build a novel product. But as the U.S. capital markets have become more hostile to small capitalization companies, increasingly startups are opting to stay private longer rather than pursue an initial public offering (IPO). This has given rise to challenges for employees at our nation's startups when their stock options vest without a liquid market to sell their shares in order to pay the taxes that are due.

Your legislation to allow an additional period of time for employees to defer taxes on exercised stock options is a common sense solution to this challenge that will encourage more talented Americans to help build today's startups into tomorrow's Fortune 500 success stories. We must make new company creation a national priority to compete in the 21st century economy. Your bill will help us avoid a startup brain drain by preserving the value of stock options for employees. NVCA and its member firms look forward to working with you to pass this legislation into law and protect the value of stock options for startup employees. Again, thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

BOBBY FRANKLIN,
President and CEO.

SMALL BUSINESS &
ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
September 19, 2016.

Hon. ERIK PAULSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOE CROWLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PAULSEN AND CROWLEY: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and its 100,000 members nationwide strongly support H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act.

Startup companies face many obstacles, including the recruitment and retention of skilled employees. Employees at startup companies often do not enjoy the higher salaries offered at established companies, but are drawn to the idea of helping to build an enterprise that is at the forefront of the next innovation. At many startup companies, employees are offered stock options or equity ownership to compensate for lower compensation and to share ownership in the company. Currently, if employees exercise these options, they are required to pay taxes immediately but sometimes lack the resources to do so. That means they may miss out on a potential financial opportunity. This is a barrier for some individuals to join a start-up, which means both the company and individual lose, and so does our economy.

H.R. 5719 resolves this barrier by allowing employees seven years or before the stock becomes tradeable on an established market to pay the taxes when they exercise options. H.R. 5719 will help startup companies attract

and keep talented employees, and provide skilled individuals another key incentive to join these promising businesses.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue. SBE Council looks forward to working with you to advance H.R. 5719 into law.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2016.

Hon. ERIK PAULSEN,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOSEPH CROWLEY,
*Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAULSEN AND REPRESENTATIVE CROWLEY: We write you to express our support for H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act (EESO). This bipartisan initiative, led by your efforts, will make it possible for more employees to obtain an ownership stake in the companies they help build and make it easier for startups and private companies to attract the talent necessary to grow the economy.

Part of the lure of startups and many private companies is the ability for virtually all employees to own a piece of their company. Unfortunately, it is difficult for many private company employees to realize the value of their equity (either through exercise or vesting) because of the unique way tax rules apply to employee grants at private companies. Under current law, employees are often required to pay taxes on the value of their shares long before they are able to sell and realize the economic value of those shares. This is due to the fact that, unlike public company employees who are able to sell shares in the public markets to offset the tax consequences of exercised or vested equity grants, private company employees do not have the ability to sell their shares since no public market (or liquid secondary market) exists. This means that many private company employees cannot cover the cost of taxes at the time of exercise/vesting through the sale of shares, but, instead, must pay those costs out of pocket.

This situation is exacerbated for employees who have seen their options or shares grow significantly in value since their date of grant. In this case, taxes due on the difference between grant price and fair market value on the exercise or vesting date will be significant, meaning that many employees will never be able to afford to exercise their options and hold shares. As a result, many private company employees allow their equity grants to expire and lose a significant component of their compensation and potential future growth through the ownership stake.

Your legislation would help solve this problem for many employees by providing them with the ability to choose to defer the payment of the income tax due upon exercise (or vesting in the case of restricted stock units) until the underlying stock is sold. This legislation is structured to minimize the revenue impact to all stakeholders by simply changing the timing of when income taxes are payable.

Again, we thank you for your leadership on this issue. We look forward to working with you to help enact this common sense modification to our country's tax laws so that employees of innovative American companies are able to acquire and retain more of their ownership interests in the businesses they help build.

Sincerely,

Palantir Technologies; Avalara, Inc.; AppNexus Inc; Bloom Energy; Sonos; Space

Exploration Technologies Corp.; Return Path; Stripe; NASDAQ Private Market; Acquia Inc.; Addepar; Sailpoint Technologies Inc.; Casper; Meetup; Betterment; Squarespace; Bromium; Engine; TechNet; The Voice of the Innovation Economy; Kleiner Perkins Caulfield Byer.

Angel Capital Association; Techstars; Hackers/Founders; Kansas City Startup Foundation; KC Tech Council; Y Combinator; GitHub Inc.; 23andMe, Inc.; Gusto; TechNexus; Accel; The Brandyery; duolingo; Kabbage Inc.; Able Lending, Inc.; Garmentory; hobbyDB; Foot Cardigan; Equityzen Inc.; Foursquare.

2nd MD; Zaarly; Wealthfront Inc.; Hyperloop One; Medici.md; Automattic; Decibilly; Medium; ClipMine, Inc.; whiteLabelLabs; Red & Blue Ventures; Global Accelerator Network; AIRMIKA, INC.; Innovation State; Hacom LLC; Village Capital; Help Scout; Filament; 60secondz; GeekGirlWeb, LLC.

Virtkick, Inc.; Speed & Function; 804RVA; Wefunder; Neighborland; Goalbook; Bristlecone Holdings; Blue Startups; Seed Philly; Lighthouse Labs; Hangar; Carao Ventures; Pick1; Alpha Prime Ventures; eShares, Inc.; CrowdCheck Inc.; Lean Team Tuning LLC.

Mr. PAULSEN. I urge all my colleagues in supporting this very commonsense, bipartisan, and bicameral legislation to increase employee ownership and accelerate American innovation.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), someone who has been a sponsor of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time.

I first want to recognize Congressman ERIK PAULSEN, my colead in drafting the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act that we are debating today here on the floor. I appreciate his work in helping to draft this and our offices working together to do that.

We have drafted up a bipartisan bill that, on the merits, should be able to pass the House with an overwhelming majority—overwhelming majority. But I must state my disappointment with the majority—and not necessarily with the sponsor of this bill, but the leadership of the majority—for refusing to allow a simple up-or-down vote on my amendment, joined by the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO), to offset the \$1 billion cost of this bill over 10 years, so that we could empower workers without saddling our children and our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren with more debt.

Now that, in and of itself, is problematic in terms of hoisting additional debt on our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, if it weren't for the fact that we also have crises

facing America, including the Zika virus.

I wonder how the women who today are pregnant and have the virus in them feel about the fact that we are doing a tax bill today, unpaid for, and yet are requiring an offset or a pay-for for money to go towards Zika virus, or the fact that we have been here for over a year and have not yet found the wherewithal to help the good people of Flint, Michigan, unless we find a way to pay for that assistance and that help; but somehow we are able to do this worthy bill on its face without a pay-for.

With respect to the underlying bill, I think all of us are growing increasingly concerned that far too many American workers have not been sharing in the success of the companies that they helped make successful. This bill aims to address that issue by promoting employee ownership, very egalitarian, something I know many on my side of the aisle are very excited about.

The Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act would allow workers at privately held firms and startups to defer the income taxes on their stock options up to 7 years or until a triggering event occurs that allows the stock to be sold, whichever occurs sooner.

The proposed legislation is needed to address real-world situations where employees of privately held firms, who are provided the opportunity to become part owners of the company they helped build through the granting of stock options and shares, cannot exercise that stock without paying taxes on them as income, even though the options cannot be readily sold. For example, there is no market for them to be sold on.

Businesses often offer stock to employees to share the value of their companies, recruit and maintain talented workers, and offer compensation in addition to a salary that they receive. Stock options also provide smaller startup companies the ability to compete with larger, more established companies in attracting top talent.

□ 1330

Currently, when an employee exercises their right to obtain stock in their company, it is a taxable event and taxed in the same way as any other form of compensation they receive.

In publicly traded companies, when employees exercise their stock options or shares vest, the employee is able to turn around and sell a small portion of that stock that is on the public market to pay the tax they owe, while at the same time continuing to retain shares and partial ownership of the company they work for.

Unfortunately, for employees of private companies and startups, there is no market for employees to sell their shares to cover the tax liability that they are exposed to in the same way that a publicly traded company employee has those liabilities.

This tax burden prevents employees of privately held companies from exercising their stock in the first place. That means they lose out on a share of their income, they lose out on the ability to become an owner in their company, and they lose out on part of their investment in their employer's long-term goals.

This bill defers the taxes owed for employees of privately held companies for 7 years or until there is what is known as a "triggering event," which occurs when a stock is sold. Examples of triggering events are stock buybacks, acquisitions, or the company itself going public.

Besides making it easier for lower-wage workers to become owners in their company, this bill encourages companies to offer more stock to more workers. We do this by stating that, to obtain these important recruitment and retention benefits, a company must offer at least 80 percent of their full-time workforce the option to own stock. This 80 percent employee participation number excludes those who own 1 percent or more of the company as well as the CEO and CFO and the four highest-paid officers.

In small startups, excluding senior management and mandating an 80 percent employee coverage test ensures that more employees and those further down the chain of command will be offered to share in the success of the company. It is a good policy and, as I said before, it enjoys bipartisan support.

Because the bill is a tax expenditure, the Joint Committee on Taxation states that it would cost the Treasury and the American taxpayers \$1 billion over 10 years.

Unfortunately, as I stated earlier, an effort that was led by my colleague from California (Ms. ESHOO) and myself to ensure this good policy was enacted without further adding to the debt and the deficit and by adding debt to future generations, unfortunately, was rejected by the majority. It is unfortunate.

While the Republicans in the Congress refuse to fund a billion dollars to help pregnant women in Florida, as I said before, fight off the Zika virus or provide clean drinking water to the people of Flint, Michigan, they are continuing their dangerous path of passing tax cuts that will explode the deficit.

Indeed, just in 2016, Ways and Means Committee Republicans have passed almost \$55 billion in tax cuts out of the committee, all of which, if enacted, would blow up the deficit.

Let's be clear: Who will pay for this tab? Will it be us?

No. We will pass the tab on to our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren to pay for our excesses. It all boils down to values, my friends.

So while I oppose this legislation today—a bill that I am a cosponsor of—I am heartened by the fact that the Senate Finance Committee passed a

companion bill to this bill just yesterday on a bipartisan basis. I don't know how they did it, but somehow they found an offset, Democrats and Republicans working together, which I attempted to do with my colleagues on the Republican side. They found an offset. It is remarkable the Republicans in the Senate thought it was important enough to pay for this and not add further debt to our future generations.

I look forward to supporting this bill when it comes back to the House, fully paid for, when we take up the Senate bill. We know that is what is going to happen. I look forward to working with the Senate to enact this good policy into law, but without saddling our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren with the cost of this benefit.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, who has moved forward and focused attention on a number of different innovation initiatives. These initiatives have come from listening to entrepreneurs.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and, most importantly, for his work. It is not just the work today, but it is the work every day for almost all Americans.

When we talk about medical devices, they are so important to keep people alive. Well, there is one person in this House who led the charge to make sure that tax was repealed so that more medical devices and more jobs could be created, and that is the author of this bill. This bill is giving more Americans the opportunity for ownership. Isn't that the American Dream?

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker. I hear a lot of words on this floor. I heard just recently words about values. You know what is interesting? The record doesn't lie. I hear on this floor about values and I hear on this floor about Zika.

Do you know what?

That is one of the greatest threats to the citizens of America. That is why this House did not delay in acting. We passed not once, but twice, funding for \$1.7 billion. But, Mr. Speaker, the sad part was that one side of the aisle got into another fight and tried to punish Americans, so they all voted "no." And then it goes back, but it passes—thank God—because the majority took it up and sent it to the Senate.

Do you know what happened over in the Senate?

The minority party has voted not once, not twice, but three times, not against the bill, but even allowing the bill to be brought up.

While those Americans sit back and are very fearful about Zika, it was one party denying the bill to even come up in the Senate to get to the President.

So, yes, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about values, values matter. That is what we are talking about today. The House is considering two important

pieces of innovation initiatives. The values. The values of creating jobs. The first is by Representative WILL HURD to improve government IT systems. The second is by Representative ERIK PAULSEN to help startups attract and retain the best employees they can.

These bills go right to the heart of the innovation initiative's two goals: to bring innovation into government and enable innovation in the private sector.

Now, I am not breaking any news here, but too many of our technology systems in government are increasingly outdated. So here are the facts. Last year alone, the Federal Government spent 80 percent—get this right—80 percent of the \$80 billion directed to IT just maintaining old legacy systems. That is 80 percent of \$80 billion.

Representative WILL HURD's bipartisan legislation will help bring government technology systems into the modern age, allowing the government to do its job more effectively, save taxpayers money, and keep public information secure. However, even as we use innovation to improve the way government functions, we can't ignore the importance of innovation in the private sector. You see, an innovation economy is a fundamental part of the American success story.

Today we have these businesses we call gazelles. Gazelles are small startups that grow 20 percent every year or double every 2 years. Gazelles make up 4 percent of all new startups. But do you know what? They make up 70 percent of all new jobs.

We have not reached America's full potential. Not even close. We need to update our laws to enable further innovation so that those with good ideas can create even more opportunity for Americans.

The idea of innovation producing growth is why we are voting today on Representative ERIK PAULSEN's Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act. The truth is, when the startups are funded and founded, they can't offer potential employees the same salaries and benefits of those companies that have already become household names, but they can offer partial ownership. That is the American Dream.

Offering stock options not only allows startups to attract the workers they need, it also gives employees a greater stake in the success of the company. But, unfortunately, the current Tax Code punishes many employees who own stock, taxing them before they even have the opportunity to sell the stock to pay the bill.

Representative PAULSEN's bill allows workers to actually own a piece of the company that they work for. It defers the tax they owe on the stocks for a time so that they have the opportunity to work for a young company that may not have the most resources, but does have a vision of a future that they can believe in.

By giving companies the chance to hire and retain the best employees, do you know what happens?

We will have more innovation, more growth, and more success for the American people.

As you grow in America and get older and have children, you no longer worry about what you will do. You worry about what opportunities your children will have.

Don't you dream that one day maybe your children can even own a piece of their company? But don't you hate to wake up and have the government punish you so that you can't be that owner? Why wouldn't you want government to work for you? Why wouldn't you want government to enhance? Why wouldn't you want innovation?

You want a government that is more effective, more efficient, and more accountable. You want a private sector that is able to spur growth and create more jobs. And you want a country that can protect you from the Zika virus.

Well, you know what? This Congress has acted on all of those and will act on the rest of them today. I hope that it is a bipartisan vote to represent all Americans.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), my good friend and colleague.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman from New York, my good friend, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition not to the legislation—because I am a cosponsor of it and I think it is a very good bill and I think it is an important bill—Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act.

The underlying policy of this bill—it is bipartisan, as has been stated—is to allow employees of privately owned companies to be able to defer taxes owed on exercised stock options for up to 7 years.

I think that there is unanimity on this. I know something about stock options. I have represented Silicon Valley for 24 years. I led the House in a battle many, many years ago on stock options. And I won that, by the way. So I know how stock options work, and I think that it is very important for non-public entities—the startups, first of all—to be able to attract people. When they attract these talented employees, the option of stock options with a deferred tax status would be very, very important. It is a magnet.

We always want new businesses to be born. We want them to grow. We want them to go public. We want them to employ more people. That is the way our economy works. I think that it is a very, very important policy to support. But I also think that—as we recognize the responsibility to take a step to help to expand our economy, I also think it is responsible to think about how we conduct our finances. I wish I had a dime or a nickel for every time someone has come to the floor, espe-

cially from the other side, pounding their chest about the national debt.

So here we have a combination of good policy and irresponsible fiscal policy.

□ 1345

Now, Mr. CROWLEY and I went to—I couldn't make it, but it was our amendment at the Rules Committee to pay for this. The Joint Committee on Taxation says it is going to cost over \$1 billion over 10 years.

Now, when first responders who got sick after the dollars were expended and we wanted them covered because they were, essentially, dying, they were over at the Energy and Commerce Committee, the majority said we are not doing this bill unless it is paid for. That was a national emergency, but you couldn't find the time or the way to take care of that.

When are we going to stop charging things to the national debt? Why do you think it is all right to do it this way? I really wonder if you want bipartisan support.

The American people want bipartisanship. They want it done responsibly. But they also want us—don't your constituents ask you how you are going to bring the debt down? Come on. This is like political cross-dressing here.

Why wouldn't the Rules Committee say: You know what? These Members are right, and they are offering a very sensible way to pay for this bill.

We gave you the pathway for it. We give you the answer for it. We say we will support the policy. We want it paid for. Why do you turn that down?

So I think it is sad, I really do. And all of this happy talk that comes to the floor about innovation, and we know and we are doing and whatever, I have represented it for 24 years, and I think one of the values of my constituents is fiscal responsibility as well as good policy, and that is what we offered.

So I urge my colleagues to examine the two prongs, not just the one. This could have been bipartisan and you could have passed it on a voice vote, for heaven's sake, if you had it paid for. And that is why I am on the floor to object to the way this is done, not to the policy, but that it isn't paid for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to please address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who has been a passionate advocate for entrepreneurship.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, entrepreneurship and employee ownership as well.

I rise in support of H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act, a bill that will allow certain employee recipients of employer stock to defer paying income tax on the stock until they are able to liquidate a portion of the stock to pay those taxes or once 7 years have passed, whichever comes first.

This is a modest but meaningful step in the right direction. It is a modest and meaningful step toward transforming our economy into an ownership society where employees are empowered with a direct and enduring stake in the well-being of their company.

I applaud Representative PAULSEN for offering this legislation and Chairman BRADY for shepherding it through his committee and onto the floor.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, I have a bill that was crafted in the same spirit as this bill that we are considering today. It is a bill that, in my view, should be this body's next step, after this step forward, toward creating an ownership society.

My bill, the Expanding Employee Ownership Act of 2016, which is H.R. 4577, would permanently exempt from income tax liability any stock that was received by employees as part of a broad-based distribution to all employees, so long as the employees held on to the stock for 5 years. If the employee holds the stock for 10 years or more, after that, a mechanism is triggered that allows the employees to sell their stock free of capital gains tax. So by giving the employee a pass on income tax for their stock or capital gains tax for their stock, we will greatly expand the number of working people in our country who own part of the company and maybe own a majority of the companies owned by employees throughout this country.

As we know, employee ownership has many positive attributes, and this bill takes us a step toward that. Studies show that employees who own a share in their company are more productive and prudent. Studies further show that employee-owned companies are generally more profitable and have a lower turnover rate. You have a solidarity between management and labor when the people working for a company own part of the company that they work for. It is more of a partnership.

Free enterprise doesn't just mean profit motive for the capitalists. It means profit motive—not only just profit motive, but it means freedom for everyone to participate in a system where ownership is so important to standard of living.

What has been really very disturbing in our society for these last 30, 40 years is we see the income disparity that exists in our society. Much of it is because working class people have been kept out of capital ownership, and that small, small number of Americans who own the capital have now vast amounts of wealth.

Well, I am not against people being wealthy, but I think that we should make sure our system is designed as our Founding Fathers meant it to be, where you have a maximum amount of people enjoying the freedom and liberty and rights of all the rest of the citizens.

This bill today and my proposal would just take us down a path in

which employees and ordinary working people would not only have a stake in their own company, but probably would have a stake in owning capital, which would bring down this disparity between working people and people of wealth. So today I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, again I want to reiterate, I do appreciate working with Mr. PAULSEN on this issue, and there is really no opposition from me in terms of the policy that we are attempting to put forward here on the floor today. We all agree on the merits of the bill. It is a good bill. I think you have heard that from the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and you also heard it from the gentlewoman on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ms. ESHOO.

Obviously, Mr. PAULSEN and I both agree that this bill has merit. It is a good bill. But I don't believe this will become law today. This bill, the one we are actually debating and we will have a vote on today, in and of itself, will not be enacted in its form today.

We need to enact good policies but not punish our next generation with new debt. That is something I have been reiterating over and over again. So I will vote "no" today on this bill, even though I am the cosponsor of the bill.

That is not the only reason why I will not support the underlying bill today, not just because of placing the debt and the burden of that debt on my children, our children, your grandchildren and great-grandchildren, but because of the fact that there are a number of crises going on in our country today that the Congress, the Republican Congress, simply can't get their hands around, and some are questioning whether they want to get their hands around them at all.

Here is a shocking statistic. Back in June of this year, it was reported by the CDC that 234 women in the 48 States, the continental United States, 234 women had contracted the Zika virus—pregnant women. I am sorry, pregnant women, 234 pregnant women.

While we were here in Congress in the month of June and July and then we broke for 7 weeks in August, and there was no work here done on the floor to address the issue of the Zika virus, as of the middle of September, of this month, in the U.S., 48 continental U.S. States, 749 pregnant women now have the Zika virus. That is three times as many people in a 3-month period.

Now, I don't suggest that possibly it would be, in 3 months from now, three times higher than it is today. In fact, I would argue it is probably a lot higher if we continue down this road of not addressing this issue at all.

But I would have to be one of the 515 women who contracted the Zika virus at the end of June and—why were we

here in Congress and did not enact Zika legislation all through July, all through the month of August into September? If I am one of those 515 women who is now pregnant, I have got to wonder: What is my government doing? They may have gotten it anyway, but at least the government may have been making an attempt to prevent them from contracting the virus.

If I am one of those women, I am saying: The government didn't do anything. The Republican Congress, who controls the House of Representatives and controls the Senate, didn't do anything and, instead, forced the President to move money around the NIH, taking from cancer research, taking from the Ebola issue, taking those resources to try to stop the water from coming out of the dam, putting a finger in the hole. And that is a euphemism.

I mean, at the end of the day, if you are one of the 515 women, there is no answer for it. There is no agreeable answer to them. They are living a nightmare.

And let's think about the thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands of children under the age of 9 in Flint, Michigan, who have been exposed to horrific levels of lead poisoning in their drinking water, unbeknownst to them and their families.

Imagine you are the mother of that child or the father of that child, and you were giving them that drinking water, the guilt you must feel because you didn't know that there was lead in that water. You didn't know that your local government, your State government had let you down, and now your Federal Government is letting you down because we are not doing anything for them.

When the call is to do something and there are negotiations going on, we are not going to have to pay for the tax cuts; but folks in Michigan and Flint and folks in Florida—and now Texas has to be concerned, the southern tier of the United States—we are going to have to find an offset to address your emergent issues.

A tax cut for a bill that I think is worthy, we don't need a tax cut for it. We don't need a pay-for for the tax cut. But for an emergent crisis like Zika, like what happened in Flint, we have to find an offset.

How would you feel? How would you feel, America, if that happened to you? How would you feel about the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate if that happened to you?

I know how I would feel. I know how I feel. I feel disappointed. I feel let down. I feel like the Republican leadership and caucus in the House and the Senate doesn't have your back, doesn't have my back. That is how I feel about it. That is how Americans feel.

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

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

As we close, let me just start by thanking my colleagues on both sides

of the aisle that have spoken in favor of the merits of the bill and in support for the bill. We all know that startups fuel innovation.

□ 1400

It is the entrepreneurial spirit and American ingenuity and know-how that has produced new technologies and has produced new breakthroughs and new inventions to improve health care, to improve society, and to create more jobs and economic growth. It is part of our DNA.

Startups don't have the ability to offer potential employees and new talent the same benefits or same salaries that can be more valuable in the long run than larger institutions can offer to certain employees. So, instead, these startups have to go forward and offer their employees something that could be more valuable—a chance to be a part of the company, a chance to own a piece of the rock.

A lot of startups offer stock options to recruit top talent. It is an incentive for an employee to work hard for the company they believe in or in the idea that they believe in. But more and more often, employees at these startups are missing out. They are missing out on the opportunity because they are not exercising their stock options to have the equity in the company that they believe in. They are not exercising them because if they do, they have to immediately pay the taxes on the income associated with the stock even though they may not be able to afford the cash payment to do so.

A big number of these startups, Mr. Speaker, are privately held with no market for the employees to sell a portion of their stock to pay their taxes. The IRS demands the tax payment immediately, and so those employees let their options expire. They never have the chance to get the investment at a job they believe in and a job they enjoy.

But, today, Mr. Speaker, we are fixing that. We have a solution. We are giving these startup employees a reasonable time period to pay the tax, allowing them to wait until their stock becomes tradeable on a public market so they can sell it to pay the bill.

Helping the innovation economy is a key and important way to promote new products, to promote new services, and to promote new ideas from the dreamers, the inventors, and entrepreneurs we have in America. Letting those innovators attract the brightest and best talent is going to keep America out front, always innovating, always creating, and always inspiring American leadership.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 875, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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. CROWLEY. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

MODERNIZING GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6004) to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6004

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 “Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016” or the “MGT Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government spends nearly 75 percent of its annual information technology funding on operating and maintaining existing, legacy information technology systems. These systems can pose operational risks, including rising costs and inability to meet mission requirements. These systems also pose security risks, including the inability to use current security best practices, such as data encryption and multi-factor authentication, making these systems particularly vulnerable to malicious cyber activity.

(2) In 2015, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) designated Improving the Management of IT Acquisitions and Operations to its biannual High Risk List and identified as a particular concern the increasing level of information technology spending on Operations and Maintenance making less funding available for development or modernization. The GAO also found the Government has spent billions on failed and poorly performing IT investments due to a lack of effective oversight.

(3) The Federal Government must modernize Federal IT systems to mitigate existing operational and security risks.

(4) The efficiencies, cost savings, and greater computing power, offered by modern-

ized solutions, such as cloud computing, have the potential to—

(A) eliminate inappropriate duplication and reduce costs;

(B) address the critical need for cyber security by design; and

(C) move the Federal Government into a broad, digital-services delivery model that will transform the Federal Government’s ability to meet mission requirements and deliver services to the American people.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) Assist the Federal Government in modernized Federal information technology to mitigate current operational and security risks.

(2) Incentivize cost savings in Federal information technology through modernization.

(3) Accelerate the acquisition and deployment of modernized information technology solutions, such as cloud computing, by addressing impediments in the areas of funding, development, and acquisition practices.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM MODERNIZATION AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in each covered agency an information technology system modernization and working capital fund (in this section referred to as the “IT working capital fund”) for necessary expenses for the agency described in paragraph (3).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Amounts may be deposited into an IT working capital fund as follows:

(A) Reprogramming of funds, including reprogramming of any funds available on the date of the enactment of this Act for the operation and maintenance of legacy information technology systems, in compliance with any applicable reprogramming law or guidelines of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(B) Transfer of funds, including transfer of any funds available on the date of the enactment of this Act for the operation and maintenance of legacy information technology systems, but only if transfer authority is specifically provided for by law.

(C) Amounts made available through discretionary appropriations.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An IT working capital fund established under paragraph (1) may be used, subject to the availability of appropriations, only for the following:

(A) To improve, retire, or replace existing information technology systems to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

(B) To transition to cloud computing and innovative platforms and technologies.

(C) To assist and support covered agency efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective information technology capabilities that address evolving threats to information security.

(D) Reimbursement of funds transferred from the Information Technology Modernization Fund established under section 4, with the approval of the agency Chief Information Officer.

(4) EXISTING FUNDS.—An IT working capital fund may not be used to supplant funds provided for the operation and maintenance of any system already within an appropriation for the covered agency at the time of establishment of the IT working capital fund.

(5) REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The head of each covered agency shall prioritize funds within the IT working capital fund to be used initially for cost savings activities approved by the covered agency Chief Information Officer, in consultation

with the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government. The head of each covered agency may—

(A) reprogram any amounts saved as a direct result of such activities for deposit into the applicable IT working capital fund, consistent with paragraph (2)(A); and

(B) transfer any amounts saved as a direct result of such activities for deposit into the applicable IT working capital fund, consistent with paragraph (2)(B).

(6) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Any funds deposited into an IT working capital fund shall be available for obligation for 3 years after the date of such deposit.

(7) AGENCY CIO RESPONSIBILITIES.—In evaluating projects to be funded from the IT working capital fund, the covered agency Chief Information Officer shall consider, to the extent applicable, guidance established pursuant to section 4(a)(1) to evaluate applications for funding from the Information Technology Modernization Fund that include factors such as a strong business case, technical design, procurement strategy (including adequate use of incremental software development practices), and program management.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the head of each covered agency shall submit to the Director the following, with respect to the IT working capital fund for that covered agency:

(A) A list of each information technology investment funded with estimated cost and completion date for each such investment.

(B) A summary by fiscal year of the obligations, expenditures, and unused balances.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director shall make the information required pursuant to paragraph (1) publicly available on a website.

(c) COVERED AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered agency” means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND AND BOARD.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury an Information Technology Modernization Fund (in this section referred to as the “Fund”) for technology related activities, to improve information technology, to enhance cybersecurity across the Federal Government, and to be administered in accordance with guidance established by the Director of the Office of Management of Budget.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council and with the concurrence of the Director, shall administer the Fund in accordance with this subsection.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—The Administrator of General Services shall, in accordance with the recommendations of the Information Technology Modernization Board established under subsection (b), use amounts in the Fund for the following purposes:

(A) To transfer such amounts, to remain available until expended, to the head of an agency to improve, retire, or replace existing information technology systems to enhance cybersecurity and improve efficiency and effectiveness.

(B) For the development, operation, and procurement of information technology products, services, and acquisition vehicles for use by agencies to improve Government-wide efficiency and cybersecurity in accordance with the requirements of the agencies.

(C) To provide services or work performed in support of the activities described under subparagraph (A) or (B).

(4) CREDITS; AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) CREDITS.—In addition to any funds otherwise appropriated, the Fund shall be credited with all reimbursements, advances, or refunds or recoveries relating to information technology or services provided through the Fund.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited, credited, or otherwise made available to the Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, until expended for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

(5) REIMBURSEMENT.—

(A) PAYMENT BY AGENCY.—For a product or service developed under paragraph (3), the head of an agency that uses such product or service shall pay an amount fixed by the Administrator of General Services in accordance with this subsection.

(B) REIMBURSEMENT BY AGENCY.—The head of an agency shall reimburse the Fund for any transfer made under paragraph (3)(A) in accordance with the terms established in the written agreement described in paragraph (6). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an agency may make a reimbursement required by this subparagraph from any appropriation available for information technology activities. An obligation to make a payment under an agreement described in paragraph (6) in a future fiscal year shall be recorded pursuant to section 1501 of title 31, United States Code, in the fiscal year in which the payment is due.

(C) PRICES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Director, shall establish amounts to be paid by an agency and terms of repayment for use of a product or service developed under paragraph (3) at levels sufficient to ensure the solvency of the Fund, including operating expenses. Before making any changes to the established amounts and terms of repayment, the Administrator of General Services shall conduct a review and obtain approval from the Director.

(D) FAILURE TO MAKE TIMELY REIMBURSEMENT.—The Administrator of General Services may obtain reimbursement by the issuance of transfer and counterwarrants, or other lawful transfer documents, supported by itemized bills, if payment is not made by an agency—

(i) within 90 days after the expiration of a repayment period described in the written agreement described in paragraph (6)(A); or

(ii) within 45 days after the expiration of the time period to make a payment under a payment schedule for a product or service developed under paragraph (3).

(6) WRITTEN AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the transfer of funds to an agency under paragraph (3)(A), the Administrator of General Services (in consultation with the Director) and the head of the requisitioning agency shall enter into a written agreement documenting the purpose for which the funds will be used and the terms of repayment. An agreement made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be recorded as an obligation as provided in paragraph (5)(B).

(B) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES.—For any funds transferred to an agency under paragraph (3)(A), in the absence of compelling circumstances documented by the Administrator of General Services at the time of transfer, such funds shall be transferred only on an incremental basis, tied to metric-based development milestones achieved by the agency, to be described in the written agreement required pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(7) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish and maintain a list of each project funded by the Fund on a public website to be updated not less than quarterly, that includes a description of the project, project status (including any schedule delay and cost overruns), and financial expenditure data related to the project.

(b) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION BOARD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Information Technology Modernization Board (in this section referred to as the “Board”) which shall evaluate proposals submitted by agencies for funding authorized under the Fund.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Board are the following:

(A) Provide input to the Director for the development of processes for agencies to submit modernization proposals to the Board and to establish the criteria by which such proposals are evaluated, which shall include addressing the greatest security and operational risks, having the greatest Governmentwide impact, and having a high probability of success based on factors such as a strong business case, technical design, procurement strategy (including adequate use of incremental software development practices), and program management.

(B) Make recommendations to the Administrator of General Services to assist agencies in the further development and refinement of select submitted modernization proposals, based on an initial evaluation performed with the assistance of the Administrator of General Services.

(C) review and prioritize, with the assistance of the Administrator of General Services and the Director, modernization proposals based on criteria established pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(D) Identify, with the assistance of the Administrator of General Services, opportunities to improve or replace multiple information technology systems with a smaller number of information technology systems common to multiple agencies.

(E) Recommend the funding of modernization projects, in accordance with the uses described in subsection (a)(3), to the Administrator of General Services.

(F) Monitor, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, progress and performance in executing approved projects and, if necessary, recommend the suspension or termination of funding for projects based on factors such as failure to meet the terms of the written agreement described in subsection (a)(6).

(G) Monitor operating costs of the Fund.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall consist of 8 voting members.

(4) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Board shall be the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

(5) PERMANENT MEMBERS.—The permanent members of the Board shall be the following:

(A) The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

(B) A senior official from the General Services Administration, who shall be appointed by the Administrator of General Services.

(6) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—The other members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

(i) One employee of the National Institute of Standards and Technology of the Department of Commerce, appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

(ii) One employee of the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(iii) One employee of the Department of Defense, appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

(iv) Three Federal employees primarily having technical expertise in information technology development, financial management, cybersecurity and privacy, and acquisition, appointed by the Director.

(B) TERM.—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (A) shall serve a term of one year, which shall be renewable up to three times, at the discretion of the appointing Secretary or Director, as applicable.

(7) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—Members of the Board may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Board.

(8) STAFF.—Upon request of the Chair of the Board, the Director and the Administrator of General Services may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the Office of Management and Budget or the General Services Administration (as the case may be) to the Board to assist it in carrying out its functions under this Act.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the responsibilities described in subsection (a), the Administrator of General Services shall support the activities of the Board and provide technical support to, and, with the concurrence of the Director, oversight of, agencies that receive transfers from the Fund.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Administrator of General Services are to—

(A) provide direct technical support in the form of personnel services or otherwise to agencies transferred amounts under subsection (a)(3)(A) and for products, services, and acquisition vehicles funded under subsection (a)(3)(B);

(B) assist the Board with the evaluation, prioritization, and development of agency modernization proposals;

(C) perform regular project oversight and monitoring of approved agency modernization projects, in consultation with the Board and the Director, to increase the likelihood of successful implementation and reduce waste; and

(D) provide the Director with information necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(7).

(d) AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CLOUD COMPUTING.—The term “cloud computing” has the meaning given that term by the National Institute of Standards and Technology in NIST Special Publication 800-145 and any amendatory or superseding document thereto.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(3) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term “information technology” has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(4) LEGACY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM.—The term “legacy information technology system” means an outdated or obsolete system of information technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 6004, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016. At the beginning of this month, we released an extensive report detailing how the Office of Personnel Management allowed the sensitive and personal information of over 22 million Americans to be stolen, thereby jeopardizing our national security for more than a generation of people.

The yearlong investigation produced many findings, including the identification of a pressing need for Federal agencies to modernize legacy IT in order to mitigate the cybersecurity threat inherent in unsupported end-of-life IT systems and application. We had too many old things on our network. In other words, a reliance on legacy IT can result in security vulnerabilities where old software or operating systems are no longer supported by vendors, and aging IT infrastructure becomes difficult and expensive to secure.

We saw this firsthand with the OPM data breach where sensitive information was stored on technology so old it was difficult, and in some cases impossible, to implement security best practices like data encryption.

OPM is not alone. It is common throughout the Federal Government for agencies to struggle with legacy IT. For example, the Department of Labor had to buy spare parts on eBay because they were no longer available from the original vendor. Consider another example that our committee learned about during a hearing that highlighted a GAO report on legacy IT.

We learned DOD's Strategic Automated Command and Control System is 50 years ago old and runs on a 1970s IBM Series One computer that uses an 8-inch floppy disk. By comparison, it would take 3.2 million floppy disks to equal the memory of one flash drive.

Numerous other agencies still use Windows 3.0, which was last supported by the vendor in 2001; Windows NT, which last supported in 2004; and Windows 95, which was last supported by the vendor in 2001. The recently issued OPM report demonstrates the security risk of such legacy IT and recommends Congress consider new tools to incentivize the transition from legacy to modernized IT solutions across the Federal Government.

I am happy to say this bipartisan bill follows up on that recommendation. The MGT Act builds on bills introduced

by myself and Minority Whip STENY HOYER and ideas from Federal CIO Tony Scott based on his experience in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, the MGT Act is a key first step in beginning to modernize the Federal Government's outdated and insecure IT infrastructure. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6004.

I would like to thank a number of folks that worked hard for the past few months to bring the best ideas forward in this one bill. I want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their leadership on this issue. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, who was the lead Democratic cosponsor.

As I said before, key portions of Mr. HOYER's bill on the ITMF legislation were included into the MGT Act. Of course, I would like to thank my dear friend and ranking member of my subcommittee, Ms. ROBIN KELLY of Illinois, along with Mr. TED LIEU of California, and especially Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY. His Innovation Initiative is a key reason that we are able to talk about this significant piece of legislation today.

Again, I would like to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6004.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6004, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016.

Let me also thank my good friend and coauthor of this bill, Mr. HURD of Texas, for his leadership in shepherding this bill through our committee and now on to the floor. Sometimes, deservedly, Congress gets dinged on for not being able to get anything done. But the fact of the matter is that, below the surface, lots of things can and do get done with leadership, collaboration, and partnership. Mr. HURD of Texas epitomizes that, and my hat is off to him for his contribution on this whole front of IT modernization and helping to bring the Federal Government into the 21st century when it comes to the use of technology.

Every day Federal agencies endure cyber attacks that have the potential to cause incalculable damage to national security and the privacy of all Americans. While the Federal Government does its best to protect our critical computer networks, our efforts are often stymied by the outdated legacy information technologies in Federal agencies. Agencies spend nearly 75 percent of their IT budgets simply trying to maintain these outdated systems. Let me repeat that: in an \$82 billion program for IT acquisition procurement and management, 75 percent of that budget is not spent in updating the Federal Government in cutting-edge technologies. It is spent maintaining what we have got, and in some cases, those legacy systems go back 40 and 50 years.

I am proud to lead the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016

with Mr. HURD of Texas to help our cyber defenders protect our most important digital resources. When you are dealing with outmoded technology, legacy systems oftentimes can't be protected. They can't be encrypted, and that makes them terribly vulnerable—low hanging fruit to those who would do harm to our country and would compromise the data of millions of Americans.

This bill in front of us marries the IT Modernization Act and the MOVE IT Act by establishing a clear role for both of these pieces of legislation in this improvement process for Federal IT systems.

The MGT Act lays the foundation for the future of IT modernization funding in the Federal Government. This bipartisan legislation will provide a mechanism for agencies to get ahead of the curve and help reduce the fiscal challenges facing every agency chief information officer, or CIO. The MGT Act will authorize a significant upfront investment to retire those vulnerable large-scale legacy systems affecting multiple agencies.

Under the guidance of an Information Technology Modernization Board, agencies will be able now to request funds to facilitate those modernization efforts—something that would absolutely be the practice in the private sector, as I know my friend, Mr. HURD of Texas, knows. If approved, those funds will be repaid through savings realized by the implementation of the more modern IT systems. The bill places an emphasis on following the practice of private industry and moving toward cloud computing solutions.

The MGT Act will allow agencies to invest savings generated through the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, or FITARA for short, and other reforms to make investments in cloud transition.

I was delighted to be a coauthor of the FITARA Act along with DARRELL ISSA of California.

The MGT Act will establish working capital funds that will allow those agencies to use savings from new, secure systems and to reinvest in themselves, including in the movement toward the cloud. This creates incentives for agencies to find those savings and reinvest internally in themselves, creating a virtuous cycle.

The Modernizing Government Technology Act is supported by industry experts and incorporates the same sort of mechanisms the private sector often uses to secure its networks.

It is important for agencies to know that Congress not only expects agencies to implement robust, modern cyber safeguards, but that it is here to help them confront these challenges. This reform has the potential to significantly speed up the Federal Government's move to the 21st century technologies.

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

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

As the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my friend, pointed out, the GAO has identified that millions of taxpayer dollars can be saved through consolidating data centers and modernizing IT systems.

□ 1415

To date, agencies have closed over 3,000 data centers out of over 10,000, resulting in a savings of \$2.8 billion.

This bill authorizes agency-level working capital funds, as well as a centralized IT modernization fund within Treasury and overseen by OMB. These funds will accelerate our transition to modernize IT systems and will save American taxpayers millions of dollars. In other words, welcome to the 21st century, Federal Government. It is about time you got here.

The Modernizing Government Technology Act does not appropriate any new money, but, instead, builds on the successes of FITARA, which Mr. CONNOLLY was instrumental in making happen. It also invests savings in retiring these data systems and accelerating our transition to the cloud.

Folks recognize that sometimes up here in Washington, D.C., it can be a circus, but there are times when folks working together can actually solve major problems. This is one example of being in a partisan part of our election cycle where people working together can solve a big problem and do it to make sure that we are using American taxpayer dollars wisely and eventually, hopefully, making sure they keep some of that at home.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my good friend from Texas. He is always gracious and has always been a wonderful partner in this enterprise.

In closing, the United States Government must come into the 21st century. We owe it to the people we serve to protect the systems that operate within the 24 Federal agencies we are particularly concerned about.

We need to streamline management of IT assets; we need to make strategic and wise investments; we need to have a schedule of replacement for most of those legacy systems; and we need to encrypt and protect against cyber attacks for the sake of the American people. I think Mr. HURD and I share that as a critical mission not only for this Congress, but for the United States Government as a whole.

I am proud, again, to be an original coauthor and cosponsor of this legislation, working with Mr. HURD. I know we have other initiatives we are going to be working on as well.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6004, 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.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 1777, PRESIDENTIAL ALLOWANCE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the order of the House of July 25, 2016, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message and the bill, H.R. 1777, be postponed until the legislative day of December 9, 2016.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1625

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia) at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 879, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of House Resolution 879, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 5719, by the yeas and nays;

Motions to suspend the rules on: H.R. 5320, H.R. 5946, H.R. 2285, H.R. 5523, H.R. 5625, S. 1550, H.R. 4419, and H.R. 5963, each by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5931, PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on order-

ing the previous question 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

YEAS—236

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

Yoho Young (IA)
Young (AK) Young (IN)
NAYS—175

Adams Fudge
Aguilar Gabbard
Ashford Gallego
Beatty Garamendi
Becerra Graham
Bera Grayson
Beyer Green, Al
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
Blumenauer Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan Hahn
F. Hastings
Brady (PA) 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 Kaptur
Cicilline Keating
Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY) Kennedy
Clay Kildee
Clever Kilmr
Clyburn Kind
Cohen Kirkpatrick
Connolly Kuster
Conyers Langevin
Cooper Larsen (WA)
Costa Larson (CT)
Courtney Lawrence
Crowley Lee
Cuellar Levin
Cummings Lewis
Davis (CA) Lipinski
Davis, Danny Loeb sack
DeFazio Lofgren
DeGette Lowenthal
Delaney Lowey
DeLauro Lujan Grisham
DelBene (NM)
DeSaulnier Lynch
Deutch Maloney,
Dingell Carolyn
Doggett Maloney, Sean
Doyle, Michael Matsui
F. McCollum
Duckworth McDermott
Edwards McGovern
Ellison McNerney
Engel Meeks
Eshoo Meng
Esty Moulton
Farr Murphy (FL)
Foster Nadler
Frankel (FL) Napolitano

NOT VOTING—20

Bass Luján, Ben Ray
Bonamici (NM)
Brown (FL) Moore
Carter (GA) Mulvaney
Fincher Pelosi
Gutiérrez Poe (TX)
Lieu, Ted Rooney (FL)

□ 1648

Mr. WALZ, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. RICHMOND changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BENISHEK changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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. HASTINGS. 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 236, noes 178, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

AYES—236

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

NOES—178

Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)

Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Lee
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IA)
Johnson (IN)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCormack
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradr
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
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—17

Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Carter (GA)
Dingell
Fincher
Gutiérrez
Lieu, Ted
Loudermilk
Moore
Mulvaney
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1656

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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 against:

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 543.

EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES THROUGH STOCK OWNERSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants, 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.

Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 124, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—287

Abraham	Gohmert	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Moulton
Aguilar	Gosar	Mullin
Allen	Gowdy	Murphy (FL)
Amash	Graham	Murphy (PA)
Amodi	Granger	Neal
Ashford	Graves (GA)	Neugebauer
Babin	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barletta	Griffith	Noem
Barr	Grothman	Nolan
Barton	Guinta	Norcross
Benishek	Guthrie	Nugent
Bera	Hanna	Nunes
Beyer	Hardy	Olson
Bilirakis	Harper	Palazzo
Bishop (GA)	Harris	Palmer
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Pearce
Black	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Blackburn	Hensarling	Perry
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Peters
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Peterson
Boustany	Hill	Pittenger
Brady (TX)	Holding	Pitts
Brat	Hudson	Poliquin
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Polis
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Posey
Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Price, Tom
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Quigley
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Ratcliffe
Bucshon	Issa	Reed
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Reichert
Bustos	Jenkins (WV)	Renacci
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rice (NY)
Capps	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Carney	Jordan	Rigell
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Roby
Chabot	Katko	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Keating	Rogers (AL)
Cicilline	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Cleaver	Kilmer	Rokita
Coffman	Kind	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	King (IA)	Roskam
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Ross
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus
Comstock	Kline	Rouzer
Conaway	Knight	Royce
Connolly	Kuster	Ruiz
Cook	Labrador	Ruppersberger
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Russell
Courtney	LaMalfa	Ryan (OH)
Cramer	Lamborn	Salmon
Crawford	Lance	Sanford
Crenshaw	Langevin	Scalise
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Culberson	Larson (CT)	Schweikert
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Scott, Austin
Davidson	Lipinski	Scott, David
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Delaney	Loeb sack	Sessions
DelBene	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Denham	Long	Shimkus
Dent	Loudermilk	Shuster
DeSantis	Love	Simpson
DesJarlais	Lucas	Sinema
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Dold	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Donovan	Lynch	Smith (TX)
Duckworth	MacArthur	Stefanik
Duffy	Maloney, Sean	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers (NC)	Massie	Thornberry
Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Tipton
Esty	McCaul	Titus
Farenthold	McClintock	Torres
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Trott
Fleischmann	McKinley	Turner
Fleming	McMorris	Upton
Flores	Rodgers	Valadao
Forbes	McSally	Vargas
Fortenberry	Meehan	Wagner
Fox	Meeks	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Walden
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walorski
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Walz
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

documents sent by mail by the Social Security Administration, 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. SAM JOHNSON) 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 414, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—414

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esh
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

NAYS—124

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esh
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Meng
Nadler
Napolitano
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

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

NOT VOTING—20

Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Carter (GA)
Fincher
Graves (LA)
Gutiérrez
Lieu, Ted
Meadows
Moore
Mulvaney
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Rooney (FL)
Rush

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

□ 1702

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 544, I was in discussions on Louisiana flood relief funding. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 544, H.R. 5719, Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

SOCIAL SECURITY MUST AVERT
IDENTITY LOSS (MAIL) 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. 5320) to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on

Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—17

Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Carter (GA)
Fincher
Gutiérrez
Larson (CT)

Lieu, Ted
Moore
Mulvaney
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Rokita

Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1710

Mr. CONNOLLY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from “present” 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.

UNITED STATES APPRECIATION FOR OLYMPIANS AND PARALYMPIANS 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. 5946) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games, 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 Illinois (Mr. DOLD) 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 415, nays 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—415

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Walorski
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Biden
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

NAYS—1

Himes

NOT VOTING—15

Bonamici
Brown (FL)
Carter (GA)
Fincher
Gutiérrez

Lieu, Ted
Moore
Mulvaney
Pelosi
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1717

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.

PREVENT TRAFFICKING IN CULTURAL PROPERTY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2285) to improve enforcement against trafficking in cultural property and prevent stolen or illicit cultural property from financing terrorist and criminal networks, 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 Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) 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 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]
YEAS—415

Abraham	Cleaver	Flores
Adams	Clyburn	Forbes
Aderholt	Coffman	Fortenberry
Aguilar	Cohen	Foster
Allen	Cole	Fox
Amash	Collins (GA)	Frankel (FL)
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Ashford	Comstock	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Conaway	Fudge
Barletta	Connolly	Gabbard
Barr	Conyers	Gallego
Barton	Cook	Garamendi
Bass	Cooper	Garrett
Beatty	Costa	Gibbs
Becerra	Costello (PA)	Gibson
Benishkek	Courtney	Gohmert
Bera	Cramer	Goodlatte
Beyer	Crawford	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Graham
Bishop (MI)	Cuellar	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Cummings	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (MO)
Blum	Davidson	Grayson
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Bost	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Grijalva
F.	DeGette	Grothman
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Guthrie
Brat	DelBene	Hahn
Bridenstine	Denham	Hanna
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Hardy
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Harper
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Harris
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Buck	Deutch	Hastings
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Burgess	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Bustos	Doggett	Hensarling
Butterfield	Dold	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Calvert	Doyle, Michael	Higgins
Capps	F.	Hill
Capuano	Duckworth	Himes
Cárdenas	Duffy	Hinojosa
Carney	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Carson (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Honda
Carter (TX)	Edwards	Hoyer
Cartwright	Ellison	Huelskamp
Castor (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Chabot	Engel	Hultgren
Chaffetz	Eshoo	Hunter
Chu, Judy	Esty	Hurd (TX)
Cicilline	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Clark (MA)	Farr	Israel
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann	Jackson Lee
Clay	Fleming	Jeffries

Jenkins (KS)	Meeks	Schakowsky
Jenkins (WV)	Meng	Schiff
Johnson (GA)	Messer	Schrader
Johnson (OH)	Mica	Schweikert
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (FL)	Scott (VA)
Johnson, Sam	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Jolly	Mooleenaar	Scott, David
Jones	Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner
Jordan	Moulton	Serrano
Joyce	Mullin	Sessions
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Katko	Murphy (PA)	Sherman
Keating	Nadler	Shimkus
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Shuster
Kelly (MS)	Neal	Simpson
Kelly (PA)	Neugebauer	Sinema
Kennedy	Newhouse	Sires
Kildee	Noem	Slaughter
Kilmer	Nolan	Smith (MO)
Kind	Norcross	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Nugent	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	O'Rourke	Smith (WA)
Kirkpatrick	Olson	Speier
Kline	Palazzo	Stefanik
Knight	Pallone	Stewart
Kuster	Palmer	Stivers
Labrador	Pascrell	Stutzman
LaHood	Paulsen	Swalwell (CA)
LaMalfa	Payne	Takano
Lamborn	Pearce	Thompson (CA)
Lance	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Thornberry
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Tipton
Latta	Pingree	Titus
Lawrence	Pittenger	Tonko
Lee	Pitts	Torres
Levin	Pocan	Trott
Lewis	Poliquin	Tsongas
Lipinski	Polis	Turner
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Upton
Loeb	Posey	Valadao
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Long	Price, Tom	Vargas
Loudermilk	Quigley	Veasey
Love	Rangel	Vela
Lowenthal	Ratcliffe	Velázquez
Lowe	Reed	Visclosky
Lucas	Reichert	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Walberg
Lujan Grisham	Ribble	Walden
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Walker
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rice (SC)	Walorski
(NM)	Richmond	Walz
Lummis	Rigell	Wasserman
Lynch	Roby	Schultz
MacArthur	Roe (TN)	Waters, Maxine
Maloney	Rogers (AL)	Watson Coleman
Carolyn	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
Marchant	Rokita	Welch
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
Massie	Roskam	Westerman
Matsui	Ross	Westmoreland
McCarthy	Rothfus	Williams
McCaul	Rouzer	Wilson (FL)
McClintock	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (SC)
McCollum	Royce	Witman
McDermott	Ruiz	Womack
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Woodall
McHenry	Russell	Yarmuth
McKinley	Ryan (OH)	Yoder
McMorris	Salmon	Yoho
Rodgers	Sánchez, Linda	Young (AK)
T.	Sanford	Young (IA)
McSally	Sanford	Young (IN)
Meadows	Sarbanes	Zeldin
Meehan	Scalise	Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Bonamici	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Brown (FL)	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter (GA)	Mulvaney	Tiberi
Fincher	Pelosi	Walters, Mimi
Gutiérrez	Poe (TX)	
Hudson	Rooney (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1723

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.

RESTRAINING EXCESSIVE SEIZURE OF PROPERTY THROUGH THE EXPLOITATION OF CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE TOOLS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5523) to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from carrying out seizures relating to a structuring transaction unless the property to be seized derived from an illegal source or the funds were structured for the purpose of concealing the violation of another criminal law or regulation, to require notice and a post-seizure hearing for such seizures, 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 Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) 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 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]
YEAS—415

Abraham	Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier
Adams	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Cartwright	Deutch
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Castro (TX)	Dingell
Amash	Chabot	Doggett
Amodei	Chaffetz	Dold
Ashford	Chu, Judy	Donovan
Babin	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael
Barletta	Clark (MA)	F.
Barr	Clarke (NY)	Duckworth
Barton	Clawson (FL)	Duffy
Bass	Clay	Duncan (SC)
Beatty	Cleaver	Duncan (TN)
Becerra	Clyburn	Edwards
Benishkek	Coffman	Ellison
Bera	Cohen	Ellmers (NC)
Beyer	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Collins (NY)	Eshoo
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Esty
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Farenthold
Black	Connolly	Farr
Blackburn	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Blum	Cook	Fleischmann
Blumenauer	Cooper	Fleming
Bost	Costa	Flores
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Forbes
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Fortenberry
F.	Cramer	Foster
Brady (PA)	Crawford	Fox
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Frankel (FL)
Brat	Crowley	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Fudge
Brooks (IN)	Cummings	Gabbard
Brooks (CA)	Curbelo (FL)	Gallego
Buchanan	Davidson	Garamendi
Buck	Davis (CA)	Garrett
Bucshon	Davis, Danny	Gibbs
Burgess	Davis, Rodney	Gibson
Bustos	DeFazio	Gohmert
Butterfield	DeGette	Goodlatte
Byrne	Delaney	Gosar
Calvert	DeLauro	Gowdy
Capps	DelBene	Graham
Capuano	Denham	Granger
Cárdenas	Dent	Graves (GA)
Carney	DeSantis	Graves (LA)

Graves (MO) Luján, Ben Ray
Grayson (NM)
Green, Al Lummis
Green, Gene Lynch
Griffith MacArthur
Grijalva Maloney,
Grothman Carolyn
Guinta Maloney, Sean
Guthrie Marchant
Hahn Marino
Hanna Massie
Hardy Matsui
Harper McCarthy
Harris McCaul
Hartzler McClintock
Hastings McCollum
Heck (NV) McDermott
Heck (WA) McGovern
Hensarling McHenry
Herrera Beutler McKinley
Hice, Jody B. McMorris
Higgins Rodgers
Hill McNeerney
Himes McSally
Hinojosa Meadows
Holding Meehan
Honda Meeks
Hoyer Meng
Hudson Messer
Huelskamp Mica
Huffman Miller (FL)
Huizenga (MI) Miller (MI)
Hultgren Moolenaar
Hunter Mooney (WV)
Hurd (TX) Moulton
Hurt (VA) Mullin
Israel Murphy (FL)
Issa Murphy (PA)
Jackson Lee Nadler
Jeffries Napolitano
Jenkins (KS) Neal
Jenkins (WV) Neugebauer
Johnson (GA) Newhouse
Johnson (OH) Noem
Johnson, E. B. Nolan
Johnson, Sam Norcross
Jolly Nugent
Jones Nunes
Jordan O'Rourke
Joyce Olson
Kaptur Palazzo
Katko Pallone
Keating Palmer
Kelly (IL) Pascrell
Kelly (MS) Paulsen
Kelly (PA) Payne
Kennedy Pearce
Kildee Perlmutter
Kilmer Perry
Kind Peters
King (IA) Peterson
King (NY) Pingree
Kinzinger (IL) Pittenger
Kirkpatrick Pitts
Kline Pocan
Knight Poliquin
Kuster Polis
Labrador Pompeo
LaHood Posey
LaMalfa Price, Tom
Lamborn Quigley
Lance Rangel
Langevin Ratcliffe
Larsen (WA) Reed
Larson (CT) Reichert
Latta Renacci
Lawrence Ribble
Lee Rice (NY)
Levin Rice (SC)
Lewis Richmond
Lipinski Rigell
LoBiondo Wilson (FL)
Loeb sack Roe (TN)
Lofgren Rogers (AL)
Long Rogers (KY)
Loudermilk Rohrabacher
Love Rokita
Lowenthal Ros-Lehtinen
Lowe Roskam
Lucas Ross
Luetkemeyer Rothfus
Lujan Grisham Rouzer
(NM) Roybal-Allard

NOT VOTING—16

Bonamici Gutiérrez
Brown (FL) Lieu, Ted
Carter (GA) Moore
Fincher Mulvaney

Price (NC) Rush
Rooney (FL) Sanchez, Loretta
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1730

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.

MODERNIZING GOVERNMENT TRAVEL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5625) to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) 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 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

YEAS—415

Abraham Capuano
Adams Cárdenas
Aderholt Carney
Aguilar Carson (IN)
Allen Carter (TX)
Amash Cartwright
Amodei Castor (FL)
Ashford Castro (TX)
Babin Chabot
Barletta Chaffetz
Barr Chu, Judy
Barton Cicilline
Bass Clark (MA)
Beatty Clarke (NY)
Becerra Clawson (FL)
Walz Benishek
Wasserman Bera
Schultz Beyer
Waters, Maxine Bilirakis
Watson Coleman Bishop (GA)
Weber (TX) Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT) Black
Blackburn Comstock
Blum Conaway
Blumenauer Connolly
Bonamici Conyers
Bost Cook
Wilson (FL) Cooper
Wilson (SC) Boyle, Brendan
F. Brady (PA)
Brady (TX) Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Brat Crawford
Bridenstine Crenshaw
Brooks (AL) Crowley
Brooks (IN) Cuellar
Brownley (CA) Culberson
Buchanan Cummings
Buck Curbelo (FL)
Davidson Davidson
Burgess Davis (CA)
Bustos Davis, Danny
Butterfield Davis, Rodney
Byrne DeFazio
Calvert DeGette
Capps Delaney

Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNeerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NJ)
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Wilson (FL)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard

NOT VOTING—16

Brown (FL) Frankel (FL)
Carter (GA) Gutiérrez
Fincher Lieu, Ted

Moore
Mulvaney
Pelosi

Poe (TX) Rush Walters, Mimi
 Price (NC) Sanchez, Loretta
 Rooney (FL) Tiberi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1737

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.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1550) to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) 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 404, nays 11, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—404

Abraham	Capuano	Davis, Rodney
Adams	Cárdenas	DeFazio
Aderholt	Carney	DeGette
Aguilar	Carson (IN)	Delaney
Allen	Carter (TX)	DeLauro
Amodei	Cartwright	DelBene
Ashford	Castor (FL)	Denham
Babin	Castro (TX)	Dent
Barletta	Chabot	DeSantis
Barr	Chaffetz	DeSaulnier
Barton	Chu, Judy	DesJarlais
Bass	Ciçilline	Deutch
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Diaz-Balart
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Doggett
Bera	Clay	Dold
Bilirakis	Cleaver	Donovan
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	F.
Bishop (UT)	Cohen	Duckworth
Black	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Blumenauer	Comstock	Edwards
Bonamici	Conaway	Ellison
Bost	Connolly	Ellmers (NC)
Boustany	Conyers	Emmer (MN)
Boyle, Brendan	Cook	Engel
F.	Cooper	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Costa	Esty
Brady (TX)	Costello (PA)	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Courtney	Farr
Brooks (IN)	Cramer	Fitzpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Crawford	Fleischmann
Buchanan	Crenshaw	Fleming
Buck	Crowley	Flores
Bucshon	Cuellar	Forbes
Burgess	Culberson	Fortenberry
Bustos	Cummings	Foster
Butterfield	Curbelo (FL)	Foxx
Byrne	Davidson	Frankel (FL)
Calvert	Davis (CA)	Franks (AZ)
Capps	Davis, Danny	Frelinghuysen

Fudge	Love	Rothfus
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Rouzer
Gallego	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Garamendi	Lucas	Royce
Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Ruiz
Gibbs	Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger
Gibson	(NM)	Russell
Gohmert	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)
Goodlatte	(NM)	Salmon
Gowdy	Lummis	Sánchez, Linda
Graham	Lynch	T.
Granger	MacArthur	Sanford
Graves (GA)	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Graves (LA)	Carolyn	Scalise
Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Grayson	Marchant	Schiff
Green, Al	Marino	Schrader
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schweikert
Grijalva	McCarthy	Scott (VA)
Guinta	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Guthrie	McClintock	Scott, David
Hahn	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Hanna	McDermott	Serrano
Hardy	McGovern	Sessions
Harper	McHenry	Sewell (AL)
Harris	McKinley	Sherman
Hartzler	McMorris	Shimkus
Hastings	Rodgers	Shuster
Heck (NV)	McNerney	Simpson
Heck (WA)	McSally	Sinema
Hensarling	Meadows	Sires
Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Slaughter
Hice, Jody B.	Meeke	Smith (MO)
Higgins	Meng	Smith (NE)
Hill	Messer	Smith (NJ)
Himes	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hinojosa	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Holding	Miller (MI)	Speier
Honda	Moolenaar	Stefanik
Hoyer	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hudson	Moulton	Stivers
Huffman	Mullin	Stutzman
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Takano
Hunter	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Hurd (TX)	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Hurt (VA)	Neal	Thompson (PA)
Israel	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Issa	Newhouse	Tipton
Jackson Lee	Noem	Titus
Jeffries	Nolan	Tonko
Jenkins (KS)	Norcross	Torres
Jenkins (WV)	Nugent	Trott
Johnson (GA)	Nunes	Tsongas
Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke	Turner
Johnson, E. B.	Olson	Upton
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Valadao
Jolly	Pallone	Van Hollen
Joyce	Palmer	Vargas
Kaptur	Pascrell	Veasey
Katko	Paulsen	Vela
Keating	Payne	Velázquez
Kelly (IL)	Pearce	Visclosky
Kelly (MS)	Perlmutter	Wagner
Kelly (PA)	Peters	Walberg
Kennedy	Peterson	Walden
Kildee	Pingree	Walker
Kilmer	Pittenger	Walorski
Kind	Pitts	Walz
King (IA)	Pocan	Wasserman
King (NY)	Poliquin	Schultz
Kinzinger (IL)	Polis	Waters, Maxine
Kirkpatrick	Pompeo	Watson Coleman
Kline	Posey	Weber (TX)
Knight	Price, Tom	Webster (FL)
Kuster	Quigley	Welch
Labrador	Rangel	Wenstrup
LaHood	Ratcliffe	Westerman
LaMalfa	Reed	Westmoreland
Lamborn	Reichert	Williams
Lance	Renacci	Wilson (FL)
Langevin	Ribble	Wilson (SC)
Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)	Wittman
Larson (CT)	Rice (SC)	Womack
Latta	Richmond	Woodall
Lawrence	Rigell	Yarmuth
Lee	Roby	Yoder
Levin	Roe (TN)	Yoho
Lewis	Rogers (AL)	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Rogers (KY)	Young (IA)
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)
Loebsock	Rokita	Zeldin
Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen	Zinke
Long	Roskam	
Loudermilk	Ross	

Amash	Griffith	Jordan
Brat	Grothman	Mossie
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Perry
Gosar	Jones	

NOT VOTING—16

Beyer	Moore	Rush
Brown (FL)	Mulvaney	Sanchez, Loretta
Carter (GA)	Pelosi	Tiberi
Fincher	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi
Gutiérrez	Price (NC)	
Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1743

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDICIAL FINANCIAL TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (HR. 4419) to update the financial disclosure requirements for judges of the District of Columbia courts, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) 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 414, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—414

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Adams	Brooks (IN)	Comstock
Aderholt	Brownley (CA)	Conaway
Aguilar	Buchanan	Connolly
Allen	Buck	Conyers
Amash	Bucshon	Cook
Amodei	Burgess	Cooper
Ashford	Bustos	Costa
Babin	Butterfield	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Byrne	Courtney
Barr	Calvert	Cramer
Barton	Capps	Crawford
Bass	Capuano	Crenshaw
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crowley
Becerra	Carney	Cuellar
Benishek	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Bera	Carter (TX)	Cummings
Bilirakis	Cartwright	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Davidson
Bishop (MI)	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Davis, Danny
Black	Chaffetz	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Blum	Ciçilline	DeGette
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Bost	Clawson (FL)	DelBene
Boustany	Clay	Denham
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	Dent
F.	Clyburn	DeSantis
Brady (PA)	Coffman	DeSaulnier
Brady (TX)	Cohen	DesJarlais
Bridenstine	Cole	Deutch
	Collins (GA)	Diaz-Balart

Dingell	Kelly (PA)	Pingree	Wasserman	Westerman	Yarmuth	Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Doggett	Kennedy	Pittenger	Schultz	Westmoreland	Yoder	Cummings	Johnson (OH)	Peters
Dold	Kildee	Pitts	Waters, Maxine	Williams	Yoho	Curbelo (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Donovan	Kilmer	Pocan	Watson Coleman	Wilson (FL)	Young (AK)	Davidson	Johnson, Sam	Pingree
Doyle, Michael	Kind	Poliquin	Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Young (IA)	Jolly	Jolly	Pittenger
F.	King (IA)	Polis	Webster (FL)	Wittman	Young (IN)	Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Pitts
Duckworth	King (NY)	Pompeo	Welch	Womack	Zeldin	Davis, Rodney	Katko	Pocan
Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Wenstrup	Woodall	Zinke	DeFazio	Keating	Poliquin
Duncan (SC)	Kirkpatrick	Price, Tom				DeGette	Kelly (MS)	Polis
Duncan (TN)	Kline	Quigley				Delaney	Kelly (PA)	Pompeo
Edwards	Knight	Rangel	Beyer	Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)	DeLauro	Kennedy	Posey
Ellison	Kuster	Ratcliffe	Brown (FL)	Moore	Rush	DelBene	Kildee	Quigley
Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Reed	Carter (GA)	Mulvaney	Sanchez, Loretta	Denham	Kilmer	Rangel
Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Reichert	Fincher	Pelosi	Tiberi	Dent	Kind	Ratcliffe
Engel	LaMalfa	Renacci	Gutiérrez	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi	DeSantis	King (IA)	Reed
Eshoo	Lamborn	Ribble	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)		DeSaulnier	King (NY)	Reichert
Esty	Lance	Rice (NY)				DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci
Farenthold	Langevin	Rice (SC)	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE			Deutch	Kirkpatrick	Ribble
Farr	Larsen (WA)	Richmond	The SPEAKER pro tempore (during			Diaz-Balart	Kline	Rice (NY)
Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Rigell	the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-			Dingell	Knight	Rice (SC)
Fleischmann	Latta	Roby	ing.			Doggett	Kuster	Richmond
Fleming	Lawrence	Roe (TN)				Dold	LaHood	Roby
Flores	Lee	Rogers (AL)	□ 1749			Donovan	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)
Forbes	Levin	Rogers (KY)				Doyle, Michael	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Fortenberry	Lewis	Rohrabacher	So (two-thirds being in the affirma-			F.	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Foster	Lipinski	Rokita	tive) the rules were suspended and the			Duckworth	Langevin	Rohrabacher
Fox	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	bill, as amended, was passed.			Duffy	Larsen (WA)	Rokita
Frankel (FL)	Loeb	Roskam	The result of the vote was announced			Duncan (SC)	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ)	Lofgren	Ross	as above recorded.			Edwards	Latta	Roskam
Frelinghuysen	Long	Rothfus	The title of the bill was amended so			Ellison	Lawrence	Ross
Fudge	Loudermilk	Rouzer	as to read: "A bill to update the finan-			Ellmers (NC)	Lee	Rothfus
Gabbard	Love	Roybal-Allard	cial disclosure requirements for judges			Emmer (MN)	Levin	Rouzer
Gallego	Lowenthal	Royce	of the District of Columbia courts and			Engel	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Garamendi	Lowe	Ruiz	to make other improvements to the			Eshoo	Lipinski	Royce
Garrett	Lucas	Ruppersberger	District of Columbia courts."			Esty	LoBiondo	Ruiz
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Russell	A motion to reconsider was laid on			Farr	Loeb	Russell
Gibson	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)	the table.			Fitzpatrick	Loeb	Russell
Gohmert	(NM)	Salmon				Fleischmann	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)
Goodlatte	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda				Fleming	Long	Salmon
Gosar	(NM)	T.				Flores	Loudermilk	Sánchez, Linda
Gowdy	Lummis	Sanford				Forbes	Love	T.
Graham	Lynch	Sarbanes				Fortenberry	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Granger	MacArthur	Scalise				Foster	Lowey	Scalise
Graves (GA)	Maloney,	Schakowsky	SUPPORTING YOUTH OPPOR-			Fox	Lucas	Schakowsky
Graves (LA)	Carolyn	Schiff	TUNITY AND PREVENTING DE-			Frankel (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Schiff
Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean	Schrader	LINQUENCY ACT OF 2016			Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Schrader
Grayson	Marchant	Schweikert	The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-			Franks (AZ)	(NM)	Schweikert
Green, Al	Marino	Scott (VA)	finished business is the vote on the			Frelinghuysen	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	Massie	Scott, Austin	motion to suspend the rules and pass			Fudge	(NM)	Scott, Austin
Griffith	Matsui	Scott, David	the bill (H.R. 5963) to reauthorize			Gabbard	Lummis	Scott, David
Grijalva	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner	and improve the Juvenile Justice and			Gallego	Lynch	Serrano
Grothman	McCaul	Sessions	Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974,			Garamendi	MacArthur	Sessions
Guinta	McClintock	Sowell (AL)	and for other purposes, as amended,			Garrett	Maloney,	Sewell (AL)
Guthrie	McCollum	Sherman	on which the yeas and nays were			Gibbs	Carolyn	Sherman
Hahn	McDermott	Shimkus	ordered.			Gibson	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Hanna	McGovern	Shuster	The Clerk read the title of the			Goodlatte	Marino	Shuster
Hardy	McHenry	Simpson	bill.			Gowdy	Matsui	Simpson
Harper	McKinley	Sinema	The SPEAKER pro tempore. The			Graham	McCarthy	Sinema
Harris	McMorris	Sires	question is on the motion offered			Granger	McCaul	Sires
Hartzler	Rodgers	Slaughter	by the gentleman from Florida (Mr.			Graves (GA)	McCollum	Slaughter
Hastings	McNerney	Smith (MO)	CURBELO) that the House suspend			Graves (LA)	McDermott	Smith (MO)
Heck (NV)	McSally	Smith (NE)	the rules and pass the bill, as			Graves (MO)	McGovern	Smith (NE)
Heck (WA)	Meadows	Smith (NJ)	amended.			Grayson	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Hensarling	Meehan	Smith (TX)	This is a 5-minute vote.			Green, Al	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Smith (WA)	The vote was taken by electronic			Green, Gene	McMorris	Smith (WA)
Hice, Jody B.	Meng	Speier	device, and there were—yeas 382,			Grijalva	Rodgers	Speier
Higgins	Messer	Stefanik	and there were—yeas 382, nays 29,			Grothman	McNerney	Stefanik
Hill	Mica	Stewart	not voting 20, as follows:			Guinta	McSally	Stewart
Himes	Miller (FL)	Stivers	[Roll No. 552]			Guthrie	Meadows	Stivers
Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Stutzman	YEAS—382			Hahn	Meehan	Stutzman
Holding	Moolenaar	Swalwell (CA)	Abraham	Boustany	Clark (MA)	Hanna	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Honda	Mooney (WV)	Takano	Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	Hardy	Meng	Takano
Hoyer	Moulton	Takano	Aderholt	F.	Clawson (FL)	Harper	Messer	Thompson (CA)
Hudson	Mullin	Thompson (CA)	Aguilar	Brady (PA)	Clay	Hartzler	Mica	Thompson (MS)
Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)	Allen	Brady (TX)	Cleaver	Hastings	Miller (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Huffman	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)	Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Huizenga (MI)	Nadler	Thornberry	Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Coffman	Heck (WA)	Moolenaar	Tipton
Hultgren	Napolitano	Tipton	Barletta	Buchanan	Cohen	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Titus
Hunter	Neal	Titus	Barr	Buschon	Cole	Herrera Beutler	Moulton	Tonko
Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer	Tonko	Barton	Bustos	Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Mullin	Torres
Hurt (VA)	Newhouse	Torres	Bass	Butterfield	Collins (NY)	Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Trott
Israel	Noem	Trott	Beatty	Byrne	Comstock	Hill	Murphy (PA)	Tsongas
Issa	Nolan	Tsongas	Becerra	Calvert	Connolly	Himes	Nadler	Turner
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Turner	Benishek	Capps	Conyers	Hinojosa	Napolitano	Upton
Jeffries	Nugent	Upton	Bera	Capuano	Cook	Holding	Neal	Valadao
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Valadao	Bilirakis	Cárdenas	Cooper	Honda	Neugebauer	Van Hollen
Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke	Van Hollen	Bishop (GA)	Carney	Costa	Hoyer	Newhouse	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Olson	Vargas	Bishop (MI)	Carson (IN)	Costello (PA)	Hudson	Noem	Veasey
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Veasey	Black	Carter (TX)	Courtney	Huffman	Nolan	Vela
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vela	Blackburn	Cartwright	Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Norcross	Velázquez
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Velázquez	Blum	Castro (FL)	Crawford	Hultgren	Nugent	Visclosky
Jolly	Pascrell	Visclosky	Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Crenshaw	Hunter	Nunes	Wagner
Jones	Paulsen	Wagner	Bonamici	Chabot	Crowley	Hurd (TX)	O'Rourke	Walberg
Jordan	Payne	Walberg	Bost	Chu, Judy	Cuellar	Hurt (VA)	Olson	Walden
Joyce	Pearce	Walorski		Cicilline		Israel	Palazzo	Walker
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Walorski				Issa	Pallone	Walorski
Katko	Peters	Walorski				Jackson Lee	Pascrell	Walz
Keating	Peterson	Walz				Jeffries	Paulsen	Wasserman
Kelly (MS)						Jenkins (KS)	Payne	Schultz
						Jenkins (WV)	Pearce	Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman	Wilson (FL)	Yoho
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Welch	Womack	Young (IA)
Wenstrup	Woodall	Young (IN)
Westerman	Yarmuth	Zeldin
Williams	Yoder	Zinke

NAYS—29

Amash	Gohmert	McClintock
Babin	Gosar	Palmer
Brat	Griffith	Perry
Bridenstine	Harris	Price, Tom
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Sanford
Buck	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Jordan	Weber (TX)
Chaffetz	Labrador	Westmoreland
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Wittman
Farenthold	Massie	

NOT VOTING—20

Beyer	Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)
Brown (FL)	Moore	Ruppersberger
Carter (GA)	Mulvaney	Rush
Fincher	Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta
Gutierrez	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Joyce	Price (NC)	Walters, Mimi
Kelly (IL)	Rigell	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1755

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. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 22, 2016 I was absent due to personal reasons and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 542 on ordering the previous question—"Aye." Rollcall No. 543 adoption of H.Res. 879—"Aye." Rollcall No. 544 passage of H.R. 5719—"Aye." Rollcall No. 545 passage of H.R. 5320—"Aye." Rollcall No. 546 passage of H.R. 5946—"Aye." Rollcall No. 547 passage of H.R. 2285—"Aye." Rollcall No. 548 passage of H.R. 5523—"Aye." Rollcall No. 549 passage of H.R. 5625—"Aye." Rollcall No. 550 passage of House Amendment to S. 1550—"Aye." Rollcall No. 551 passage of H.R. 4419—"Aye." Rollcall No. 552 passage of H.R. 5963—"Aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 544 (on passage of H.R. 5719), 545 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5320), 546 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5946), 547 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 2285), 548 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5523), 549 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5625), 550 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended House Amendment to S. 1550), 551 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 4419), and 552 (motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended H.R. 5963) I did not cast my vote due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all of the votes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1878. An act to extend the pediatric priority review voucher program.

S. 2683. An act to include disabled veteran leave in the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 110-315, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following individual to be a member of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity:

Steven VanAusdle of Washington vice Cameron Staples of Connecticut.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). 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 vote on postponed questions will be taken later.

SAN LUIS REY INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1296) to amend the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act to clarify certain settlement terms, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1296

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

SECTION 1. SAN LUIS REY SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION.

The San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 100-675) is amended by inserting after section 111 the following:

"SEC. 112. IMPLEMENTATION OF SETTLEMENT.

"(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds and recognizes as follows:

"(1) The City of Escondido, California, the Vista Irrigation District, the San Luis Rey River Indian Water Authority, and the Bands have approved an agreement, dated December 5, 2014, resolving their disputes over the use of certain land and water rights in or near the San Luis Rey River watershed, the terms of which are consistent with this Act.

"(2) The Bands, the San Luis Rey River Indian Water Authority, the City of Escondido, California, the Vista Irrigation District, and the United States have approved a Settlement Agreement dated January 30, 2015 (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Settlement Agreement') that conforms to the requirements of this Act.

"(b) APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION.—All provisions of the Settlement Agreement, including the waivers and releases of the liability of the United States, the provisions regarding allottees, and the provision entitled 'Effect of Settlement Agreement and Act,' are hereby approved and ratified.

"(c) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Attorney General are authorized to exe-

cute, on behalf of the United States, the Settlement Agreement and any amendments approved by the parties as necessary to make the Settlement Agreement consistent with this Act. Such execution shall not constitute a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The Secretary is further authorized and directed to take all steps that the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate to implement the Settlement Agreement and this Act.

"(d) CONTINUED FEDERALLY RESERVED AND OTHER WATER RIGHTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including any provisions in this Act, the Bands had, have, and continue to possess federally reserved rights and other water rights held in trust by the United States.

"(2) FUTURE PROCEEDINGS.—In any proceeding involving the assertion, enforcement, or defense of the rights described in this subsection, the United States, in its capacity as trustee for any Band, shall not be a required party and any decision by the United States regarding participation in any such proceeding shall not be subject to judicial review or give rise to any claim for relief against the United States.

"(e) ALLOTTEES.—Congress finds and confirms that the benefits to allottees in the Settlement Agreement, including the remedies and provisions requiring that any rights of allottees shall be satisfied from supplemental water and other water available to the Bands or the Indian Water Authority, are equitable and fully satisfy the water rights of the allottees.

"(f) NO PRECEDENT.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted as a precedent for the litigation or settlement of Indian reserved water rights."

SEC. 2. DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS.

The second sentence of section 105(b)(1) of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 100-675) is amended by striking the period at the end, and inserting the following: ", provided that—

"(i) no more than \$3,700,000 per year (in principal, interest or both) may be so allocated; and

"(ii) none of the funds made available by this section shall be available unless the Director of the Office of Management and Budget first certifies in writing to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate that the federal budget will record budgetary outlays from the San Luis Rey Tribal Development Fund of only the monies, not to exceed \$3,700,000 annually, that the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to this section, allocates and makes available to the Indian Water Authority from the trust fund."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The bill before us today helps bring closure to almost 50 years of litigation and uncertainty that have impacted tribal and nontribal communities in southern California.

□ 1800

Negotiations between five tribes, water districts, cities, and Federal Government have been ongoing for decades, and this bill represents the results of those successful negotiations. The Federal money has already been appropriated for this settlement, and this bill, as amended, includes provisions that are aimed at resolving direct spending issues that have been identified by the Congressional Budget Office.

It is not often that both sides of the aisle come to an agreement on anything involving California water. While I hope that we will have agreement on larger California water issues in the near future, this bill shows that we can come together. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

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

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

This bill approves a water rights settlement agreement that would resolve nearly five decades of litigation. That is a great thing.

The 2015 settlement between the United States and the parties that Mr. DENHAM just mentioned is important, and approving this settlement will finally put an end to years of bitter fighting over water rights in the San Luis Rey River Basin. It also leaves intact the full amount of funds Congress previously appropriated for the tribes. This kind of negotiation is important, and the painstaking work that has gone into it is to be commended. Now it is up to Congress to do its part to implement a well-crafted settlement.

I commend my colleagues across the aisle for introducing this bill and for moving it through the House, and I thank the committee staffs on both sides who have been working hard to bring this bill to the floor.

I have to say, though, Mr. Speaker, that all of this good, collaborative work represented in Mr. HUNTER's bill stands in contrast to another set of pending water agreements in our State. I hope that the Obama administration will look at this successful example of collaboration in San Diego County and reconsider its current approach to the Westlands-San Joaquin Valley drainage disputes, where Congress and the public have been extremely ill-served.

In the two pending drainage agreements, the Interior Department has agreed to waive hundreds of millions of dollars that are owed to taxpayers. They have failed to close off potential litigation risks from other parties and have failed to secure actual commitments to clean up the contamination. They have also promised to write a new, permanent water contract for a party that is not a tribal party but is

in an arid state where everyone is hurting for clean water. Meanwhile, we weren't able to receive administration testimony on one of the agreements due, in part, to a pending inspector general investigation of the beneficiaries.

I am hopeful that, in the next administration and in a new Congress, we can do a better job on this drainage issue and, specifically, that we will be able to tackle those California drainage disputes with the same level of collaboration and problem-solving that we have seen in the San Luis Rey Basin.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman and my great friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, the parties to this settlement have been working towards a resolution for almost 50 years; so I will keep my remarks brief so that we don't delay them any further. Before I get into the substance of this bill, I thank Chairman BISHOP, Chairman FLEMING, and the Natural Resources Committee staff for their assistance in getting this bill to the floor right now. I also thank my friends across the aisle.

Today we are addressing an issue that dates back to the late 19th century, when the Federal Government established reservations—in what is now my district in northern San Diego County—for five Mission Indian bands. The creation of these reservations included sufficient water to meet the bands' present and future needs. However, in 1969, litigation arose surrounding whether the Federal Government improperly signed over the bands' water rights claims to two non-Indian municipalities—what are today the city of Escondido and the Vista Irrigation District.

In 1988, after decades of litigation, Congress enacted legislation that was introduced by former Congressman Ron Packard, the 1988 San Luis Rey Water Rights Settlement Act. Among its provisions, the legislation directed the U.S. Secretary of the Interior to provide water annually to the tribes and established the San Luis Rey Tribal Development Fund. However, that act only becomes effective when all of the parties to the litigation enter into a settlement agreement providing for the complete resolution of all claims. That is what the legislation we are considering today accomplishes.

This legislation puts into effect a previous Department of Justice settlement agreed to by all parties—the five Mission Indian bands, the two local municipalities, and the Federal Government—and requires no new money or water to be enacted. With the passage of H.R. 1296, Congress can, at last, end this dispute and finalize the action it sought in passing the original settlement act in 1988.

I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this is one small step to California's water solutions. It is about time that we came together on this one small issue in California. Now it is time to face the much bigger issues of a drought-stricken State that continues to see a lack of water storage. It is time that we find a real solution for all of California.

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. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1296, 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.

ROBERT EMMET PARK ACT OF 2016

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4564) to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as "Robert Emmet Park", and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4564

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 "Robert Emmet Park Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Robert Emmet was one of Ireland's most prominent historical figures, having led an effort to secure Irish independence in 1803.

(2) Although Emmet's efforts initially failed, they succeeded in inspiring new generations of Irish men and women to struggle for independence.

(3) For his efforts to gain Irish independence, Emmet was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death by hanging.

(4) Robert Emmet's "Speech from the Dock" motivated many of the efforts that led to an independent Ireland following 1916's Easter Rising; (Emmet famously said that "To [Ireland] I sacrificed every selfish, every lasting sentiment . . . I wished to place her independence beyond the reach of any power of earth . . . to procure for my country the guarantee which Washington procured for America . . . to exalt her to that proud station in the world."). Emmet was strongly influenced by American democracy and the American Revolution.

(5) Emmet had family members similarly admiring of the United States and dedicated to the cause of Irish independence, including his brother Thomas Addis Emmet who went on to become a prominent Attorney General of New York.

(6) Emmet has been revered by generations of Irish-Americans for his leadership, courage, and sacrifice.

(7) Fifty years ago on April 22, 1966, the Robert Emmet Statue was dedicated on a

small parcel of National Park Service land (reservation 302) at the corner of 24th Street NW and Massachusetts Avenue NW in Washington, DC.

(8) Robert Emmet's statue is the central feature of reservation 302.

(9) Many leading Members of Congress, including Speaker of the House John W. McCormack and Senators Everett Dirksen and Mike Mansfield served on the Robert Emmet Statue Dedication Committee.

(10) Other members of that committee and participants in the dedication ceremony included Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, Representative Michael Kirwan, Ambassador of Ireland William P. Fay, and Rector of St. Matthews Cathedral John K. Cartwright.

SEC. 3. REDESIGNATION OF ROBERT EMMET PARK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The small triangular property designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302, shall be known as "Robert Emmet Park".

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, paper, or other record of the United States to the property referred to in subsection (a) is deemed to be a reference to "Robert Emmet Park".

(c) SIGNAGE.—The Secretary of the Interior may post signs on or near Robert Emmet Park that include one or more of the following:

(1) Information on Robert Emmet, his contribution to Irish Independence, and his respect for the United States and the American Revolution.

(2) Information on the history of the statue of Robert Emmet located in Robert Emmet Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

This bill, introduced by Congressman CROWLEY of New York, redesignates a small, triangular property in Washington, D.C., that is currently designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302, as Robert Emmet Park.

Robert Emmet is a prominent historical figure who is known for his role in the Irish Rebellion of 1803 and for his classic Speech from the Dock that inspired future efforts to gain Irish independence. Last April marked the 100th anniversary of the 1916 uprising, commonly known as the Easter Rising by Irish Republicans, to end British rule and establish an independent Irish Republic.

The small property redesignated by the bill is located just a few blocks from the Irish Embassy, and it cur-

rently features a nearly 100-year-old statue of Robert Emmet—a source of pride for America's Irish community. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to post informational signage regarding Robert Emmet and his statue in the park.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Robert Emmet was an Irishman who was inspired by our hard-fought independence in this country, and he wanted the same for his native land. I think this bill is a wonderful thing for Ireland and a wonderful thing for Irish Americans, including for my colleague, Mr. CROWLEY, a great, proud Irish American.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4564 designates a small triangle of land in Washington, DC as the Robert Emmet Park. The parcel is home to a statue of Robert Emmet, a seminary figure in Ireland's quest for independence. The bill also authorizes the National Park Service, which managed the area, to add interpretive displays and signage to the area.

Emmet admired the independence we achieved in this country, and only wanted the same freedom and liberty for his compatriots. These powerful sentiments are a charge to all of us in this Chamber and throughout the country: that we put the good of our fellow countrymen before our individual gains and that we work together to preserve this great Nation.

By designating this small plot of land and the accompanying statue as Robert Emmet Park, this stands as a constant reminder of the call to liberty and freedom that binds our Nation together. I am glad to support this bill and thank the sponsor, Representative JOE CROWLEY of New York, the vice-chair of the Democratic Caucus.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my friends from California for bringing this bill to the floor today. I am not a member of the requisite committee, but I appreciate the work that was done to bring it to the floor. I thank them both for speaking in favor of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that we are here this week at the cusp of the grand opening of the National Museum of African American History and Culture here in Washington, D.C.—a, rightfully, magnificent building here on The Mall of our Nation's Capital. I think, after listening to a few of the remarks I will make about this little piece of property here in Washington, it is a modicum in comparison to that, but it is, I think, worthy of our support.

This is a bipartisan bill that is before us today. It has earned the support of both sides of the aisle. Specifically, it would name a small parcel of land in Washington, D.C., as the Robert Emmet Park. In some ways, the name can be considered a formality because, as has been mentioned by Mr. DENHAM, there is already a statue of Emmet

that has been in the park for decades. It is the only statue in the very small park, and it is situated so that it is the main visible feature to visitors. I hope one doesn't mind my sharing just a little of the history here today.

The Robert Emmet statue first came into the possession of the United States 100 years ago, when then-President Woodrow Wilson, other Cabinet members, diplomats, and Members of Congress joined in the acceptance ceremony.

The statue was a gift from the Irish American community and was created by renowned artist Jerome Connor. After it was donated, it graced the rotunda of the National Museum of Natural History for its first 50 years. In the 1960s, it was moved to its current location in the park, and it was rededicated. The statue has stood there ever since and has been admired by millions of tourists, visitors, local residents, and passersby.

But this is not just a statue. For many Americans, the admiration for Robert Emmet reflects a deep and abiding pride in Irish American history as well as the lasting, worldwide influence of our own American history. That is because, over 200 years ago, inspired by George Washington and the American Revolution, Emmet led an attempt to free Ireland from British rule. For this effort, he was captured and was ultimately executed. In the course of his execution, he gave one of the most famous speeches in history, known as the Speech from the Dock. His cause lived on not only because he paid the ultimate price on September 20, 1803, but because of his incredible and indelible words that he spoke that day.

In his speech, Emmet spoke about how George Washington and the American independence struggle inspired his actions. He spoke about his desire for sovereignty and for independence for his own land. He spoke about his desire for freedom and uttered words that live on in the hearts of Irish Americans and of all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

I quote from that speech:

Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them and me rest in obscurity and peace and my tomb remain uninscribed and my memory in oblivion until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the Earth, then—and not till then—let my epitaph be written.

It is dangerous to paraphrase a famous speech; but basically Emmet was saying not to write his epitaph until the struggle was won. He believed it ultimately would be won someday.

The brilliance of his speech and the courage of his convictions had a profound impact on people throughout the world, but particularly in Ireland. Understand that he was subject to execution—he was hung, drawn, and quartered—and he knew that that is what he was facing; yet he had the ability to

deliver one of the greatest speeches in the history of mankind.

Scholars indicate that President Abraham Lincoln knew and recited the very speech I just alluded to. The American author Washington Irving wrote of Emmet, and many school-children across our country memorized parts of the speech I just referred to. I, myself, learned of that passage during time spent at my high school, my alma mater, Power Memorial Academy in New York City.

Emmet and his speech also had a real and concrete impact on our own American history. In fact, organizations called the Emmet Monument Association sprung up in the United States. Their goal was to build a burial monument to Emmet on which that promised epitaph, one day, could be written. Since Emmet had requested that Ireland be free before his epitaph were written, these were really Fenian freedom organizations.

□ 1815

Over the years, these and other organizations were supported by countless Americans not only in New York, Boston, and Washington, D.C., but throughout our land, Irish and non-Irish alike. Their work was the precursor to later American roles in the struggle for Ireland's independence, and their presence played a major part in American political life for many, many, many decades.

When the Emmet statue was moved to its current location 50 years ago, many leading American figures served on the bipartisan dedication committee, including then-Speaker of the House John W. McCormack and Senators Everett Dirksen and Mike Mansfield. They were joined by the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Rector of St. Matthews Catholic Cathedral, John Cartwright.

President Lyndon Johnson also conveyed his admiration for Emmet in a message to the event writing, "... the sheer patriotism and the gallant courage of Robert Emmet has inspired Americans no less than Irishmen ... We Americans are proud to accord a place of honor here in the Nation's Capital to Robert Emmet, whose struggles and sacrifices bespeak the yearnings of mankind throughout the ages."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Congress and the U.S. Government have long recognized the significance of this park and its central statue in keeping alive not only the memory of Robert Emmet but the ideals that he fought and what he was executed for.

I hope we can continue that record and the bipartisan cooperation here today by passing this legislation. This bill doesn't require spending funds. It doesn't require undue efforts. It doesn't significantly rearrange any current setup of the park or the park system. It would simply attach the name "Robert Emmet Park" to the existing small piece of land where that statue rests.

I respectfully urge its passage.

In closing, I thank the members and staff of the Natural Resources Committee for their work and their support of this measure. I greatly appreciate their work in ensuring that this is on the floor and that the bill passes today.

I can't do enough justice to the life of Robert Emmet, nor his brother, Thomas, for that matter, and all those who followed afterwards. He was an incredible inspiration, as I said, not only to Ireland but well beyond the shores of Ireland as well, including the United States of America.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to thank Mr. CROWLEY for offering this important issue. It is important to Irish heritage, and it certainly deserves the recognition as a park right here in our local area of Washington, D.C.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4564.

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.

PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials they might want to include on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879 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. 5931.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1820

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. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, with Mr. RUSSELL 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 California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I raise this issue because, on three occasions now, we have had the transfer of pallets of cash to the Government of Iran, and this legislation would make certain that that does not happen again.

The reason we do not want to pay cash to the Government of Iran has to do with all of the efforts that the international community has put into trying to track the conduct of that regime, which is a primary money laundering concern for the international financial community, and for the fact that particular government in Iran, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, has been the primary source of cash support for Hamas in the past and also today for Hezbollah.

We could add to that the work of the IRGC in trying to get parts for their ballistic missile program as their agents are out and about Europe trying to buy this equipment.

It is not in the interest of the United States to have the regime have cold, hard cash. So this legislation would put an end to that.

As the Members of the House will recall, the President announced in January that the United States would pay Iran \$1.7 billion to settle a dispute involving a 1979 arms deal. This payment came out of the blue.

From the start, by the way, Iranian military commanders were saying that a hostage exchange, which I think most of us originally assumed, was going to be nine prisoners who were in the process of being convicted in the United States, of Iranian nationality, were going to be exchanged for the four hostages, the four Americans, that Iran was holding.

Yet, from the beginning, as this was announced, you saw the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps speaking to this issue saying there was going to be a transfer of cash. Basically, there was going to be a ransom payment here in exchange for letting the Americans go.

Well, it turns out that, after months of pressing from the Foreign Affairs Committee and the media, the Obama administration finally admitted that it had ignored the concerns from the Justice Department.

Now, what was the Justice Department's concerns? It had to do with the way in which the payment was being made. It had to do with the transfer of cash.

As the Justice Department said, there is a longstanding U.S. policy against this process. Why? Because when you do so, you can expect to get more of the same kind of action from a state like Iran.

Indeed, once the \$1.7 billion in these three tranches of cash were paid, the

result, after the release of Americans held hostage in Iran and after they announced in Iran that this was linked to these pallets of cash, then they took three more American hostages. They detained three more Americans and held them, plus a Canadian, plus a Frenchman, and a Brit. So, not surprisingly, I guess, Iran is continuing in this behavior.

I think now the administration claims also that cash was the only way they could do this particular transaction, but that is simply not true. It could have permitted a transaction to go through the international financial system. How do we know this? Because they were making other payments through the international financial system to Iran as sanctions were being lifted through the proper procedure there.

Just this week, the Treasury Department confirmed that other recent transactions with Iran were conducted through traditional banking channels.

I think the reason this was done in pallets of cash, in my opinion, was because that is what the Iranians were demanding. The reason I think that is because that is what they are saying in terms of their television coverage of this.

So the administration did choose to deliver \$1.7 billion in untraceable assets to Iran's radical regime. And that is problematic when the international body charged with developing policies to combat money laundering and combat terrorism financing tells us that, in their words, physical transportation of currency is one of the main methods used to move criminal assets, to launder money, and—to me, most importantly—to “finance terrorism.”

I believe that, again, that is why the Iranian regime wanted the cash. It is not a coincidence to me that the desire for cash comes just as this committee's legislation to crack down on banks that finance Hezbollah is having an impact. What kind of an impact? We have made it very, very hard for those in Hezbollah and Hamas to now get their hands on the support that previously had come through Iran.

Iran and its proxies need cash, and we should not be transferring it to them. So this legislation, which passed out of the Foreign Affairs Committee last week, has two core elements: One, it prohibits future cash payments for any reason to Iran. And, two, it demands transparency and advanced notification of any future settlements related to the U.S.-Iran Hague Tribunal so that the Congress is not surprised again.

It poses a fundamental question: Are we comfortable providing Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism that is fueling a bloodbath in Syria, with billions of dollars in cash that they can turn around and funnel to the Assad regime, to Hezbollah, and to Hamas? I think, for all Members, the answer to that question is clear.

I would urge an “aye” vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to this bill.

Let me start by underscoring my respect and admiration for our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and my friend, ED ROYCE. It is unusual that we debate a Foreign Affairs bill subject to a rule because the vast majority of our legislation is the product of strong bipartisan collaboration.

So I regret that the bill we are debating today doesn't have support across the aisle, and all you need to do is read the bill's title to know what I mean. There were 50 Republican sponsors and no Democrats. We really weren't part of putting this bill together. And again and again in the bill, we see the word “ransom.”

Now, I know that some of my colleagues and the chairman believe sincerely that the latest payment to Iran was a ransom. I happen to disagree. I think holding Iran's money until Iran released American detainees was a pretty shrewd bargain. Whatever we think, using the word “ransom” turns this bill into a political hot button, a poke in the eye of the administration.

Now, I don't like or trust the Government of Iran. I voted against the Iran bill last year, and it is no secret that I have some differences with the President's Iran policy. But I do know that pushing legislation just to embarrass the White House won't help to resolve those differences we might have.

□ 1830

I also question the bill's focus on cash. Look, I share the view that any sum dumped into Iran's bank account may be put to bad use. But, Mr. Chairman, I would have that concern whether the money got to Iran via cash, check, wire transfer, or stacks of gold bars. Money is money; it is fungible. We have no way of knowing what happens to it once it is in Iran's hands. We can guess, but we have no way of knowing.

Does that irk me? Sure, it does. Iran's leaders do all sorts of things that irk me and, more important, that make the world less safe. But whether we like it or not, the payment we are talking about was Iran's money. We paid it as part of a settlement under the Algiers Accords, which the United States signed in 1981. We have been making payments like this for decades—under Ronald Reagan, under George H.W. Bush, and now under Barack Obama—and in that time, regardless of how we sent the money, we haven't had any control over what Iran does with it. I agree, it is deeply frustrating because we know what Iran is up to.

We can't control that, Mr. Chairman. But there are some things we can control. For instance, I agree with Chairman ROYCE that the way we found out about this payment gave Congress short shrift. We did receive a briefing, but we did not learn how and when the

payment was going forward. Congress can, and should, make sure that happens with respect to future payments. That is what my amendment does, which I am going to introduce.

In my view, that is what the Committee on Foreign Affairs would have done if we had advanced this bill according to our normal bipartisan process. Again, as I said, there was no input from the minority. It comes to the floor with 50 Republican cosponsors and not a single Democrat. I am not able to support the bill because, to me, it puts political concerns ahead of our legitimate concerns. I share the chairman's feelings about Iran. I don't think there is a dime's worth of difference between our feelings with Iran. It is simply a matter of what is the best way to go about doing it. I don't think this is the best way.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would make the point that, as we talk about whether Iran took possession of this money in cash or by check, that transaction is immaterial. I understand the argument here, but let me explain why I do not think that holds true with respect to the process here.

There are other options that could have been followed, that have been followed by the international community when payment is made. For example, the administration could have held the funds in an escrow account overseas, verified that the end recipients of the funds were, in Iran, not sanctioned entities, like the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

By providing cash, the administration is doing the work for the Iranians that they need done in terms of preparatory work for money laundering. That is the problem. That is the problem with the way this was done. Cash transactions, in and of themselves, raise serious terrorism financing risks, according to the Financial Action Task Force; and that is the official body, international body, that sets the global standards for preventing money laundering and is most focused on stopping terror finance. What they say, again, is that the physical cross-border transportation of currency is the main method used to move illicit funds, to launder money, and to finance terrorism. That is why we want to cut off cash.

These risks are particularly acute here because the State Department has identified Iran as the leading state sponsor of terrorism and as the country that is actively supporting terrorist organizations with cash, such as Hezbollah, Hamas as well, and then also assisting Syrian President Assad in his murderous assault on civilians. So that is the first point I would make.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this issue. I rise in support of this legislation, the Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Last month, Mr. Chairman, information came to light the administration secretly paid a cash ransom to Iran, a state sponsor of terrorism, in exchange for the release of American hostages, a decision kept secret from Congress, a decision kept from Congress because, as this administration and its own State Department know well, it is longstanding U.S. policy to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom.

In fact, just last year, President Obama issued a Presidential Policy Directive stating just that: "The United States Government will make no concessions to individuals or groups holding U.S. nationals hostage. It is United States policy to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom, prisoner releases, policy changes, or other acts of concession."

I fear this President has set a dangerous precedent for United States nationals and personnel abroad. We are already seeing it, Mr. Chairman. Since the ransom has been paid, Iran has taken seven more United States citizens hostage.

This decision was not only foolish, but shortsighted. I have yet to mention where this money is likely to go. Iran has been designated as a state sponsor of terrorism by the U.S. State Department since 1984. It has supported groups like Hezbollah and Hamas, which call for the destruction of our allies, including Israel.

The President would understandably like to deny ransom was paid and instead claim this was simply leverage and part of a settlement deal that he struck with the same Iranians who, by his own admission, have violated the spirit of his generous agreements before. For someone who holds the spirit of pledges in such high esteem, Mr. Chairman, I don't think even the President could disagree that, at the very least, he violated the spirit of his own policy.

This administration's desire to appease a radical Iranian regime knows no bounds. Though the President stands idly by as the Iranians violate the terms of their agreement with the United States, Congress must not stand idly by while he violates his own deal with the American people.

I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 5931. It is time to cut off the cash.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), whose helpful amendment to this bill was adopted during the Committee on Foreign Affairs' markup.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman ROYCE and rise in support of his legislation, Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act, which I

cosponsored, to prohibit ransom payments to Iran, the largest state sponsor of terror.

Iran calls America the Great Satan and pledges death to America. Iran is illegally test-firing ICBMs. They finance Assad in Syria, Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terror groups. Iran recently detained and embarrassed, publicly, U.S. Navy sailors. Iran currently is threatening U.S. Navy warships. Iran leaders do not respect American weakness—they prey upon it—and the U.S. is feeding into it, like the unsigned political commitment otherwise known as the Iran nuclear deal. Purchasing Iran's heavy water didn't help. Speaker RYAN has aptly pointed out, Secretary Kerry has been a shill for Iran, as if he is the president of the Tehran Chamber of Commerce.

I am deeply troubled that earlier this year the Obama administration airlifted a cash ransom payment at the exact same moment as the release of four unjustly detained American hostages. Some people blindly loyal to this President will say that this was Iran's money. No, it wasn't. This was a disputed claim for decades, and for very good reason. In the late 1970s, Iran fell behind in their payments under the Foreign Military Sales program. Iran canceled their orders, overtook our Embassy, and then repudiated all foreign obligations.

Not only have we been disputing Iran's claim for \$400 million, we had counterclaims against Iran, including one for \$817 million. In fact, a Federal law from 2000 details a very specific requirement regarding payments to Iran from the FMS account, which was directly violated by the ransom payment to Iran.

Between the 1979 Iranian Revolution and the 2000 law, U.S. victims of Iranian-sponsored terrorism sued the Iranian Government in U.S. court with claims caused by Iran's terrorism. The claims were paid by the U.S. Government. These claims were subrogated to the U.S., meaning that their claims against Iran became the U.S.' claims against Iran.

The 2000 law clearly states that "no funds shall be paid to Iran, or released to Iran . . . from the Foreign Military Sales Fund, until such subrogated claims have been dealt with to the satisfaction of the United States."

Yet President Obama paid Iran the full \$400 million amount from the FMS fund, plus more than three times that amount in interest, a total of \$1.7 billion in cash, in violation of the 2000 law. You can call a ransom payment leverage. But guess what, folks; it is still ransom. And why don't we pay ransom? Because now, with the price paid on American hostages, Iran has now captured new, unjustly imprisoned American hostages.

Passage of this bill is critically important, and I thank Chairman ROYCE for his unyielding, inspiring leadership on this issue to hold Iran accountable.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The argument that the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) was making is based on the counter to this argument that the administration has made. What the administration has said is: Look, Iran says we owe them \$400 million. We will impute the interest on that. The interest on the \$400 million is \$1.3 billion. Thus, we get to the \$1.7 billion that the tribunal says we owe, and we will pay that in three tranches.

The only way you get to that number, as Mr. ZELDIN has pointed out, is if you ignore the fact that in 2000, pursuant to a law signed by President Clinton, American taxpayers provided \$400 million, the same amount as in the FMS trust fund, to U.S. citizens who had won judgments against Iran for its support of terror. So the United States Government then took on their \$400 million in claims against Iran. So, in fact, those two sums should have been netted out.

In fact, according to this law, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, the President was required to attempt to recover that money, that \$400 million from Iran, to the satisfaction of the United States. As part of this settlement, we are just finding out—get this—we are just finding out that the administration is letting Iran off the hook for the \$400 million plus interest. These sums would have netted out to zero.

According to the State Department, the administration has agreed to no longer pursue that \$400 million claim against Iran plus interest. Why? Why? And that is why this bill is so important, because it brings much-needed transparency to the U.S.-Iran Claims Tribunal by allowing Congress to see what claims each side has filed when they are likely to come in front of the tribunal and the likelihood that either Iran or the United States will prevail.

So again, what I am concerned happened here is because of the push from Iran—and we need pushback against this. So Iran comes in at the eleventh hour of this deal and says: Wait a minute. We want this \$400 million in cash plus we want the interest. We are going to the tribunal. That is the decision from the tribunal. And then we give up on the counterclaim for the same amount. That is the concern here.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say this: None of us likes the Government of Iran. None of us likes the idea of making payments to Iran, but this bill imposes a blanket ban on most forms of payment of our international obligations.

Let me just say that the Algiers Accords, which were signed 35 or 40 years ago, President Ronald Reagan, and President George H.W. Bush did the same thing that President Obama is doing now by making payments to

Iran. There are things that gail us, but there are international obligations that we really have to follow through with.

□ 1845

It wasn't a matter and isn't a matter of giving money for hostages. We know this was part of a larger transaction. In fact, it was Iran's money that we held back; and we didn't release their money until we knew that those hostages were free. So I think it was pretty shrewd on our part to wait and use their money to hold back until the hostages were released.

Again, I think the Government of Iran is a terrible government. I think there are lots of things we could and should be doing together to put the skids on them. And we will be developing legislation together. But this legislation, to me, is more about poking a finger in the eye of the President and the eye of the administration by using words like "ransom" and saying all kind of things.

That is not really what we should be doing. We should be working together to find bipartisan solutions to check Iran, which nobody here will say is a good actor—certainly not me—one of the worst actors in the world, a leading sponsor of terrorism. But the United States has to fulfill international obligations, and we will do that, and we will do it at the same time we are countering Iran and making sure that it doesn't get away with its aggression and all the other horrific things the Government of Iran does. So I have to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chair, it looks as though I have one more Member who has arrived and wishes to speak on this measure. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. LANCE. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this extremely important issue.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5931, the Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act.

It is a sad day when the American people see their tax funds being given to the world's most notorious financier of international terrorism. This legislation puts an end to it. And it is taxpayer funds. That was the original purpose in the 1970s. Since then, the Iranian regime has sponsored state terrorism across the globe.

The total now stands at \$1.7 billion that this administration has handed over to Iran. And despite weeks of denial after denial, the administration has finally acknowledged that these cash shipments to Iran were leveraged for the release of four innocent Americans unlawfully held by Tehran. I translate the term "leverage" to mean ransom.

We already know that the world is less safe based upon the nuclear agree-

ment with Iran and that we are catering to Iran's demands. I believe that the \$1.7 billion to Iran sets a dangerous precedent that a terrorist network convicted in our courts can escape compensating U.S. victims.

There have been quite a few victims who were compensated in our courts, and those amounts of money have never been paid to the victims' families. The cash payments shipped in the middle of the night to Iran should instead have gone to the loved ones of those murdered by the Iranian regime.

The bill would stop the flow of funds to the terrorist networks long supported by Iran. I fear it may be inevitable that these funds would make their way to some of the world's worst actors. It is a risk we shouldn't have taken, and this legislation would ensure that it cannot happen again not only regarding this administration—this administration is going out of office and there will be a new President and a new administration come January—but this legislation goes well beyond the remaining months in office of this administration.

This is excellent legislation, regardless of which political party controls the White House, the executive branch, the State Department.

All of us should honor the judgments that have been rendered in courts of law for those who have lost their lives in acts of terrorism where the responsibility has been adjudicated in our courts of law. And it is to that end that Chairman ROYCE and the Foreign Affairs Committee and many others of us in the Congress have been involved in this issue.

The Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act is needed, and I urge its passage.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the esteemed majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, back in June of 2015, President Obama said: "It is United States policy to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom, prisoner releases, policy changes, or other acts of concession."

That was back in 2015. Of course, just 6 months later, President Obama released seven Iranians and sent \$400 million in cash to Iran in exchange for Americans held hostage.

When the initial word came out that \$400 million was sent in unmarked bills on an unmarked plane to, in essence, exchange that money for American hostages, it sent a chilling signal all across the world. Not only was the administration completing a prisoner swap, but the administration was actually cowering to the Iranians' request for a cash payment.

\$400 million was converted into European currency, flown through Geneva, and then transferred to Iran just as the

American hostages were released. But what we heard from the White House were denials, actually calling us out, saying it wasn't a ransom payment, despite the clearly coordinated series of events.

Mr. Chairman, nonetheless, we learn that the President's own Justice Department warned that this cash payment would signal a change in U.S. ransom policy and, of course, the Iranians themselves consider it a ransom payment. In fact, the Iranians bragged that they received cash ransom from the United States.

Nonetheless, the administration continues to refuse to confront this problem and how it actually makes America less safe. And we have seen that play out. Since this hostage ransom payment, more Americans and other Westerners have been taken hostage because the President put a bounty on the heads of Americans and other Westerners.

We have also learned there is another \$1.3 billion sent to Iran in cash. The administration said that there was no other way to send the payment; that they couldn't wire it. But, of course, since then, we have learned that there have been wire transfers made to Iran. So the President continued to mislead the American people about this serious breach of American protocol as it deals with Iran.

Now, a serious question to ask is: Where is that \$1.7 billion going? And not if, but how much of that \$1.7 billion is going to end up in the hands of Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist organizations?

After all, Iran is the largest state sponsor of terror.

I think these are all important questions that need to be answered, Mr. Chairman. So all of these serious questions need to be answered by the administration, which has continued throughout this entire process of misleading the American people about what really happened. And the American people are demanding answers.

This bill by Chairman ROYCE is a serious response to stop these kinds of cash ransom payments from ever happening again to make America less safe. I appreciate all of my colleagues voting for this.

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

In summation, Mr. Chairman, throughout negotiations on the President's nuclear deal, the Foreign Affairs Committee held scores of briefings and hearings and meetings with the Obama administration on Iran.

So if the goal of this settlement was only to put to rest a decade-old excuse over an abandoned arms sale, why the secrecy? And why the secrecy, especially, about transferring this in pallets of cash?

I believe what happened here was that Iran, at the eleventh hour, demanded this cash payment and we ended up acquiescing.

And why ignore your own lawyers?

That is the other real question, to me. The head of the Justice Department's National Security Division warned that Iran would see it as a ransom and respond by taking more American hostages. And that is exactly what happened. They held the cash until the hostages left Iran that day. Even the State Department calls it leverage. It was textbook ransom. The Iranians viewed it as a ransom. They bragged about it. And now 3 more Americans have been taken hostage.

In an interview just yesterday, President Rouhani said Iran is actively engaged in negotiations with the Obama administration to get more money. And that is why the bill in front of us today does two things: it provides more transparency regarding the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal and it prohibits cash payments to the Government of Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, for any reason.

Remember, as international authorities have made clear, the physical transportation of currency—that means cash—is one of the main methods used for the purpose of money laundering and to finance terrorism.

So, once again, all Members must ask themselves today one important question: Are you comfortable providing Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, with billions of dollars in cash that they can turn around and funnel to the Assad regime, to Hezbollah, and to Hamas?

Mr. Chairman, the answer is clear. And I ask all Members to support this legislation.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I am grateful to be a co-sponsor of H.R. 5931, to prohibit future cash payments to Iran.

In January, the President made a \$1.7 billion cash payment along with the dangerous Iranian Nuclear Deal. After months of questions from the Foreign Affairs Committee about the deal and other leaders, we are just now getting the truth—

The payment was a ransom for four Americans who sat on a runway until the currency was en route.

The payment was made in cash—provided in pallets of untraceable foreign currency easily provided to murderous terrorists.

The Administration claimed cash was the only way to pay the ransom, yet the Treasury Department stated that the U.S. has made payments to the Iranian government via wire transfer in the past year.

As a leading state sponsor of terrorism, a cash payment to Iran will almost certainly go to finance terrorist activities, putting American families at risk.

Needless to say, the cash payment to the Iranian regime is a dangerous precedent that puts American families at risk. Last week, I sent a letter to the Treasury Department's Acting Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence asking what steps his office took to ensure the cash ransom did not go to finance terrorism. I am still awaiting response.

I appreciate the leadership of Chairman ED ROYCE for sponsoring this legislation and for his work to stop the dangerous practice of providing cash to state sponsors of terrorism threatening American families.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this crucial legislation.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which is not a product of bipartisan collaboration as is the tradition of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The facts of this case are simple. Unfortunately, they have been muddied by election year politics and a lack of careful deliberation on this matter.

In 1979, U.S. weapons sales to Iran were interrupted by the Iranian revolution, and \$400 million worth of American weapons that were paid for by Iran were never delivered.

In December 2015, the U.S. and Iran settled the claim over the weapons sale for \$1.7 billion, including \$1.3 billion in interest.

Payment of the claim on January 16, 2016 coincided with Implementation Day of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and the release of four Americans detained in Iran.

The settlement was announced the next day, and Congress was briefed on the payment.

For eight months this settlement was not the emergency it has somehow become.

And now with less than 50 days until the election we have rushed this legislation to the Floor without any input from the Minority.

We did not even bother to have a hearing on this subject, which the Majority obviously views as important.

In fact, the hearing on the settlement payment was scheduled for this week, after we marked up this bill in Committee last week.

The hearing was subsequently cancelled, which was probably for the best.

The Committee might have looked a little foolish sending a bill to the Floor to be voted on and then seeking out the facts of the case in a hearing.

Point, shoot, aim, should not the manner in which Congress conducts U.S. foreign policy.

Perhaps we should go back to the drawing board and try to move forward in a bipartisan fashion.

That is how the House Foreign Affairs Committee functions best.

It is how we passed Iranian sanctions to bring Iran to the negotiating table.

It is how we have gone after Iran's financing of Hezbollah.

And it is how we should continue to confront the legitimate challenges Iranian behavior poses to security and stability in the world.

This legislation is not in keeping with that successful tradition, and I must oppose it.

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.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-64. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 5931

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 "Prohibiting Future Ransom Payments to Iran Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) *Since 1979, when it held more than 50 United States citizens for 444 days, Iran has repeatedly held United States citizens hostage.*

(2) *Presidential Policy Directive 30 issued by President Barack Obama on June 24, 2015, states that "It is United States policy to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom, prisoner releases, policy changes, or other acts of concession."*

(3) *On January 17, 2016, the President announced that Iran would release several United States citizens while the United States would grant clemency to and release seven Iranian nationals serving sentences or awaiting trial in the United States for serious crimes.*

(4) *Senior officials of the Department of State have acknowledged that these United States citizens were released as part of a "prisoner swap" and Iranian negotiators reportedly asked for a cash payment.*

(5) *On January 17, 2016, the President also announced that "The United States and Iran are now settling a longstanding Iranian government claim against the United States Government."*

(6) *The overall amount of the settlement is approximately \$1,700,000,000.*

(7) *Subsequent reports revealed that \$400,000,000 of this \$1,700,000,000 settlement was secretly flown to Iran, in cash, simultaneously with the release of these United States citizens.*

(8) *One of the United States citizens released that night, Pastor Saeed Abedini, has stated that Iranian officials explained a delay in their departure was due to the status of another plane.*

(9) *Senior officials at the National Security Division of the Department of Justice reportedly objected to the \$400,000,000 cash payment, warning that Iran would see it as a ransom.*

(10) *On August 18, 2016, a Department of State spokesman admitted that the \$400,000,000 cash payment was "leverage" to gain the release of Americans held hostage by Iran.*

(11) *Iranian State Television quoted General Mohammad Reza Naghdi, commander of the Basij militia, as claiming "Taking this much money back was in return for the release of the American spies."*

(12) *According to Presidential Policy Directive 30, the United States policy against paying ransom and releasing prisoners "protects United States nationals and strengthens national security by removing a key incentive for hostage-takers to target United States nationals, thereby interrupting the vicious cycle of hostage-takings, and by helping to deny terrorists and other malicious actors the money, personnel, and other resources they need to conduct attacks against the United States, its nationals, and its interests."*

(13) *Since the United States released Iranians serving sentences or awaiting trial in the United States for serious crimes and provided Iran with \$400,000,000 in cash, Iran has taken several more United States citizens hostage.*

(14) *On August 22, 2016, the Department of State issued an "Iran Travel Warning" noting that "Iranian authorities continue to unjustly detain and imprison U.S. citizens, particularly Iranian-Americans, including students, journalists, business travelers, and academics, on charges including espionage and posing a threat to national security."*

(15) *The Government of the United States has designated Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism since 1984 and a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern since 2011.*

(16) *The Department of State's most recent Country Reports on Terrorism makes clear that "Iran continued its terrorist-related activity in 2015, including support for Hizballah, Palestinian terrorist groups in Gaza, and various groups in Iraq and throughout the Middle East."*

(17) *In announcing Iran's designation as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern,*

the Department of the Treasury made clear that “any and every financial transaction with Iran poses grave risk of supporting” Iran’s ongoing illicit activities, including terrorism.

(18) On March 17, 2016, the Department of State acknowledged in a letter to Congress that there remain some “large claims” pending before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal, “many of which are against the United States”.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States Government not to pay ransom or release prisoners for the purpose of securing the release of United States citizens taken hostage abroad.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON CASH PAYMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Government may not provide, directly or indirectly, promissory notes (including currency) issued by the United States Government or promissory notes (including currency) issued by a foreign government, to the Government of Iran.

(b) **LICENSING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the conduct of a transaction or payment in connection with an agreement to settle a claim or claims brought before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal may be made only—

(A) on a case-by-case basis and pursuant to a specific license by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury; and

(B) in a manner that is not in contravention of the prohibition in subsection (a).

(2) **PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.**—The President shall publish in the Federal Register a list of transactions and payments, including the amount and method of each such transaction and payment, by the United States Government to the Government of Iran in connection with the agreement described in paragraph (1).

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) and the licensing requirement in subsection (b) shall remain in effect until the date on which the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the President has rescinded a preliminary draft rule or final rule (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act) that provides for the designation of Iran as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern pursuant to section 5318A of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the Secretary of State has removed Iran from the list of countries determined to have repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act, section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any other provision of law.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON OUTSTANDING CLAIMS BEFORE THE IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.

(a) **REPORT.**—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that lists and evaluates each outstanding claim before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The total value of each outstanding claim.

(2) The current status of each outstanding claim.

(3) The likelihood that each claim will be resolved in the next 6 months.

(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 3 years.

(d) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 6. NOTIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION RELATING TO SETTLEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING CLAIMS BEFORE THE IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.

(a) **NOTIFICATION.**—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days prior to conducting a transaction or payment from the Government of the United States to the Government of Iran in connection with an agreement to settle a claim or claims brought before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The notification required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The total amount of the settlement, including the total principal and interest, and an explanation of the calculation of the interest.

(2) A legal analysis of why the settlement was made, including a detailed description of all claims and counter-claims covered by the settlement.

(3) A certification by the President that the settlement is not a ransom for the release of individuals held hostage by Iran.

(4) An identification of each entity of the Government of Iran that will receive amounts from the settlement.

(5) A certification that the funds provided to Iran under the settlement will not be used to provide support to foreign terrorist organizations, the regime of Bashar al-Assad, or other destabilizing activities.

(6) Whether an equal amount of Iranian funds are available and accessible in the United States to satisfy judgments against Iran by victims of Iranian-sponsored terrorism.

(7) A copy of the settlement agreement.

(8) A description of the disposition of any related claims that have been subrogated to the United States Government.

(9) A certification that the settlement is in the best interest of the United States.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 7. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.

Nothing in this Act shall apply to any activities subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947.

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any payment by the Government of the United States to the Government of Iran.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**—The term “Government of Iran” means—

(A) the state and the Government of Iran, as well as any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof;

(B) any entity owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the foregoing;

(C) any person to the extent that such person is, or has been, or to the extent that there is reasonable cause to believe that such person is, or has been, acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of any of the foregoing; and

(D) any person or entity identified by the Secretary of the Treasury to be the Government of Iran under part 560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) **IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.**—The term “Iran-United States Claims Tribunal” means the tribunal established pursuant to the Algiers Accords on January 19, 1981, to resolve certain claims by nationals of one party against the other party and certain claims between the parties.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–781. 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 be not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–781.

Mr. ROYCE. 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 5, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 17 and insert the following:

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Government may not provide, directly or indirectly, to the Government of Iran—

(A) monetary instruments; or

(B) precious metals.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

(A) the term “monetary instruments” has the meaning given the term in paragraph (d) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) the term “precious metal” has the meaning given the term in section 1027.100(d) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

Page 6, after line 11, insert the following:

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The term “agreement to settle a claim or claims brought before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal”, as used in subsection (b), shall not be construed to mean a “promissory note”, as used in the definition of “monetary instrument” for purposes of subsection (a).

Page 6, line 12, strike “(c)” and insert “(d)”.

Page 7, line 6, strike “(d)” and insert “(e)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, last week, when the Foreign Affairs Committee met to consider this legislation, the ranking member expressed concerns that the bill, as introduced, was too broad in our attempt to end payments to Iran in cash and cash-like equivalent. So I committed to sharpening this language as the process moves forward.

The amendment before us makes good on that commitment, using the more precise term “monetary instrument,” which has a much more specific definition in U.S. law, while also adding precious metals, a real concern among those who closely follow Iran.

So that is the nature of the amendment before us.

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

□ 1900

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, say I appreciate Chairman ROYCE's consideration of my feedback during the markup, and I know he is well-intentioned with this measure.

As he mentioned, I believe that the underlying legislation was too broad. It could have been interpreted as a ban on any payment, including wire transfers, checks, or cash. This does improve the bill.

I don't like sending money to Iran, but if we ban any payments to Iran, we would be violating our obligations under the Algiers Accords. So, the specific changes in this bill narrow the banned payments to cash and precious metals.

To me, cash is a red herring. No matter how we pay money to Iran, whether cash or wire transfer, once the money gets to an Iranian bank account, it is impossible for us to track it. We can imagine how Iranians use it, but we can't know for certain.

Whether cash or wire transfer, we can't prevent them from doing the terrible things they do. So let's not talk about the form of the payment when I think our real concern is that we don't like what Iran does with money that it legally obtains.

Additionally, my understanding is that the settlement in question required an immediate payment. So as much as it might be counterintuitive, electronic wire payments to Iran have taken months to complete, while the cash option met the terms of the settlement.

It is galling. It is nothing we like to do, but, again, we signed an agreement called the Algiers Accords, and every President, in terms of giving money back to Iran, which was legally their money, has used the rules of the Accords. President Obama is not the first President to do that. As I pointed out before, both President Reagan and President George H.W. Bush did it as well.

It takes a long time to make a wire transfer to Iran because U.S. sanctions against Iran are so powerful and so comprehensive that there are virtually no banking relationships between the United States and Iran. Therefore, a wire transfer was not an option; it would have taken too long. So in order to abide by the settlement, the U.S.

Government had to make an immediate payment.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason I will have to oppose this amendment, even though I appreciate that the chairman is seeking to clarify the bill and make it better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I would just make the following points. We did have another way to transfer any agreed-upon settlement without transferring pallets of cash, and we know that because the administration had made other transfers to Iran.

So this bill does not withdraw the U.S. from the Claims Tribunal or Algiers Accords. It doesn't impact that. Nor does it effectively prevent the United States from paying out awards rendered by the tribunal.

As I have indicated, we simply, with this bill, prohibit cash from being used as a payment method. If the United States has to pay Iran a tribunal award in the future, the payment should be processed through the formal financial system as the other payments to Iran have been, and that is how the Hague Tribunal payments have been handled for 35 years, and that is how it should work in the future.

But our sanctions system was designed with tribunal payments in mind. The Iran transaction sanctions regime contains a number of exemptions from the rules so that certain transactions can go forward, and, in this case, transactions for tribunal settlements are explicitly authorized and would shield any entity involved in such a transaction from liability under U.S. law.

So going back to the original argument, we are trying to perfect the bill. But at the end of the day, we can't collapse the effort because we have now had three planeloads full of cash, with pallets of cash transferred to the regime, and we can bet Iran will angle for more.

Just last night, the Iranian President asserted that considerable sums of money are under discussion to be returned in Iran. This can't happen again. This cannot happen by another pallets-of-cash shipment to the Iranian regime or the IRGC, so this amendment is important.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me respond just to some of the things that we have heard from some of our colleagues.

This was not a ransom payment. This was payment for a 30-year-old claim over a weapons shipment that was never delivered, and the United States actually got a pretty good deal in the settlement. We might have had to pay more interest if we hadn't settled and the claim had gone to judgment at the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal.

When the prisoners' plane was sitting on the tarmac, the administration, as I mentioned before, held up the settlement money. They couldn't find the

mother and wife of one of the prisoners, Jason Rezaian from The Washington Post. Administration officials feared that, as Mr. Rezaian was being released, the Iranians were detaining his family, and this was unacceptable. The administration leveraged the settlement money, holding it up until Mr. Rezaian's family could be found and the prisoners could leave the country.

Leveraging the money, money that belonged to Iran in the first place and was going to be paid to Iran under the Algiers Accords, was smart. Can you imagine if the administration had paid the settlement anyway, even if the prisoner release was stalled? That didn't happen.

Some people are saying that the administration made payments to Iran via wire transfer before and after the ransom, so why did the ransom have to be cash? Well, the payments that were made via wire transfer before and after the settlement payments were months in the making. It takes a long time to make a wire transfer to Iran because U.S. sanctions against Iran are so powerful and so comprehensive, as I mentioned before, that there are virtually no banking relationships between the U.S. and Iran. It takes a long time to wire money to Iran.

But the requirement of the settlement was that the payment had to be immediate; therefore, a wire transfer, instead of cash, was not an option. It would have taken too long.

Let me say this. I said it before and I will say it again. Money is fungible. Whether cash, wire transfers, checks, gold, or any other form of payment, once it gets to Iran, we have no way of tracking it. So I believe this debate about cash is beside the point. Money can be moved, be used for nefarious purposes once it gets to Iran, no matter what the method.

But when we are going to make a payment to Iran pursuant to a settlement or a judgment, Congress should know about it, and I am offended that we didn't know about it. And that is why, when I introduce my amendment a little bit later on, we are going to require that Congress be informed of any kinds of transfer, not only to Iran, but to any other rogue nation, at least 5 days before.

So we should have greater oversight of these payments. I agree with that. But I don't think that we should worry about whether it was cash or some other method.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-781.

Mr. POMPEO. 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 11, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PAYMENT OF RANSOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), the President and all officers of the United States Government shall not make a payment to a government or person for the purpose of securing the release of unjustly detained individuals who are nationals of the United States or aliens who are lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under subsection (a) does not prohibit the United States Government from providing assistance to individuals who are nationals of the United States or aliens who are lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States that have been arrested.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, may take such actions, including the promulgation of such rules and regulations, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY.—The term “entity” means a corporation, business association, partnership, trust, society, or any other entity.

(2) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, in short, prohibits ransom payments to any country. Although the American people consider this to be U.S. policy, given the administration's recent actions, we have to make this prohibition explicit. This amendment will support and strengthen the good work of Chairman ROYCE on H.R. 5931.

Think about this timeline. The U.S. wires \$400 million in cash from the Swiss National Bank and then physically transports it to another city to hand off to Iranian officials, all in 3 days, 3 days before Iran releases four American hostages. But it gets worse. Less than a week after this, the U.S. again sends hoards of cash to Iran.

We only know this timeline thanks to multiple and persistent inquiries from myself and other Members of Congress. And yet there are so many details that we still don't know.

For instance, on April 5, 2016, White House Spokesman Josh Earnest, in response to a reporter's question on whether the Obama administration misled Congress about the Iran deal, stated: “I don't think there is any evidence to substantiate this claim . . . I think you should take a rather dim view of that suggestion because Congressman POMPEO . . . didn't approve this deal and he certainly didn't favor it.”

But of course my personal view of the JCPOA is irrelevant if the administration stonewalls Congress. The State Department has admitted that its payment of millions of dollars in pallets of cash to the Iranians would not have been made without the release of American hostages. The administra-

tion's selective noun use does not excuse criminality, nor does it explain away months of lying to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, ransom payments put a price on the head of every American. This bill prohibits the United States Government from making a payment to secure the release of unjustly detained U.S. nationals or lawful residents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Let me say, first of all, on the face of it, the amendment makes sense. It is already U.S. policy not to pay ransom.

On June 24, 2015, President Obama issued a directive:

It is the United States' policy to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom, prisoner releases, policy changes, or other acts of concession.

Codifying this policy though, without giving the President any flexibility, is not what we should be doing. There is no waiver in this bill. Things like this usually have waivers so the President—any President, this President and future Presidents—would have flexibility.

But again, this whole issue, I believe, is a red herring. The United States did not pay ransom for the four Americans detained in Iran. We were paying Iran back its own money, money it had given us to buy weapons before the Iranian Revolution.

I have never heard of paying a ransom using the captor's own money. It is galling, but it is not a ransom. Every mention of ransom is an attempt to politicize this issue and criticize the President, and that is not what we should be doing here. We should be putting our heads together and finding a solution.

These issues are too important to get caught in partisan fights. It is not how we do things on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas for offering this amendment to a very important underlying bill from the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ed ROYCE.

It is really important to point out, as a matter of policy and what, unfortunately, is very necessary for this Congress to take action on, to make it very clear that we don't pay ransom.

Now, with regard to the \$1.7 billion that has been paid to Iran to secure the release of the four Iranian hostages, other terms have been used. The one most often used lately is called “leverage.”

The fact is, if the money did not arrive immediately, the hostages wouldn't have been released. No money, no hostage release.

Why are we debating as if this wasn't a ransom? If the money didn't show up, \$400 million in cash, the hostages wouldn't have been released.

Why do we not put a price on securing the release, a financial price? It is because now more Americans are being unjustly imprisoned by Iran. Mr. Shahini, from California, in Iran visiting his mother, is being held, accused of “cooperating with hostile governments, actions against national security, and communication with antirevolutionary agents and media.” This is an American visiting his mom in Iran.

And why do we not pay ransom? Why we do not give money to secure the release of American hostages is that now more Americans have been taken hostage.

□ 1915

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. We need to codify what we have known for years has been American policy under Democrat Presidents and Republican Presidents that we simply won't pay ransom to get Americans back. It is enormously important to our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, first of all, that the Iranian regime is a bad regime. They hold American prisoners before we paid them the money, and they will hold prisoners after. It has no basis whatsoever. It is easy to put out the word “ransom,” but this was not a ransom.

It is a reprehensible regime. They do reprehensible things. The United States fulfills its obligations. Again, the Algiers Accords, by the logic that this should not have been done, then when George H.W. Bush did it, it shouldn't have been done; when Ronald Reagan did it, it shouldn't have been done. They did it because we maintain our obligations in the United States.

So any of us can get up and give a litany of things we don't like about the Iranian Government. Believe me, I take second to none when it comes to that. But the United States needs to fulfill its obligations, and the Iranian regime needs to be checked. But it is not a ransom, and that is just the problem.

By calling it a ransom, by calling names, by trying to poke a finger in front of the eyes of the administration, we don't get to the real issue. The real issue, which I hope we will get to later, is, again, to give Congress notice before this happens. That is the issue. To just say ransom and throw that word out, anybody can do that; but this wasn't a ransom.

We are fulfilling our obligations under the accords that we signed that

each American President facing the same type of thing has sent money to Iran because we fulfill our obligations. It doesn't matter from which party the President comes. President Obama did nothing more than other Presidents have done before him.

I oppose the amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-781.

Mr. POMPEO. 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 11, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 10. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRANIAN PERSONS THAT HOLD OR DETAIN UNITED STATES NATIONALS OR ALIENS LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

(1) any Iranian person involved in the kidnapping or unjust detention on or after March 9, 2007, of any individual who is a national of the United States or an alien who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States;

(2) any Iranian person that engages, or attempts to engage, in an activity or transaction that materially contributes to, or poses a risk of materially contributing to, kidnapping or unjust detention described in paragraph (1); and

(3) any Iranian person that—

(A) is owned or controlled by a person described in paragraph (1) or (2);

(B) is acting for or on behalf of such a person; or

(C) provides, or attempts to provide—

(i) financial, material, technological, or other support to a person described in paragraph (1) or (2); or

(ii) goods or services in support of an activity or transaction described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all property and interests in property of any person 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.

(c) EXCEPTION; PENALTIES.—

(1) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of subsection (b).

(2) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The requirement to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under subsection (b) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers

Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under subsection (b) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY.—The term “entity” means a corporation, business association, partnership, trust, society, or any other entity.

(2) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term “Iranian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Islamic Republic of Iran; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(3) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(4) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) an individual who is a national of the United States or an alien who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-781 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 10. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO IRANIAN PERSONS THAT HOLD OR DETAIN UNITED STATES NATIONALS OR ALIENS LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

(1) any Iranian person involved in the kidnapping or unjust detention of any individual who is a national of the United States or an alien who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States;

(2) any Iranian person that engages, or attempts to engage, in an activity or transaction that materially contributes to, or poses a risk of materially contributing to, kidnapping or unjust detention described in paragraph (1); and

(3) any Iranian person that—

(A) is owned or controlled by a person described in paragraph (1) or (2);

(B) is acting for or on behalf of such a person; or

(C) provides, or attempts to provide—

(i) financial, material, technological, or other support to a person described in paragraph (1) or (2); or

(ii) goods or services in support of an activity or transaction described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The President shall block, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), all transactions in all

property and interests in property of any person 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.

(c) EXCEPTION; PENALTIES.—

(1) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of subsection (b).

(2) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The requirement to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under subsection (b) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations prescribed under subsection (b) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ENTITY.—The term “entity” means a corporation, business association, partnership, trust, society, or any other entity.

(2) IRANIAN PERSON.—The term “Iranian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Islamic Republic of Iran; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the Islamic Republic of Iran or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(3) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(4) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) an individual who is a national of the United States or an alien who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

Mr. POMPEO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Kansas? There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered today places comprehensive sanctions on individuals who hold Americans hostage. This amendment will support and strengthen the good work of Chairman ROYCE on H.R. 5931.

This week marks 1 year the Iranian Government has been holding hostage Nizar Zakka, a U.S. legal permanent resident and international Internet development expert. Mr. Zakka, this week, was sentenced to 10 years in prison and millions of dollars in fines. His only crime was to bring greater Internet access to the women of Iran. He joins two other Americans held hostage and one who is missing.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the sentiment behind what the gentleman is seeking to do. Of course we want to punish anyone who is unjustly holding American citizens behind bars, but there are so many potential unintended consequences in this amendment, I simply don't know where to start.

First, the amendment requires sanctions against any Iranian who unjustly detains a U.S. citizen. But the term "unjustly detained" is not defined.

So who defines it? Does the White House? The Congress? Iran? It is very difficult.

Secondly, as anyone who has worked on sanctions policy knows—and we work on sanctions a lot on the Foreign Affairs Committee—it is typically not the use of sanctions that encourages the change in behavior; it is the threat of sanctions that encourages the change in behavior. That means that the Iranians have to believe that we will implement sanctions against them, but the President has to be given flexibility to use it or suspend it if they do change their behavior.

This is impossible under this amendment. The President has no flexibility, no waiver, no termination authority, none of the typical details that compels regimes to change their behavior.

So let me say, because of that, I encourage all Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), our colleague and the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, and I thank my friend, the ranking member.

I have to oppose the amendment of my friend from Kansas. I oppose the amendment not because of what my friend is trying to accomplish, but because of the way that we are trying to do it.

I proudly represent Bob Levinson, who went missing on March 9, 2007. He is the longest held American in history. We have worked tirelessly in this House—working with my friend, the sponsor of this amendment; Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the committee; and Mr. ENGEL, the ranking member, we have worked in a strong, bipartisan way, all of us together, to bring Bob home.

By amending this legislation—which I explained last week in our committee hearing why I opposed, just as the ranking member did today, because of the risks that the underlying bill causes in violating our legal obligations under the Algiers Accords that has yielded over \$2.5 billion for American claimants and prohibiting settlement of claims until certification, that requirement that could prevent the U.S. from reaching settlement. This is

a piece of legislation that we oppose. The goal is to continue to ensure that everything we do in focusing on bringing Bob home is done in a way that can pass with overwhelming support.

So, unfortunately, I have to oppose my good friend's amendment. But I want to thank him for the effort of focusing attention, again, on American citizens who continue to be held in Iran.

Eight months ago we were told when Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, and Jason Rezaian finally were able to return home to their families and that the Iranians agreed to continue cooperating with the United States to determine the whereabouts of Robert Levinson. It is 8 months later, and Bob Levinson is not home with his family in Coral Springs, Florida.

I look forward to working with my friend from Kansas and I look forward to working with every Member of this House and all of us in this country who understand that as long as there are Americans being held and as long as Bob Levinson, the longest held American in history, continues to be missing in Iran that this House of Representatives will not rest, and that we will continue to pay attention and work together to find ways to maximize our efforts to bring him home through whatever pressure is necessary. It is intolerable that we have to come to the floor over and over and over again as this poor family continues to wait for the return of their father and grandfather.

I thank my friend for helping to raise this issue. I, unfortunately, have to oppose the amendment for the reasons that I have stated. But I look forward to working together with my friend from Kansas, Democrats, Republicans, and all of the people of goodwill in this House and in this country until we bring him home.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-781.

Mr. DUFFY. 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 11, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON CASH PAYMENTS TO STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Government may not provide, directly or indirectly, to a government of a state sponsor of terrorism, or an agent acting on behalf of such a government—

(A) monetary instruments; or

(B) precious metals.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term "monetary instruments" has the meaning given the term in paragraph (dd) of section 1010.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) the term "precious metal" has the meaning given the term in section 1027.100(d) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) APPLICATION TO NORTH KOREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a payment, or an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of the Government of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, or an agent acting on behalf of such Government, in the same manner and to the same extent as such subsection applies with respect to a payment, or an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of a state sponsor of terrorism, subject to the termination provisions described in paragraph (2).

(2) TERMINATION.—Subsection (a) shall cease to apply with respect to a payment, or an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of the Government of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, or an agent acting on behalf of such Government, beginning on the date on which the President makes the certification to Congress under section 402 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122; 22 U.S.C. 92512).

(c) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "state sponsor of terrorism" means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a)), section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)), or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment and thank Chairman ROYCE for all of his work on this commonsense bill.

But I have to say I am a little bit shocked that Chairman ROYCE has to put so much work into this kind of a bill to prohibit cash payments to Iran, the lead sponsor of terrorism in the world. Shame on us for being in a situation where we need legislation to stop cash payments to a state sponsor of terror.

Have we so soon forgotten what happened on 9/11? Have we so soon forgotten Iran's role in 9/11 15 years ago?

Just recently, former U.S. Senator and Democratic Party vice presidential nominee Joe Lieberman quoted the 9/11 Commission saying that there is strong evidence that Iran facilitated the transit of al Qaeda members into and out of Afghanistan before 9/11 and that some of these were future 9/11 hijackers.

Iran supports international terror. They have been designated a state sponsor of terror since 1984.

We know that the currency of terror is what?

It is cash. They use cash to fund terrorism.

So instead of saying, Do you know what, we are going to make payments—if payments have to be made—by wire transfer to some Iranian bank in Europe where those payments can be traced, we say, No, no, no; we have been so successful in cutting them off from the financial world, we want to make these payments in cash to them.

It is illegal right now for us to actually load up a plane full of cash and send it from the U.S. to Iran. So the recent transaction that happened to get around that rule, the administration—President Obama and Jack Lew—said: We are going to wire the money. We are going to actually wire the money. We are going to wire it to a European bank and instruct them to convert it to cash and send it to Iran.

Shame on the American administration and shame on this House for not stopping it.

I have an amendment that says not just Iran, but all state sponsors of terror; and we should also include North Korea to be included on the list of folks that we are unwilling to send cash payments to.

This is just commonsense American policy that we have had in place for a long time that now is being rolled back by this administration. We have had so many people on both sides of the aisle who understand the threat of terror and the threat of cash in terrorists' hands that we have all stood together. We now see a division in this House to not support that very commonsense effort, which is an effort to support the American citizens and their safety. I think this is a sad day for this institution.

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

□ 1930

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think everybody knows I am from New York, and, frankly, I don't need anyone lecturing me about 9/11. That is a pain in my heart that I will live with for the rest of my life. So I think that any reference to 9/11 from this bill is just totally off base.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't like the idea of shipping payments to Iran or any government hostile to the United States, but we have to abide by our obligations whether we like it or not. We also don't want to tie our hands, which is what this amendment would do.

This measure would impose a permanent and blanket prohibition on most forms of money transfers, not just cash, whether made directly or indirectly through third parties. It would preempt all existing provisions of law.

We have no idea what sort of consequences could come with something

like this. We may face diplomatic or strategic opportunities that would require quick action. But this provision is all-encompassing, regardless of circumstance. And, again, there is no waiver for unforeseen situations. There are always waivers for the President in bills like this because the President can best decide what unforeseen situations there are. And, again, it is any President from any party.

So I think this amendment would take us down a wrong path. I am going to oppose it, and I urge all Members to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that the chairman's bill and my amendment don't prohibit cash payments to a lot of countries around the world. It restricts cash payments to only a few countries around the world and those countries that are American designated states that sponsor terrorism.

I don't mean to lecture anybody about 9/11. I didn't live in New York, I am not from New York, but I watched what happened in New York. And I think it is important that we not forget what happened, who was responsible, and that we don't lose our focus today for partisan reasons on who those bad actors are, and that we remain vigilant in our effort to push back and fight back against state sponsors of terror. And part of that fight is the fight against allowing them cash.

On the Financial Services Committee—I know Mr. ROYCE works on this aggressively—we can use the global financial system to shut them out, and we have been successful at that. But if you open up the global financial system and you pour cash and gold into Iran that can be used to sponsor terror, to buy technology in regard to missiles, or to advance your nuclear program, that has a direct impact on all Americans, our security, and our safety.

I think it is incumbent upon this House to look out first for our constituents and our countrymen, which means let's prohibit cash payments, not any payment. You can make a wire transfer that you can actually trace. But let's not send cash payments that are untraceable to State sponsors of terror.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-781.

Mr. ENGEL. 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:

Strike the text of the committee print and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Restrictions on Payments to State Sponsors of Terrorism Act".

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON PAYMENTS TO STATE SPONSORS OF TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No agency or instrumentality of the United States Government may make a payment, or enter into an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of a government of a state sponsor of terrorism, or an agent acting on behalf of such a government, in settlement of a claim or judgment against the United States, unless, not less than 5 days prior to making such payment or entering into such agreement, the President submits to the appropriate committees of Congress in writing—

(1) a notification of the proposed payment or agreement; and

(2) the text of the claim or judgment with respect to which such payment or agreement relates.

(b) APPLICATION TO NORTH KOREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a) and (c) shall apply with respect to a payment, or an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of the Government of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, or an agent acting on behalf of such Government, in the same manner and to the same extent as such subsections apply with respect to a payment, or an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of a state sponsor of terrorism, subject to the termination provisions described in paragraph (2).

(2) TERMINATION.—Subsections (a) and (c) shall cease to apply with respect to a payment, or an agreement to make a payment, to an agency or instrumentality of the Government of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, or an agent acting on behalf of such Government, beginning on the date on which the President makes the certification to Congress under section 402 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-122; 22 U.S.C. 92512).

(c) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall publish in the Federal Register a list of payments, and agreements to make payments, to agencies and instrumentalities of governments of a state sponsors of terrorism as described in subsection (a) that were made or entered into during the prior 180-day period.

(2) CONTENTS.—The list of payments, and agreements to make payments, required to be published in the Federal Register under paragraph (1) shall, with respect to each such payment or agreement, include the following:

(A) The amount of the payment or agreement.

(B) The agency or instrumentality of the United States Government that made the payment or entered into the agreement.

(C) The reason or reasons for the payment or agreement.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON OUTSTANDING CLAIMS BEFORE THE IRAN-UNITED STATES CLAIMS TRIBUNAL.

(a) REPORT.—The President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that describes each claim pending before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the amount (if an amount is specified) and the status before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal of each claim described in subsection (a).

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(d) DEADLINE.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter until the disposition of all claims pending before the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal.

SEC. 4. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.

Nothing in this Act shall apply to any activities subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any payment by the Government of the United States to a state sponsor of terrorism or North Korea.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

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

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term “state sponsor of terrorism” means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j)(1)(A) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)(A)) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a)), section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)), or any other provision of law, to be a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment because I do think there is a lot of common ground when it comes to this issue.

My concern is that the administration really did not give Congress its due with respect to this payment. We were told about the payment but not notified about how this transition would take place, and that is just not right, especially when it is somewhat unusual.

My amendment would require the administration, and future administrations, to notify Congress at least 5 days in advance of any settlement agreement or payment to Iran, to other countries on the state sponsors of terrorism list, and to North Korea, and it provides appropriate oversight on the claims that are remaining at the tribunal.

It is straightforward, and it ensures that Congress' role in foreign policymaking is not overlooked. I don't think anyone here disagrees with that idea.

My amendment gets to the heart of it. I think it would allow this bill to

sail through the House with strong support on both sides. It leaves aside the areas that are sure to eventually derail the underlying measure—talk of ransom again and again, or to focus exclusively on cash payments. We are not going to agree on these areas. Putting them front and center guarantees that this bill has no path forward.

So let's put those issues aside and advance legislation that addresses all our concerns. That is what we do every day on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I hope my amendment will help get our committee's work back on track.

Again, I ask all Members to support the amendment. I don't think anyone can disagree with the fact that the administration, or future administrations, give Congress enough time so that we will hear about payments, we will hear about transactions before they are done, not while they are done or after they are done.

I ask all Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and will regretfully oppose the ranking member's substitute.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with part of the argument that is being made here by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

You just heard a common theme between the underlying bill and the ranking member's substitute, and that is the need for greater transparency, especially transparency around the Claims Tribunal. That is a must.

I will go back to the underlying problem. If diplomats were working overtime on a settlement, why not tell the committee of jurisdiction of the possibility? If the goal of this settlement was merely to put to rest a decade-old dispute over an abandoned arms sale, as we were told after the fact, then why the secrecy? The administration has intentionally left us, the committee, and this Congress in the dark.

Both the underlying bill and the ranking member's substitute requires the administration to be more transparent with Congress and the American people about how it engages with the tribunal. If future settlements are truly a good deal for the American taxpayers, these requirements should be welcomed, not a burden.

The goal of the underlying legislation is to ensure that a tribunal that has been in place since 1981, and has operated more or less successfully, cannot be manipulated, cannot be manipulated by either the next administration or this administration. So here the two of us agree.

But I am afraid that this substitute does not address a larger problem, and that is because this proposal, unlike the underlying bill, contains no restriction on the way in which Iran could be paid. I was raising questions about the \$1.7 billion payment when it was first

made. Quite frankly, not too many were focused on it until it was revealed that it was paid in cash.

Let me explain why many of us believe that this is a crucial problem. It is because checks and wire transfers do leave a paper trail. Cash does not leave a paper trail. If Iran wires money to its terrorist proxies, we can see the banks it used, and we can work to cut them out of the financial system. That is what we are trying to do in isolating their ability to transfer funds to Hezbollah or Hamas.

Now, when we give Iran cash then Iran can put that cash on a plane or on the back of a truck, and they can send that cash to Syria, or send it to Gaza, or to Hamas, or send it to Lebanon, or to Hezbollah. And that is why cash, the physical bills, are so valuable to Iran. Cash, not wire transfers, is the currency of terror.

So the bottom line is that because everyone knows that cash is a conduit for all sorts of illegal behavior, my hope is to carry the day here with this argument that the underlying bill has got to maintain this ability to cut off payments in cash to the terrorists in Tehran.

I call them terrorists because that is what the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps is funding, as well as ballistic missile production, and that is what the Quds Force—and the head of the Quds Force is in charge of assassinations outside of the country—that is what he is doing.

They have just toppled a government in Yemen that was an ally to the United States, they just committed further atrocities in Syria, and they are bulking up Hezbollah as we speak.

That is why I feel that portion has to remain in the bill, and that is why I reluctantly oppose this amendment which would remove the effectiveness of the cutting off of cash.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I appreciate my friend, Chairman ROYCE's words. We don't agree totally on this, but we do agree that the Iranian regime is a bad regime and they need to be checked. And I would hope that after this whole process is done, because this bill is not going to become law, that we can put our heads together and come up with something that can become law. The Iranians need to be checked, and the Congress needs to be informed and needs to be a part of the process. We are, obviously, an independent branch of government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. Chairman, the goal here tonight, I think, is to both simultaneously ensure that we don't take any action that would make it difficult for Americans to bring claims to the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal that would enhance our ability to continue with our legal obligations under the Algiers Accords but

that will also focus on the very specific problem that we have at hand.

Mr. ENGEL's substitute amendment, I think, will permit us to do all of that. It carries over the provision from the underlying bill that requires reporting to Congress on claims settlements and payments to Iran, it enhances our ability to be aware of and to have greater disability of transfer of funds to Iran going forward, and it ensures that Congress will be able to keep in sharp focus before any of those transfers happen so that we can then act accordingly.

And I would just remind everyone that we have really done meaningful work in the House under the leadership of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, and the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL. We have done meaningful work because we have been able to work together to take on the threats posed by Iran.

It is because of the work, the bipartisan effort, the work that has been done together that Iran faced unprecedented economic sanctions. And it is because of the work, again, that has been done in a bipartisan way that members of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, who direct the funding of terror and commit egregious human rights violations, continue to remain sanctioned. And it is because of the efforts of Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL that banks continue to be weary of dealing with Iran, and Iran is still fully unable to access the international financial market in U.S. dollars.

So there are plenty of examples of the good work that we have done together. When we work together on these issues of critical importance, the country is stronger and safer. I think Mr. ENGEL's amendment will provide us the opportunity to go forward in a bipartisan way in a manner that, again, will help the United States be stronger and safer. I know that is everyone's goal, both on the Foreign Affairs Committee and in the House. That is why I support the amendment, and that is why I urge my colleagues to also support it.

□ 1945

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, regretfully, I will be opposing the substitute. As Members of the House know, it is unusual for the two of us to be at odds. In working together, we have a long track record of success: 14 bills this session, 18 in the last session. Just yesterday, the House sent to the President's desk bipartisan legislation, which was authored by me and Ranking Member ENGEL, to crack down on the illegal trafficking of wildlife; but here we have a disagreement. Sending pallets of cash is bad policy. This bill fixes the problem. I oppose the substitute and urge the passage of the underlying measure.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Mr. ENGEL. 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 New York will be postponed.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUFFY) having assumed the chair, Mr. RUSSELL, 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. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2046

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.

PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5931.

Will the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) kindly take the chair.

□ 2047

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, with Mr. ABRAHAM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-781, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL)

on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 238, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—176

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

NOES—238

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

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

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta Lieu, Ted Rush
 Carter (GA) Moore Sanchez, Loretta
 Davis, Rodney Mulvaney Shuster
 Farr Payne Vela
 Fincher Pelosi Walters, Mimi
 Gutiérrez Poe (TX)

□ 2111

Messrs. PERRY, SMITH of Missouri, DUNCAN of South Carolina, GUINTA, CRAMER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. YOHO, HUELSKAMP, McDERMOTT, DOGGETT, and PALMER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, CROWLEY, BARTON, and MASSIE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 553, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) having assumed the chair, Mr. ABRAHAM, 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. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 879, 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.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5037; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5798.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 163, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—254

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

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

NOES—163

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

Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta
 Carter (GA)
 Farr
 Fincher
 Gutiérrez

Lieu, Ted
 Moore
 Mulvaney
 Payne
 Pelosi

Poe (TX)
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Walters, Mimi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2119

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS AND PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5037) to authorize the establishment of a program of voluntary separation incentive payments for non-judicial employees of the District of Columbia courts and employees of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) 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 413, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]
 YEAS—413

Abraham
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 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 (TX)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clawson (FL)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davidson
 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)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foy
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Graham

Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizinga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeback
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 MacArthur

NAYS—1

McClintock

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta
 Carter (GA)
 Farr
 Fincher
 Gutiérrez
 Hanna

Kildee
 Lieu, Ted
 Moore
 Mulvaney
 Payne
 Pelosi

Poe (TX)
 Rokita
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Walters, Mimi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2126

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.

ABNER J. MIKVA POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5798) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1101 Davis Street in Evanston, Illinois, as the "Abner J. Mikva Post Office Building", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) 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 392, nays 22, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]
 YEAS—392

Abraham
 Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 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 (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Buechson
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clawson (FL)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Connelly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 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)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frankel (FL)

Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hahn
 Hardy
 Harper
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huelskamp
 Huelskamp
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer

Schiff
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Allen
 Brat
 Davidson
 Gosar
 Griffith
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Huelskamp
 Kelly (MS)
 Labrador
 Lummis
 Massie
 Moolenaar
 Mulvaney
 Palazzo
 Perry
 Barletta
 Carter (GA)
 Costa
 Farr
 Fincher
 Gutiérrez
 Hanna
 Kildee
 Lieu, Ted
 Moore
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Poe (TX)
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Walters, Mimi

Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Trott
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?
 There was no objection.

HONORING ST. CLOUD ATTACK VICTIMS AND HEROISM OF POLICE OFFICER

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, an act of terror took place at a St. Cloud, Minnesota, mall.

On Saturday night, 10 people were stabbed at the Crossroads Mall before the attacker was fatally shot by an armed off-duty police officer on the scene. Thankfully, none of the victims were killed, and all are expected to make full recoveries. The attack is yet another troubling reminder of the growing threat that Americans do face here at home.

The quick reaction of the armed off-duty police officer, Jason Falconer of Avon, likely stopped this from being an even greater tragedy. He is a hero for his bravery, his courage, and his selflessness to protect those who were in danger that night. Our law enforcement officers put themselves in harm's way, and they deserve our utmost respect for the risks and the difficult decisions that they make each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, the safety of our citizens must remain a top priority, and I will continue to work to ensure that our law enforcement agencies have the resources that are necessary to protect American lives.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JOHN YEE OF AURORA, COLORADO

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the service of an extraordinary retired high school world history teacher, Mr. John Yee, whom I had 44 years ago when I was a student at Central High School in Aurora, Colorado.

Mr. John Yee was a teacher who inspired his students by making history come alive in the classroom and by leaving us with an intellectual curiosity about the world around us that would forever be a part of our lives.

Mr. John Yee's personal story of having grown up in Kunming, China, during the Imperial Japanese Army's invasion of his homeland, as well as his subsequent service as a translator with the Flying Tigers, gave him an unparalleled depth of understanding when it came to describing the cultural dynamics of global events.

Mr. Speaker, a great nation cannot exist without great teachers, and I believe that Mr. John Yee is among the very best, and I will forever be grateful

NAYS—22

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—16

Hanna
 Kildee
 Lieu, Ted
 Moore
 Payne
 Pelosi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2132

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.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5931, PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5931.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2016, TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, September 26, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

for his unyielding dedication to public education.

WYOMING LOSES TWO OF ITS FAVORITE SONS

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a tough week for Wyoming. Wyoming is the land of high altitudes, low multitudes, and great attitudes. We have the smallest population in the Nation, and yet, geographically, we are one of the largest States in the Nation; so everyone matters. This week, we lost two of our favorite sons—two of our most impressive people.

Brian Scott Gamroth was killed in a motorcycle accident when coming back to Wyoming from a Shriners Convention on Sunday. Brian was the voice of Wyoming. He gave his time, talents, and energy to raise hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of dollars for Wyoming's charities. His heart was as big as his gigantic frame and as his deep, baritone voice on the radio in Casper, Wyoming. He was a dear friend and a beloved Wyoming person, and I will miss him with my whole heart.

On the same day, we lost our beloved Flip McConnaughey, who died after serving our senior U.S. Senator, MIKE ENZI, as his chief of staff here in Washington for over 20 years. Flip McConnaughey came out of municipal government in Wyoming, as did our senior Senator, MIKE ENZI. They love the communities of Wyoming. They have worked so hard all of these years in the U.S. Senate for Wyoming.

I thank them, and we will miss them with all of our hearts.

NATIONAL READ WITH A CHILD WEEK

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of National Read with a Child Week, which is organized by the Children's Reading Foundation to promote early literacy development.

The first few years of a child's life are critical to the acquisition of language and literacy skills, which are cornerstones of social and academic development. I firmly believe that all children deserve an excellent education and that preparation for academic success can never begin too early. Unfortunately, many children face significant barriers to achievement as recent research shows that over three-quarters of fourth graders from low-income families are not proficient in reading.

The Children's Reading Foundation, which is headquartered in Kennewick, Washington, is leading the way in supporting early childhood literacy and in preparing all children for success in school and throughout their lives. Read with a Child Week, which takes place this week, September 18 through 24, is highlighting the tremendous importance of early literacy, and I call on all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this initiative.

GUIDANCE ON THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration is advancing something under the Council on Environmental Quality known as a "guidance on the social cost of carbon." This would be undertaken while doing environmental impact studies.

At the same time the administration claims that it is trying to advance more oil and gas by using those reserves to further help the energy economy in this country, it is also advancing this, but it claims it has not yet been adopted. Yet, some Federal agencies are already using it in order to block the development of this and of other important infrastructure. This will be yet another tool to stop either needed energy policy or other infrastructure projects that need to be done around this country.

We cannot afford to have these regulators coming out using a policy that has not been passed by the Congress but, indeed, is something that has been adopted by the administration on its own in order to block projects that are

especially needed in rural areas for our energy economy in this country, for nonreliance on foreign energy, and for the jobs that are so desperately needed. This is a wrong-headed approach to adopt policy without the word of Congress—the people's Representatives—on this issue.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 3 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

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. 1878. An act to extend the pediatric priority review voucher program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. 2615. An act to establish the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission.

H.R. 5252. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at 1400 Lower Island Road in Tornillo, Texas, as the "Marcelino Serna Port of Entry".

H.R. 5937. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to acquire, operate, and maintain the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes-la-Coquette, France, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 26, 2016, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 16 AND AUG. 19, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Markwayne Mullin	8/16	8/19	Jordan		649		14,588				15,237
Committee total					649		14,588				15,237

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MARKWAYNE MULLIN, Sept. 16, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY AND AFGHANISTAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 30 AND AUG. 6, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Hon. Eliot Engel	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Hon. Anna Eshoo	7/31	8/5	Italy		2,255		(3)				2,255
Hon. Steve Israel	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Hon. André Carson	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Hon. Terri Sewell	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Wyndee Parker	7/31	8/5	Italy		1,804		(3)				1,804
Caroline Behringer	7/31	8/5	Italy		2,255		(3)				2,255
Bina Surgeon	7/31	8/5	Italy		2,255		(3)				2,255
Emily Berret	7/31	8/5	Italy		2,255		(3)				2,255
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. Eliot Engel	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. Anna Eshoo	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. Steve Israel	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. André Carson	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Hon. Terri Sewell	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Wyndee Parker	8/3	8/4	Afghanistan		7		(3)				7
Committee total					23,515						23,515

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Sept. 2, 2016.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6942. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alabama and North Carolina; Interstate Transport — 2010 NO₂ Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0209; FRL-9952-74-Region 4] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6943. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Prong 4-2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, SO₂, and 2012 PM_{2.5} [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0315; FRL-9952-72-Region 4] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6944. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2016-0407; FRL-9952-55-Region 7] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6945. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of Air Qual-

ity Implementation Plans; State of Arkansas; Regional Haze and Interstate Visibility Transport Federal Implementation Plan [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0189; FRL-9952-03-Region 6] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6946. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyridaben; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0390; FRL-9951-92] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6947. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.3555(e) of the Commission's Rules, National Television Multiple Ownership Rule [MB Docket No.: 13-236] received September 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6948. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6949. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Za-

blocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(d)(1); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1; (86 Stat. 619); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6950. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan, Transmittal No. 16-46, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6951. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Identification of 14 Distinct Population Segments of the Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) and Revision of Species-Wide Listing [Docket No.: 130708594-6598-03] (RIN: 0648-XC751) received September 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6952. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the report of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts on applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2015, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3103a(d)(2); Added by Public Law 90-351, Sec. 1401(a) (further added by Public Law 109-177, Sec. 114(c)); (120 Stat. 211); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6953. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, Santa Clara County, California final integrated report and environmental impact report for September 2015 (revised December 2015) (H. Doc. No. 114-166); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6954. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the West Sacramento General Reevaluation Final Report and Appendices for December 2015 (revised May 2016) (H. Doc. No. 114—167); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6955. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Navigation Improvements Craig, Alaska Final Interim Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment for March 16, 2016 (H. Doc. No. 114—168); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6956. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the American River Watershed Common Features General Reevaluation Final Reports and Appendices for December 2015 (Revised May 2016) (H. Doc. No. 114—169); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6957. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Treatment of Indian Tribes in a Similar Manner as States for Purposes of Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act [EPA-HQ-OW-2014-0622; FRL-9952-61-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF52) received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6958. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Announcement of the Results of the Phase III Allocation Round of the Qualifying Gasification Project Program [Announcement 2016-34] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6959. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration; 2016 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor [Notice 2016-53] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6960. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Updating of Address for Qualified Vehicle Submissions [Notice 2016-51] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6961. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Foreign Tax Credit Guidance under Section 909 Related to Foreign-Initiated Adjustments [Notice 2016-52] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6962. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — October 2016 (Rev. Rul. 2016-25) received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6963. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Facilitating Compliance with Qualified Plan Document Requirements [An-

nouncement 2016-32] received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6964. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Announcement of Certification Resulting from the 2012-2013 Phase III Allocation Round of the Qualifying Advanced Coal Project Program (Announcement 2016-33) received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6965. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rules — Evidence from Excluded Medical Sources of Evidence [Docket No.: SSA-2016-0015] (RIN: 0960-AH92) received September 20, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6966. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Fiscal Year 2015", pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, Sec. 316(b), as amended; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

6967. A letter from the Labor Member, Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for FY 2018, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(f) (as amended by Public Law 93-445, Sec. 416); (97 Stat. 436); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 6004. A bill to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-783, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the individual mandate certain individuals who had coverage under a terminated qualified health plan funded through the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan (CO-OP) program; with an amendment (Rept. 114-784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5303. A bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-785, 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 Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5303 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. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 6116. A bill to enable needed drinking water standards, reduce lead in drinking water, plan for and address threats from climate change, terrorism, and source water contamination, invest in drinking water infrastructure, increase compliance with drinking water standards, foster greater community right to know about drinking water quality, and promote technological solutions for drinking water challenges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 6117. A bill to provide at-risk and disconnected youth with subsidized summer and year-round employment and to assist local community partnerships in improving high school graduation and youth employment rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 6118. A bill to promote innovation in financial services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 6119. A bill to distribute Federal funds for elementary and secondary education in the form of vouchers for eligible students and to repeal a certain rule relating to nutrition standards in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 6120. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for clarification and rationalization of Medicare prescription drug plan recovery rules for certain claims; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPAS (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 6121. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act with respect to climate resiliency, security, and source water protection planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 6122. A bill to authorize the creation of a commission to develop voluntary accessibility guidelines for electronic instructional materials and related technologies used in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 6123. A bill to congressionally designate the museum to preserve the stories, knowledge, and history of the Medal of Honor to be constructed in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, as the National Medal of Honor Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 6124. A bill to amend section 428 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide incentives to grantees under the Continuum of Care program to re-house all former members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 6125. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for perfluorinated compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 6126. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of total corporate tax paid by a corporation in each annual report required to be filed under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the improvement of consumer confidence reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 6128. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study on the presence of pharmaceuticals and personal care products in sources of drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFABIO:

H.R. 6129. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 6130. A bill to provide the victims of Holocaust-era persecution and their heirs a fair opportunity to recover works of art confiscated or misappropriated by the Nazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 6131. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human-animal chimeras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 6132. A bill to establish a task force to develop a national trauma care system, to improve the trauma care system of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BOST, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 6133. A bill to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 6134. A bill to establish a National TechCorps program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 6135. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 719 Church Street in Nashville, Tennessee, as the "Fred D. Thompson Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 6136. A bill to provide for USA Retirement Funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 6137. A bill to provide emergency tax relief for persons affected by severe storms and flooding occurring in Louisiana; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 6138. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 560 East Pleasant Valley Road, Port Huene, California, as the U.S. Naval Construction Battalion "Seabees" Fallen Heroes Post Office Building; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 6139. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare entitlement to immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant recipients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in ad-

dition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6140. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for perchlorate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 6141. A bill to amend the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 to require the publication of the negotiating position of the United States for each proposed trade agreement after each meeting of the parties to the trade agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 6142. A bill to amend section 403(q) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the Food and Drug Administration from requiring the percent of daily value of added sugars to be included in the labeling of certain nutrient-dense foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 6143. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish revised guidance for school officials seeking to reduce exposure to lead from drinking water in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 6144. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to include the outlays and revenue totals relating to social security benefits in a concurrent resolution on the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 6145. A bill to require certain equestrian helmets to include a warning label, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the dependent care credit by repealing the phasedown of the credit percentage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 6147. A bill to establish the 50th Anniversary Apollo I Memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and

Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 6148. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a maximum contaminant level goal and promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for microcystin toxin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. GABBARD, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 6149. A bill to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 6150. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit private educational lenders from requiring accelerated repayment of private education loans upon the death or disability of a cosigner of the loan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 6151. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow veterans affected by school closures to continue receiving monthly stipends under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for a certain period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 6152. A bill to provide funding for Violent Crime Reduction Partnerships in the most violent communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 6153. A bill to provide installation reutilization authority for arsenals, depots, and plants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6154. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reduce lead in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 6155. A bill to amend the Wilderness Act to ensure access to wilderness areas by Federal, State, and local emergency response personnel during an emergency, 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. MEADOWS:

H.R. 6156. A bill to amend the Wilderness Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to require the management of a wilderness study area, not designated by statute, under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management for multiple use pending congressional consideration of the recommendation for designation of the area as wilderness, 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. OLSON (for himself and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 6157. A bill to modernize the prescription verification process for contact lenses, to clarify consumer protections regarding false advertising of contact lenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 6158. A bill to provide for enhanced penalties for certain offenses relating to controlled substances containing fentanyl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 6159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt premiums paid on non-cash-value property and casualty insurance from the taxes to enforce reporting on certain foreign accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 6160. A bill to establish the United States Chief Manufacturing Officer in the Executive Office of the President with the responsibility of developing a national manufacturing strategy to revitalize the manufacturing sector, spur economic growth, and expand United States competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 6161. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to notify certain Federal agencies when principal investigators at such institutions engage in discrimination on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6162. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that prepaid funds deposited in an insured depository institution satisfy the requirements of the primary purpose exclusion to the definition of deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6163. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to repeal the denial of assistance and benefits for individuals with certain drug-related convictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr.

BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SChAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution recognizing the opening of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, the only national museum dedicated to documenting African American life, history, and culture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TAKANO, and Miss RICE of New York):

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have been exposed to the toxin Agent Orange and should be eligible for all related Federal benefits that come with such presumption under the Agent Orange Act of 1991; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

of New Mexico, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H. Res. 882. A resolution encouraging the observance of the week beginning on October 9, 2016, as "National Wildlife Refuge Week"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H. Res. 883. A resolution supporting the designation of a week as National Federal Nurse Recognition Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PARENTHOLD, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H. Res. 884. A resolution recognizing that Hillary Rodham Clinton violated, ignored, and otherwise chose not to follow legal and ethical obligations and responsibilities expected of the head of any Federal agency of the United States Government during her tenure as United States Secretary of State from 2009 through 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Res. 885. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos and Latinas to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Ms. MENG, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BRAT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HARDY, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H. Res. 886. A resolution recognizing November 26, 2016, as "Small Business Satur-

day" and supporting efforts to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 887. A resolution supporting efforts to increase competition and accountability in the health insurance marketplace, and to extend accessible, quality, affordable health care coverage to every American through the choice of a public insurance plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. KIND, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. TIBERI):

H. Res. 888. A resolution expressing support for designation of September as "National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Res. 889. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should continue to raise awareness of domestic violence and its devastating effects on individuals, families, and communities, and support programs designed to end domestic violence in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H. Res. 890. A resolution expressing support for the Arctic Council 20th anniversary; 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. PALLONE:

H.R. 6116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 6117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 6118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence . . . of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 6119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "Power of the Purse" as defined in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 6121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 6123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 6124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Sec 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 6126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 6127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 6128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 6129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 6130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 9; article III, section 1, clause 1; and article III, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts and article I, section 8, clause 3, which gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 6131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 6132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the authority to ‘make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof’

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 6133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 6134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Article 3, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to regulate commerce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 6137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 6138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 7

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 6141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section VIII

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 6142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 6143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 6144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 6145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation provides for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 6146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 6147.

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. KAPTUR:

H.R. 6148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 6149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: “[T]o provide for [the] general Welfare . . . [and] To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 6150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 6151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 6152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 6153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 6154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 6155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 purports that, “The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .”

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 6156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 purports that, “The Congress shall have the Power to

dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .”

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 6157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 6158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 6159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution:

The Congress shall have the 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.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 6160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 6161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 6163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 188: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 213: Mr. LONG, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 225: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 226: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 347: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 532: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 583: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 729: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 742: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 923: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1218: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

- H.R. 1221: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 1284: Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1310: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 1375: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1399: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 1427: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 1530: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 1572: Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 1608: Mr. GRIFFITH and Ms. KUSTER.
- H.R. 1728: Mr. KEATING and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 2132: Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 2224: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2268: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2293: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 2302: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 2431: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 2660: Mr. DOGGETT.
- H.R. 2737: Mr. STUTZMAN, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. POMPEO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. COOK, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. SANFORD, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 2739: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 2799: Mr. BARR and Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 2889: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
- H.R. 3048: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 3119: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3226: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 3316: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 3355: Mr. TROTT.
- H.R. 3378: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 3381: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 3397: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. SIREs.
- H.R. 3512: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 3514: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 3522: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 3656: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 3660: Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 3666: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. DOLD.
- H.R. 3683: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 3687: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
- H.R. 3706: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 3720: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 3742: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. COOK, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 3790: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 3849: Mr. GRAYSON.
- H.R. 3886: Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 3892: Mr. FLEMING.
- H.R. 3919: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 4027: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 4177: Mr. AGUILAR.
- H.R. 4184: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 4212: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 4216: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 4298: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 4365: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 4450: Mr. MEEKS.
- H.R. 4559: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 4567: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 4626: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
- H.R. 4718: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 4764: Ms. ADAMS.
- H.R. 4773: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. RIBBLE.
- H.R. 4798: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. AGUILAR.
- H.R. 4907: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 4919: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 4927: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 4938: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H.R. 4989: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 5002: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 5045: Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 5083: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 5113: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 5177: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 5182: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 5224: Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 5301: Mr. JOYCE.
- H.R. 5313: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
- H.R. 5321: Mr. MASSIE.
- H.R. 5344: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
- H.R. 5475: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 5499: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. CONAWAY.
- H.R. 5557: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 5560: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 5619: Mr. TROTT.
- H.R. 5622: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 5628: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 5671: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 5721: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 5727: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. STEWART.
- H.R. 5732: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HILL, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
- H.R. 5733: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 5745: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 5807: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BARR, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 5813: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. REED.
- H.R. 5814: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 5829: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 5898: Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 5902: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 5935: Mr. SANFORD.
- H.R. 5942: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. JOLLY.
- H.R. 5951: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 5961: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 5962: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 5972: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H.R. 5980: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
- H.R. 6001: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 6013: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 6017: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 6030: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 6042: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 6045: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 6070: Mr. HUNTER.
- H.R. 6074: Mr. WESTERMAN.
- H.R. 6076: Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 6086: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
- H.R. 6087: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LANCE.
- H.R. 6088: Mr. BARLETTA and Mrs. WALORSKI.
- H.R. 6094: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 6097: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 6098: Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 6100: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H.R. 6108: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 6110: Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.J. Res. 22: Ms. GRAHAM.
- H.J. Res. 94: Mr. HONDA.
- H.J. Res. 98: Mr. DOGGETT.
- H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
- H. Con. Res. 114: Mrs. BLACK.
- H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BOST, Mr. HARPER, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
- H. Con. Res. 141: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H. Con. Res. 153: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NUNES, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. ROSS.
- H. Res. 28: Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H. Res. 591: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
- H. Res. 750: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H. Res. 838: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H. Res. 846: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. RANGEL.
- H. Res. 854: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H. Res. 866: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
- H. Res. 881: Mr. MCNERNEY.