



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 2015

No. 87

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 2, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, 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.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY SHIFTS TO HOUSE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in our fast-changing world, the global economy looms large. America has long been the leader in promoting freer and fairer trade, promoting the economy at home while strengthening ties overseas. The current issue that is before us now deals with a trade promotion authority and the Trans-Pacific Partnership, an agreement with 12

countries, representing almost 40 percent of the global economy.

After the recent bipartisan vote in the Senate on the trade promotion authority and related package, attention now shifts to the House where we are likely to be voting on this in the next couple of weeks. Many confuse support for the trade promotion authority with the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership. They are two distinct items.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is an ongoing series of negotiations which has yet to be concluded. Indeed, one of the reasons we are looking at trade promotion authority now, establishing the rules of the game and how Congress will evaluate and process it, is to make sure that we get into the final stages.

Trade promotion authority historically, something we have done repeatedly in the past, provides for Congress to vote on an up-or-down basis on a trade agreement once it is finalized. This is what happens in negotiations routinely in the United States, an up-or-down vote. I find it somewhat ironic that some of my friends in organized labor think that it somehow should be negotiated in Congress, that it ought to be subject to amendment in Congress. Yet there is no labor union that I am aware of that has its contracts voted piecemeal. Members aren't allowed to amend. It is up or down, and that is what is necessary to be able to reach a conclusion with these negotiations.

Some are demanding that Members of Congress oppose an agreement that is not yet completed. Well, I, for one, am not going to support or oppose an agreement until I can see what is in it and until the agreement is finalized. Until it is finished, I am going to continue to work to make it as strong as possible.

I have been working on provisions to strengthen enforcement, establishing a trust fund to make sure that provisions in trade agreements have the resources

to make sure that they are, in fact, enforced, such as having provisions known as the Green 301 that has greater strength to be able to enforce environmental provisions. This makes a difference for my community.

Oregon's small- and medium-sized businesses, family farmers, winemakers, bike manufacturers say that enhanced trade authority is critical to creating more jobs at home and increased value for customers. That is something that gets lost in this debate because, as a result of our policies promoting freer trade between countries, Americans have seen their standard of living increase. Americans today are paying less for clothing, less for food, less for electronics as a result of the benefits of these agreements. Some estimates say it is about \$8,000 per family.

Well, we will see what the current trade agreement looks like when it is completed. As I mentioned, the trade promotion authority is necessary to reach the final stages.

Thanks to the efforts of my friend and my constituent Senator RON WYDEN, the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, this trade promotion authority that we will be dealing with makes it mandatory that everybody in the country will be able to look at the final agreement for 60 days before the President even signs it, and then it will be public for another 90 days—5 months, essentially—before Congress will vote up or down on whether or not it is worthy of our support.

Well, I will do what I have done in trade agreements in the past. I will consider each element with the same principles: Is this package good for the people I represent in Oregon? Does it align with our values? Will it be a net positive for areas that I care about, like labor and the environment? More fundamentally, are we going to be better off with an agreement or with none?

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.

H3645

PUTTING A STOP TO
MISMANAGEMENT AT THE VA

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2014, Congress passed legislation with broad bipartisan support to improve access to and the quality of care for veterans in response to the nationwide scandal over manipulated wait times at the VA.

The Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act created a 3-year program to allow veterans to seek care from private providers if they live too far from a VA facility or cannot otherwise get an appointment within 14 days.

It also gave the VA Secretary the authority to fire senior executives for poor performance and required a top-to-bottom study of the entire Department to be completed within 1 year of enactment.

When government failure is exposed and legislation aimed at restoring accountability is enacted, it makes sense that action would be swift and immediate, people would be fired, and wrongs would begin to be made right. Unfortunately, that has not been the case at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

While there are as many as 1,000 employees that could potentially face disciplinary actions, the VA has punished a total of eight for involvement in the scandal. We continue to hear about unacceptable patient wait times, unanswered benefit inquiries, patient safety concerns, medical malpractice, flagrant mismanagement, infighting, corruption, and years of construction delays that total millions of dollars.

Frustration, anger, outrage, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the words that describe how I and other Americans felt when we read these latest stories about problems within the Department of Veterans Affairs. The continued ineptitude at the highest levels of the Department of Veterans Affairs is simply unacceptable. It is past time to put an end to this agency-wide pattern of mismanagement.

Last month, the House continued its efforts to fulfill the commitment we have made to those who have served by approving several pieces of legislation to further improve accountability at the VA.

We also passed legislation to increase access to education programs for veterans and to encourage small businesses to hire them. While it will never be enough, this legislation is a positive step forward in meeting our responsibility to America's veterans.

However, Congress cannot transform the VA alone. It is the President's responsibility to ensure changes are made within the agency and that employees are held accountable for their actions. Unfortunately, that is not happening.

Every day, we hear only more stories about further misdeeds. President Obama must commit to reforming the VA with more than just lip service. America's veterans deserve a meaningful, decisive plan to right the many wrongs.

As a country, we are uniquely blessed. We live in a nation where each of us has the possibility of nearly limitless fulfillment and prosperity in the world's finest democracy. That unparalleled freedom and opportunity has been made available to us because of the profound sacrifices of those who have fought for and defended our Nation.

America's veterans deserve better than the inexcusable misconduct and neglect that we have seen over the last few years at the VA. It is critically important that we provide high-quality, timely care for those who have sacrificed so much to our country.

Republicans are committed to that principle and to the veterans of this country.

URBAN FLOODING AWARENESS
ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress continue to debate whether or not climate change is real, Americans are paying the price. To the climate doubters that I serve with, I will remind them that there are over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies that conclude that climate change is real and that man contributes to it, and there are zero peer-reviewed scientific studies that say the opposite.

Climate change often brings images to mind of melting icecaps and rising sea levels, but the effects of climate change are being felt every day by people around the country. Climate change is causing even more destructive storms which, when combined with our aging infrastructure, is resulting in cities around the country being pummeled by urban flooding.

A little more than 2 years ago, residents in my district endured their second 100-year flood in a mere 3 years. A 100-year storm means that there is a 1 percent chance that a storm of that magnitude will happen every year, but folks in Chicago are experiencing these storms with greater intensity and frequency.

The morning after the rains bombarded Chicago in 2013, I visited numerous community members and their homes. The damage I saw was devastating: thousands of homes and businesses flooded; tons of carpeting, furniture, and memories are ruined; businesses shattered; and entrepreneurs' dreams crushed, along with millions of dollars in damages.

Throughout the region, we saw the closure of schools, libraries, and even hospitals were forced to relocate patients. That kind of devastation cannot

be ignored. Our constituents cannot be ignored.

In Chicago, over the past century, we have seen countless storms that have caused pipes to back up into houses and dump upwards of 1.5 inches of rain in a single day. What is more, rains of more than 2.5 inches a day are expected to increase another 50 percent in the next 20 years.

The National Climate Assessment, released by the Obama administration last year, predicted that the frequency and intensity of the Midwest's heaviest downpours will more than double over the next 100 years. That means even more trouble for our Nation's already deteriorating infrastructure and the cities around the country that rely on that infrastructure to keep them safe. Storm drains are outdated; sewers are inadequate, and families are at risk.

Whether it is because of flooded pipes or the lack of permeable surfaces in our cities, our constituents are paying the prices. Thousands of households in America are affected every year by urban flooding, yielding catastrophic economic, environmental, and social damage in some of our country's largest cities. Basements with water damage decrease property values by an estimated 10 to 25 percent.

But the impacts don't end there. Chronically damp houses can cause respiratory problems and higher insurance costs. Additionally, almost two out of five small businesses cannot open after experiencing a flooding disaster. Urban flooding erodes streams and riverbeds and degrades the quality of our drinking water sources and the health of our aquatic ecosystems.

It is time we come up with a national response to this growing problem. That is why I am proud to introduce the Urban Flooding Awareness Act. This legislation will finally create a definition of urban flooding to be used when designing flood maps and will require a first-of-its-kind study to analyze the costs associated with urban flooding and develop solutions. It would also help us better protect downstream communities from the flooding impacts of development in upstream areas.

Existing regulatory and policy mechanisms are not adequate for this task. It is time we develop new strategies. By identifying the most effective and economical remedies to urban flooding, we are better preparing our communities to defend themselves against the devastation caused by increasingly intense weather.

□ 1015

And investing in real solutions to this problem now is the only way to avoid higher costs down the road. We can learn from our successes and investigate innovative new strategies for funding crucial new programs that eliminate flood risk and damage. Our cities need the best tools available if they are going to survive this era of oversized storms.

THE RAINS OF MAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the rains came down and the floods came up. And although Texas did not receive Noah's 40 days and 40 nights of rain, the recent 10 days of rain were of Biblical proportions.

The whole State received the incessant rain. And about the time we thought it was all over on Saturday morning, it all happened again Saturday night, flooding many of the same homes and communities throughout the State.

In Houston, six, so far, have died. Statewide, there are now 24 deaths. Eleven are still missing in Hays County when the Blanco River rose so fast at night it trapped people in over 200 resort homes that were on the river—homes that eventually washed away. Many of Texas' rivers—the Trinity, the Colorado, the Brazos, and the San Jacinto—rose at rapid record rates and are still out of their banks.

Weather experts, Mr. Speaker, said so much rain fell in Texas in May that it was enough moisture to cover the entire State in 8 inches of water. That is a lot of rain. Seventy counties have been designated disaster areas. But the rainbow news, Mr. Speaker, is that many, many voluntarily helped their neighbors and strangers survive the troubled waters of the floods.

Here is just one example. The hard rain in Dallas flooded the Trinity River. Dallas is in north Texas. The Trinity River flows south down to southeast Texas near Houston, and the added rain in southeast Texas had the Trinity River the size of the Mississippi River.

As the river rose in southeast Texas, a herd of cattle were trapped in the middle of the river on high ground. This high ground was eventually going to be overcome with water and the cattle would be washed out to sea. The river at this point is between the two small towns of Liberty and Dayton, about 6 miles apart, separated by U.S. highway 90.

So Sunday, in a scene reminiscent of the 1800s roundups, cowboys mounted airboats—yes, airboats, Mr. Speaker—to force the hundreds of cattle into the river and have them swim to safer ground. The only area that had high ground was U.S. highway 90. The highway was above the water, even though water was on both sides of the highway.

The roundup took several hours because, Mr. Speaker, cattle are hard-headed. They did not want to leave the high ground and swim to a highway. So it took several hours to do this. Even the cowboys were lassoing calves and tying them to the airboat so they wouldn't drown. Finally, after many hours, all the cattle were forced up on U.S. highway 90 between Liberty and Dayton, Texas.

Now, what do you do with them? Well, the cowboys, now on horses,

along with citizens and other volunteers, herded the cattle down U.S. highway 90 to Dayton, Texas, through Main Street of Dayton, Texas. The citizens came out with their kids to see the cattle drive through Dayton, Texas, and they moved these several hundred of cattle to a rail yard where they will be kept, that is the highest area in the county, until the flood waters finally are diminished.

Of course, local businesses helped out: a local store, Casa Don Boni in Liberty; and, of course, the Sonic, always present in Dayton, supported the volunteers with food and drinks; and other businesses as well helped. This is an example of how, during a troubled time, tough times, Texans are helping each other survive this catastrophic flooding.

So, now, Mr. Speaker, that the rains that came down and the flood that came up have subsided and the earth has returned to its dry land, our prayers go out to the ones who lost family, friends, and property. God bless every one of them. And we also give grateful thanks to those that helped each other during the floods of May.

And that is just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING LE GRAND UNION HIGH SCHOOL AND DOS PALOS HIGH SCHOOL IN SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two exemplary high schools in my district: Le Grand Union High School and Dos Palos High School.

In California's San Joaquin Valley, one of the most economically challenged regions of the Nation, having access to a quality education is critical for our young people, and these two schools shine on both the State and national levels.

Recently, both Le Grand and Dos Palos were acknowledged by the U.S. News & World Report's annual grading as among the top high schools in America. Not only are Le Grand High School and Dos Palos among the best in Merced County, but they both ranked among the top five high schools in our region. Their accomplishments show how our students, with the right encouragement and support, in fact, can succeed.

Students, regardless of their socioeconomic status or being college bound, deserve a quality education that prepares them for the road ahead. And both Le Grand and Dos Palos High Schools are doing just that. Mr. Speaker, 81 percent of the students at Le Grand High School and 97 percent of the students at Dos Palos High School qualify as low-income.

These are challenging and difficult areas. I am proud to say that, at both Le Grand High School and Dos Palos, approximately half of all enrollees are

in AP classes and taking the end-of-year test for college credit. Now, what does that mean? It means that every day these students are actively seizing opportunities to change their lives for the better, and for that, we are glad.

Mr. Speaker, when our students succeed, our Nation succeeds because, after all, they are the future of America. The great success of these students would not be possible without the amazing support of both the faculty and the staff at both high schools. These are the teachers and educators who see promise in our students and inspire them to follow their dreams and progress, teachers who have dedicated their professional careers to public education in America.

To Le Grand Union High School Principal Javier Martinez, the Le Grand Union High School faculty and staff, their board of directors, and the Le Grand student body, job well done.

To the Dos Palos High School Principal Heather Ruiz, the Dos Palos High School faculty and staff, the Dos Palos-Oro Loma School District Board of Trustees, and to that student body, again, a job well done.

Let me take this opportunity to say a big thank-you to all of you, and congratulations in achieving the Silver Medal Award given annually by the U.S. News & World Report. Your collective academic achievement is a source of pride not only in our community, but throughout the Nation.

Most importantly, all of you are making a difference, making a difference for our students. Thank you for setting the example, and thank you for the difference you are making in their lives. It is an honor and a privilege to represent you, and keep up the good work.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that is incredibly important not only to America, but to the folks who I represent in south central Kansas. We need to make sure that in south central Kansas we have the opportunity to access markets all over the world and to sell the great products that we make.

Mr. Speaker, it sometimes sounds like just statistics, but in 2014, \$12 billion in goods from over 3,000 companies were exported outside of Kansas. In the Fourth District alone, over \$3.8 billion was exported, making Wichita and south central Kansas one of the three top exporting metros in the entire United States of America.

When you visit Wichita, you can see that. If you travel around south central Kansas, you will find great aerospace companies, companies like Learjet, Cessna, Beechcraft, and Airbus, manufacturing goods that are sold all across the world. They need access to these markets overseas. We make the 737 fuselage right in Wichita, Kansas.

And we all know the hundreds of small businesses that supply them, machine shops like DJ Engineering and McGinty Machine, that hire hundreds of people in good-paying jobs that are dependent on the capacity for south central Kansas to ship their products around the world, companies like Rubbermaid and Case New Holland that makes farm equipment and Coleman that makes camping goods.

This doesn't begin to mention all the petroleum products that move out of Kansas. And, of course, we sell lots of agricultural products as well. Kansas is the top exporter of wheat, with over \$1.5 billion per year. It ranks second in the export of meat products and third in cattle.

International trade is incredibly important to the people of south central Kansas. These aren't just numbers. These are about real, hard-working Kansans and good-paying jobs.

We need to make sure, here in Congress, that we provide outlines for our President to go negotiate deals with both Europe and Asia such that companies like Excel that makes lawn mowing equipment in Hesston, Kansas, can continue to grow. It is their objective to double over the next 5 years. They cannot do so without the capacity to sell their products into Europe and to Asia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is much controversy about some pieces of trade promotion authority in some of the trade agreements. I have read the document as it currently stands. I can assure everyone who is listening today that this Congress will retain its full authority to approve every agreement that is entered into to make sure that it is, in fact, in the best interests of reducing taxes, reducing tariffs, and reducing regulatory barriers so that Americans and Kansans can sell their products all across the globe.

Sometimes the word "trade" gets bandied about, but what it really means is the capacity for innovation, creativity, the rule of law, and competitiveness to triumph around the world. Those are the hallmarks of the people of south central Kansas. If we get these trade agreements right, we can enhance the lives of so many folks all across the Fourth District of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting passage of trade promotion authority when it comes before the House for a full vote. It is about trade, which is about jobs, which is so important for the American people.

CELEBRATING THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY'S WATTS BAR NUCLEAR FACILITY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1796, Tennessee became the 16th

member of these United States. For some 200 years, Tennessee has been a part of the innovative vanguard that makes this country great, whether it be through culture, science, or even our fabulous barbecue.

Last week, I had the opportunity to tour the latest energy innovation the State of Tennessee has to offer—the Tennessee Valley Authority's Watts Bar Nuclear facility. With the construction of Watts Bar Unit 2 now approximately 98 percent complete, TVA will soon mark the 21st century's first new American nuclear unit to come online. And I am so pleased, Mr. Speaker, that today The Hill newspaper has an article about this very facility.

The project is indeed to be celebrated. It is a model of safety and quality. The dedicated TVA employees at Watts Bar have put in a million hours of work without a lost-time accident. At the same time, they have maintained a quality acceptance rate above 97 percent. That also should be celebrated. Together with Watts Bar Unit 1, the complete facility will be able to power 1.3 million homes in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. Speaker, America must pursue an all-of-the-above energy policy that includes nuclear. Nuclear is a clean, responsible option and one that strengthens our Nation's energy security grid. Unfortunately, though, the EPA, the Obama administration, has proposed sweeping regulations that wage a war on coal while also dismissing the benefits and the power of nuclear energy.

Under the EPA's Clean Power Plan, Tennessee is actually penalized for taking a leading role in providing the region and the country with a clean and reliable source of energy. When drafting the Clean Power Plan, the EPA counted the Watts Bar Unit 2 as being completed and operating at 90 percent efficiency.

□ 1030

It is not online yet, it is not complete, and it is not yet helping to power homes and businesses.

As a result, Tennessee's emission targets under this rule are more difficult to reach because the State is not able to count the emission reductions from this cleaner plant towards its required cuts.

Rather than recognizing TVA's forward-looking work to construct Watts Bar 2, EPA unfairly, and significantly, increased the emission reduction rate for Tennessee.

I was sent to Congress to ensure that the needs of my constituents are represented here in Washington. As the vice chair of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I will continue my efforts to stop the EPA from its overreach and to stop them from implementing this administration's special interest agenda, which has no regard for the economic impact or energy needs of the people of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, this is important, and I want to thank the TVA team for show-

ing me the Watts Bar facility and for allowing me to have a remarkable visit, and I encourage them in their continued good work.

SCHOOL MILK NUTRITION ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recently teamed up with Congressman JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut to introduce H.R. 2407, the bipartisan School Milk Nutrition Act of 2015.

Between 2012 and 2014, schools across the country served 187 million fewer pints of milk, despite an increase in public school enrollment. Mr. Speaker, this is an alarming statistic considering milk is the number one source of nine essential nutrients in young Americans' diets and provides many significant health benefits.

The School Milk Nutrition Act, which has the strong support of the International Dairy Foods Association and the National Milk Producers Federation, seeks to reverse the decline of milk consumption in schools throughout Pennsylvania and across the country.

To help achieve this goal, the bill would reaffirm the requirement that milk is offered with each meal and also give schools the option of offering low-fat flavored milk, rather than only fat free.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get behind this legislation and become a cosponsor of the School Milk Nutrition Act of 2015.

THE VETERANS E-HEALTH AND TELEMEDICINE SUPPORT ACT OF 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with this past week being celebrated and remembering Memorial Day—Memorial Day having just passed—it is important that we continue to remember and honor our fallen soldiers and the new generation of heroes who equally deserve our respect, our gratitude, and the promise of continued support.

This is why I recently joined with New York Congressman CHARLES RANGEL to introduce H.R. 2516, the Veterans E-Health and Telemedicine Support Act of 2015.

This bipartisan legislation would allow Veterans Affairs health professionals, including contractors, to practice telemedicine across State borders if they are qualified and practice within the scope of their authorized Federal duties.

Currently, overly cumbersome location requirements can make it difficult for veterans, especially those struggling with mental health issues, to get the help they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, the VA can only waive the State license requirement for treatment if both the physician and the patient are located in a federally owned facility.

The Veterans E-Health and Telemedicine Support Act of 2015 removes these barriers and allows the VA to provide treatment through physicians free of this restriction. Veterans will no longer be required to travel to a VA facility but, rather, can receive telemedicine treatment from anywhere, including their home or a community center.

Mr. Speaker, these brave men and women put so much on the line each and every day in service to our country that when they return home it is our shared duty to be there for these heroes by making lifesaving resources readily available.

This legislation will eliminate the multiple layers of bureaucracy, allowing our veterans to have greater access to mental and behavioral health services, especially in rural areas.

I rise today and ask my colleagues in both parties to get behind this bipartisan, commonsense legislation.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, 22 veterans commit suicide every day. Let's end that crisis.

OBAMACARE RATE HIKES

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than 5 years since President Obama signed his landmark achievement, which he called the Affordable Care Act, into law. At that time, the President and the Democrats in Congress promised that their massive Federal takeover of our healthcare system would lower costs on American families. Affordability was its central selling point.

But 5 years later, they must face the facts. Their law, which they forced on the American people, is a failure.

According to yesterday's much-anticipated Congressional Budget Office reports—an independent agency—insurance premiums are expected to increase even more significantly next year than they did this year.

One insurer in New Mexico, Blue Cross and Blue Shield, called for a 50 percent increase in premiums. And New Mexico is just the tip of the iceberg. Tennessee is also seeking an increase of 30 percent.

The average West Virginia family—the State I am blessed to represent—pays about the same as the residents in the State of New York, which is \$17,105 a year on their health insurance. That is \$271 above the national average.

We cannot pretend that the Affordable Care Act is anywhere close to “affordable.” ObamaCare adds taxes, regulations, and unfunded mandates onto the American consumers. The limited choice in health insurance plans is harming families and their budgets.

In my district in West Virginia, there is only one insurance provider through the exchange. And this one plan is asking for a rate increase as high as 21.6 percent.

President Obama has routinely and blatantly forced his failed policies on the American people. According, again, to the independent Congressional Budget Office report of February 4, 2014, ObamaCare has killed 2.5 million jobs a year.

Who are these 2.5 million Americans who have lost their jobs thanks to ObamaCare? They are disproportionately low-wage workers. The people who are hurt the most by ObamaCare are the same ones who ObamaCare was supposed to help. What we really should call it is the “Non-Affordable Care Act.”

West Virginians who get their healthcare insurance through their work are paying some of the highest rates in the United States for premiums and deductibles, according to a report from The Commonwealth Fund. The 33,421 West Virginians who are currently enrolled in ObamaCare cannot afford to have their rates hiked yet again.

Many Americans are left wondering how much more will we have to pay each year because of the Non-Affordable Care Act. To make matters worse, the Non-Affordable Care Act has added \$1 trillion in tax increases. This is money taken out of the pockets of hard-working American families.

The top Democrat leader here in Congress famously said on March 10, 2010: “We have to pass the Affordable Care Act to find out what’s in it.” You should know what it is before you vote on it—come on. Well, it has been 5 years since the bill was shoved through Congress, and the American people deserve better.

We must halt ObamaCare’s takeover of the U.S. healthcare system and pass commonsense reforms that lower costs for hard-working families and expand access to health care. The State of West Virginia and the Nation need lower costs and personal control over healthcare decisions, not more Federal Government intervention.

The budget that was recently passed by the House and the Senate repealed ObamaCare—including all of its taxes, regulations, and mandates—and ObamaCare’s outrageous requirement that the taking of unborn human lives be covered as so-called “health care.”

Republican healthcare plans pave the way for patient-centered healthcare solutions. We need to focus on reform that will help reconnect doctors and patients and give patients better care through more options.

The goal of patient-centered healthcare reform is to empower the patients. Republicans in Congress have multiple proposals to address the healthcare issue. Republicans propose increasing competition and transparency in the health insurance market and stopping frivolous lawsuits against doctors and hospitals.

Americans should not be forced to buy into something that simply doesn’t work. The Non-Affordable Care Act does not work. The estimated premium

increases that were announced yesterday are yet another example of the failings of this bill and this President.

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 10 o’clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARDY) at noon.

PRAYER

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

There are many important issues facing our Nation—concerns about immigration, our national security, our personal privacy, the economy, and levels of unemployment. Bless abundantly the Members of this people’s House.

Help them to see new ways to productive service, fresh approaches to understanding each other, especially those across the aisle, and renewed commitment to solving the problems facing our Nation.

May they, and may we all, be transformed by Your grace and better reflect the sense of wonder, even joy, at the opportunities to serve that are ever before us.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr.

CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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 PRO TEMPORE

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

AMERICA NEEDS A CHANGE

(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, as American families continue to be under attack from radical Islam, it can be credited President Obama was correct on December 14, 2011, addressing troops at Fort Bragg: "We are leaving behind a sovereign, stable, and self-reliant Iraq . . . a moment of success."

Clearly, then-President George W. Bush's strategy of denying mass murderers safe havens to kill Americans anywhere was admitted successful. I am grateful my two oldest sons served in Iraq to protect American families.

President Obama's failure to achieve a status of forces agreement in Iraq and his failure to uphold his declared red line in Syria led to murderous advances of ISIL/Daesh, which he publicly dismissed as junior varsity.

I hope President Obama changes course for victory in the global war on terrorism, which began with the declarations of war in 1997 against America with a goal of death to America, death to Israel, and mass slaughter of Muslims who do not submit.

President Obama's legacy should be peace through strength, not weakness, as future attacks threaten American families.

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

SUPPORTING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank is a critical resource for small- and medium-sized businesses in Rhode Island's First Congressional District and all across this country.

In fact, over the last 8 years, the Ex-Im Bank has provided more than \$20 million in insured shipments, guaranteed credit, or disbursed loans for companies in my district, enabling them to export products valued at nearly \$50 million.

The Ex-Im Bank provides financing that enables these companies to access foreign markets, compete in the global economy, and create good-paying jobs here in America. American jobs are supported by the Ex-Im Bank, 164,000 American jobs. It generated \$675 million for the taxpayers in 2014, and the default rate for the Ex-Im Bank was less than one-fifth of 1 percent, 0.175 percent.

Support for the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank is bipartisan. 180 Democrats have signed a discharge petition to force a vote on reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank before it expires on June 30, and many Republicans have publicly supported reauthorization.

I have had the opportunity to meet with companies in my district that rely on the Ex-Im Bank, companies like the Cooley Group in Pawtucket that designs, develops, and manufactures a diversified industry-leading portfolio of premier engineered coated fabrics used across an array of industrial, commercial, and military applications.

This issue is too important for the usual partisan politics that Washington has grown used to. We need to stand up for small- and medium-sized companies and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank before the end of this month.

ALZHEIMER'S & BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month. Alzheimer's is the only top 10 cause of death in America that cannot be prevented or cured; however, we are making strides.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6, the 21st Century Cures Act, is a historic, nonpartisan bill that will help spur the development of cures and treatments more quickly to help patients with chronic or rare conditions.

I am an original cosponsor of a provision in H.R. 6 to create a national data collection system for neurological diseases. Better data will pave the path toward better treatments.

In April, I held a neurological disease roundtable in my district to engage with doctors and patients, including Ron Hall, a constituent and Alzheimer's patient. We discussed how to advance the development of treatments and cures for diseases like Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, by working together, we can help Alzheimer's patients.

WESTERN NEW YORK'S PRIDE WEEK

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined the Pride Center of Western New York to celebrate the LGBTQ

community and kick off Buffalo Pride Week. Last week Niagara Falls Mayor Paul Dyser, Councilwoman Kristen Grandinetti, and the Rainbow City Coalition raised the rainbow flag for the first time at city hall in Niagara Falls.

Western New York's Pride Week comes at a particularly historic time. The Supreme Court is expected to rule soon on whether the Constitution guarantees same-sex couples the right to marry. I believe that it does. I was proud to join 211 of my colleagues in Congress in filing an amicus brief urging the Court to find such a right in its ruling.

Mr. Speaker, marriage equality is one of the important components of a larger effort to ensure that everyone has the same basic rights as each and every American. I congratulate the Pride Center of Western New York and the Rainbow City Coalition for their community efforts this week and advocacy for equality each and every day, and I hope next year Pride Week will celebrate a Supreme Court decision that honors the right of all Americans to marry the person they love.

HIGHLIGHTING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TIMBERLAND SHOE COMPANY

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the significant contributions of a New Hampshire-based business that employs almost 1,500 people and contributes approximately \$1.8 billion in economic revenue.

For nearly 40 years, Timberland Shoe Company has remained a staple in the New England region business community. From what started out as a small shoe company in Boston, Timberland has grown into a worldwide leader of outdoor footwear and apparel.

Headquartered in Exeter, New Hampshire, Timberland employs over 400 Granite Staters in a variety of departments such as marketing, operations, retail, administration, and more. The accomplishments of Timberland also transcend the workplace in ways where they have logged 8,300 hours of community service just in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, giving back to the community is an important aspect of successful business, and Timberland sets a great example for what all businesses should strive for. It was a privilege to visit Timberland's headquarters last month, and I look forward to their next 40 years in the great State of New Hampshire.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Today we recognize the first National Gun Violence Awareness Day, and when you

look around, you will see a lot of people wearing orange.

This day was declared in memory of Hadiya Pendleton, a teen-age girl who was shot and killed in a park 2 years ago. She would have turned 18 today. Hadiya's story is sadly familiar. For Americans under the age of 20, gun violence is now the second leading cause of death.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, we have lost more children to guns here at home than we did soldiers in Iraq and Afghan. It shouldn't be political to say that these shootings need to stop. I hope we can all agree that America's young people deserve better.

We owe it to Hadiya and those like her to come together on this issue and work to prevent future tragedies. We know that simple solutions like mandatory background checks, which a majority of Americans support, can make all the difference.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is dire, and action is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to act now on sensible gun control.

SUPPORT FOR MORE BORDER CONTROL HITS FOUR-YEAR HIGH

(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, a recent poll shows that a great majority of the American people continue to oppose President Obama's immigration policies. The new Rasmussen Reports national survey found that 77 percent of likely voters view illegal immigration as a serious problem in America today. Just 19 percent do not.

Most voters, 63 percent, believe that controlling our borders is more important than providing a legal status to those already in the country illegally. This is the highest level of support for border security since 2011. And almost three-fifths of voters think that a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants will just encourage more unlawful immigration. Just one-quarter disagree.

As in prior polls, Mr. Speaker, a strong majority of voters, 62 percent, feel that the United States is not aggressive enough in deporting illegal immigrants. A similar percentage of voters want to use our military along our southern border to prevent unlawful entries.

It is time for the President to heed voters' views on illegal immigration and to enforce immigration laws.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am wearing orange in recognition of the first annual National Gun Violence Awareness Day. Orange is the

safety color hunters wear to alert others of their presence, and this is the perfect color to represent safety with respect to firearms and the value of human life.

Last week, as we honored our troops and celebrated Memorial Day weekend, a wave of gun violence ripped through the city of Chicago, wounding more than 50 people and killing 12. Among the victims were a 17-year-old boy, a 15-year-old girl, and a 4-year-old child.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to act now. We can't equip every American with an orange hunting vest, but we can surely take sensible approaches to reduce the threat of gun violence in our communities.

This Congress, I have introduced H.R. 224, which would require the Surgeon General to compile a report on the public health impact of gun violence. This commonsense gun bill can help us understand the public health impact of gun violence and prevent future shootings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and support commonsense legislation to curb the violence that plagues our Nation. And I want to say happy birthday, Hadiya, and happy birthday, Blair Holt.

□ 1215

SUPPORT OUR NATION'S TRUCKERS

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

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to debate the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill, I stand in support of our Nation's truckers.

The trucking industry not only provides Americans with access to goods we need to use every day, but it is also critical to our Nation's economy.

In my home State of North Carolina, there are over 70,000 truckers working for more than 16,000 small businesses.

Perhaps even more impressive is that 86 percent of North Carolina communities depend exclusively on trucks in order to transport consumer products and goods across our State.

This industry is essential to ensure a growing and thriving U.S. economy and to provide crucial support to our Nation's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hard-working men and women of this industry who eat their dinners on the road so that we can eat ours at home.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN AND ALICIA NASH

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of

Princeton University mathematician John Forbes Nash, Jr., and his wife, Alicia, two beloved members of the Princeton, New Jersey, community, who died tragically over the Memorial Day weekend.

Many of us knew Dr. Nash for his groundbreaking, award-winning work in mathematics, his practical contributions to economic theory, and his journey to conquer mental illness.

Many more learned his story through its passionate portrayal in "A Beautiful Mind."

He shared the 1994 Nobel Prize, and had just returned from celebrating his receipt of mathematics' highest honor, the Abel Prize.

A University of Chicago economist, Roger Myerson, described Mr. Nash's theories as equivalent to "that of the discovery of the DNA double helix in the biological sciences."

But in New Jersey, we knew both Dr. Nash and Alicia Nash for their kindness, their humility, their devotion to the community, and the many other ways they remained so down to earth after accomplishments that drew international praise and recognition.

HONORING JUAN JOSE MALO

(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 to honor Juan Jose Malo on his retirement as the president of Miami's Ecuadorian-American Chamber of Commerce.

Juan Jose has tirelessly worked to help the Ecuadorian American-owned and -operated businesses in south Florida to prosper, to thrive, and to grow. And he has always demonstrated his trademark diligence by enthusiastically advocating on behalf of all of south Florida's business community.

Juan Jose's generosity has also pushed the Ecuadorian-American Chamber of Commerce to undertake seven medical and humanitarian missions to Ecuador and one to the Dominican Republic.

Juan Jose specifically has sought to bring attention to the plight of the Ecuadorian people by founding the magazine "Revista Remesa," ensuring that our community had the latest political and economic news about Ecuador.

Juan Jose, congratulations on your years of leadership. We know that you will continue your stellar work on behalf of all of south Floridians and the entire Ecuadorian American community.

AMERICA'S RED ROCK WILDERNESS ACT

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce America's Red

Rock Wilderness Act, a bill to designate as wilderness southern Utah's incredible public lands, such as Desolation Canyon, the Dirty Devil, and the Greater Cedar Mesa.

These wild and precious lands are our birthright as Americans, and they are essential to who we are as a Nation. My bill safeguards these special lands and the waters, the flora, and the fauna within them. It furthers the great American conservation ethic of John Muir, of Theodore Roosevelt, and of the many others who helped to preserve the great wild places we cannot imagine today living without.

As we advance toward a cleaner economy, we must protect the \$646 billion outdoor recreation economy, which employs more than 6 million people nationwide. None of that is possible without protecting our public lands.

America's Red Rock Wilderness Act would do just that.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the first annual National Gun Violence Awareness Day.

In just the past year, gun violence has killed 372 people in Los Angeles County, including 43 in my own congressional district and 20 in the city of Compton alone.

My communities continue to mourn these victims: victims like 16-year-old Lontrell Lee Turner, who was gunned down walking home from church in Compton last December; 65-year-old Jose Padilla, the father who was shot and killed while closing up his restaurant in Lynwood; and 72-year-old Mary Motsumoto, who was shot to death by her husband in their home in San Pedro.

I have mourned with too many parents and comforted too many children who have lost loved ones through gun violence. My communities have suffered through the scourge of gun violence for too long. The children of my community can no longer be targets.

Today, I am proud to stand for gun violence awareness and wear an orange ribbon, representing the value of human life and the efforts we must take to protect it.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, according to a report I read recently, serious mental health problems are declining among our children, and that is very good news. But the same report found that over half of severely troubled youth get absolutely no help at all. That is a glaring gap in our system that must be addressed today.

Far too often, the only thing standing in the way of treatment is the negative stigma associated with this disease. The stigma of treatment and medication, the stigma of anger and instability, the stigma of fear of the disease itself.

At a time when there are 10 times more people with mental illness in jail than in State-funded psychiatric beds, we are not doing our job to help our loved ones wage this silent battle alone.

Last month during Mental Health Awareness Month, we recognized and thanked organizations like the Massachusetts Association for Behavioral Health for their critical work to fill the gaps in our system and wipe away the stigmas that deter so many from pursuing treatment.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS DAY

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the first National Gun Violence Awareness Day.

Gun violence is an increasingly growing problem in our country, claiming the lives of hundreds of thousands nationwide each year. This must be addressed now.

Gun violence has taken the lives of America's men, women, and children. In 2010, nearly 3,000 infants, children, and teens died as a result of gun violence. This is unacceptable.

In my State of North Carolina, gun violence is rampant. According to a 2013 Center for American Progress report, North Carolina ranked 15th in the Nation for gun violence. From 2001 through 2010, more than 11,000 North Carolinians died as a result of gun violence. These senseless crimes instill fear, pain, and insecurity in our communities.

My colleagues, we must band together to repair our communities and help stop gun violence.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2578, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction on Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 287 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 287

Resolved, That (a) 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 any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. The first reading of each such bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. General debate on each such bill shall be confined to that bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate each such bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in each such bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of each such bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports any such bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on that bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 287 provides for a modified open rule for separate consideration of H.R. 2578 and H.R. 2577. Under this rule, any Member may offer any amendments to the bills in question that comply with the rules of the House. It

also provides for 10 minutes of debate on each amendment considered. This approach has been what we call a standard rule for appropriations bills and was established and has been followed for this last year and the year before, and I believe it has been effective and, really, a good way for this body to be able to effectively operate, allowing each and every Member of this body the chance to offer their amendments.

This rule also accomplishes two important goals:

First, it reflects the majority's commitment to an open and transparent appropriations process. This rule will also allow for all Members to bring to this body their ideas that they have that they bring from back home, perhaps ideas from their own individual constituents about how we can make this appropriations process even better. I think it is important that Members of Congress be given an opportunity to do this in the appropriations process, and that is exactly what we are trying to do today for a robust opportunity for discussion. If an amendment complies with the rules of the House, it certainly will be given an up-or-down vote, if that Member chooses to do so.

Secondly, this rule provides for reasonable time constraints. It is my belief that if Members' ideas are heard and the process by which we consider appropriations bills is done on a timely basis, then the House will benefit, and so will the American people, so that we work effectively and efficiently at the same time. This rule, I believe, strikes a good balance, allowing all Members an opportunity to offer necessary amendments but also allowing the House to get its work done.

□ 1230

I estimate that we will spend about 18 hours in the process to get these bills done. Throughout this open process, the House will be able to make two great bills, I think, even better.

Mr. Speaker, the open process by which these two bills will be considered, if the rule is adopted, is not only a good thing, but I think it says something about the work that the Rules Committee is doing. I am proud to support these two underlying bills because they make tough decisions, and they prioritize the responsibilities of the Federal Government. We simply do not have enough money to spread around to not have to make tough decisions. These are tough decisions that are made.

Yesterday, at the Rules Committee, both of these bills were equally addressed on a bipartisan basis, and both the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee said they worked well together.

Obviously, not everybody was happy with how much money they had to spend, but both of the ranking members—the Democrats who were present—addressed our committee and said that they were treated fairly, that

they were treated respectfully, and that it was an open and transparent process to achieve good things for the bills.

That is the hope that I have as we come to the floor today in that you will see groups of Members who will come to the floor with an open opportunity as a result of what we did in the Rules Committee, knowing that the process that took place back in the Appropriations Committee was well done.

Alarming, however, yesterday, we learned that President Obama has threatened to veto both of these bills because, as I quote him, they “drastically underfund critical investments.”

Let me see if I can break this down for you. It is our job to determine what those appropriations levels would be. We heard from the President of the United States when he presented his budget, and year after year after year, the President of the United States has failed to receive more than only several votes on his budget.

I believe that what we have done by working carefully and meticulously through the budget process and through the appropriations process gives us a better angle on the needs and the priorities of these agencies from a congressional and, I believe, a “back home” experience.

The people of this country elected their Representatives, and their Representatives have come to Washington and have had a fair and open process, notwithstanding that we are not spending as much as people want us to spend.

I believe that the President is saying that he will veto these bills because he does not believe that we simply continue to spend more and more and more. This President has an insatiable appetite that we saw and have seen year after year after year.

Based upon his words, I would say back to him: Mr. President, please look at the merits of the work that the House of Representatives is doing on a bipartisan basis. We are trying to live within the parameters of a budget that has been established and that was voted on by Members of this body, that has the vast majority of the Members of this body to say, when compared to the President's budget, this is the budget that I believe best represents not only what we can accomplish but what will work in the best interests of the American people, our constituents. Mr. President, they are the same ones that you have across this great Nation. Mr. President, we are asking you to take a second look at how you will listen to us and to watch the process that is going on here. I think it will develop itself into a better way for us to do business, and I would encourage the White House to look at that.

Mr. Speaker, a great nation simply cannot spend money that it does not have and be a great nation for very long. This last month, we crossed over the terrible, terrible threshold of going

from \$17 trillion to \$18 trillion in debt, and we continue to add up this debt and live off that debt and add to the debt with the spending that we do. We believe that what we have got to do is become more responsible with the taxpayers' dollars and the future of this great Nation.

The law of the land and the law that the President has signed requires Congress to act within the requirements of the Budget Control Act. These were agreements that were made with the President. That is what we are sticking to, and that is what these bills do; yet the President, once again, is telling us: Please set aside the agreement that was made. I don't now like the thing that I agreed to, that I signed into law.

In some instances, they were some of the President's own ideas.

We need to understand that the American people want and expect us to see problems and to solve them and to stick to it. That is what this budget process is about, and that is exactly what this appropriations process is about.

Look, I disagree with the President. I believe that what we need to do is to live within the agreement of the Budget Control Act. My party, the Republicans, have worked to lower discretionary spending from nearly \$1.5 trillion in 2009, where we were, to today in 2015, \$1.014 trillion.

That is the difference between 2009 and 2015, years in which excessive and out-of-control spending could have taken place but for the discipline of the Republican Party and the discipline of our Members and, might I say, of the American people, who have heard our call for having a plan, a plan which carefully moves America into the future, that lessens the amount of debt the American people have to take on, and that makes better opportunities for our children and grandchildren not to have to pay back our excessive spending just because we are a group of people who thinks it is smarter than the people back home. We aren't.

They get also, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have a defined goal. We have to do exactly what they do back home, and that is to be responsible about a family budget, about a State budget, about a Federal Government budget.

That means disciplined accountability and a plan that you are willing to stick to. That is exactly what we have done. We have worked hard to lower discretionary spending over these years, and the effort has saved more than \$2 trillion over this period of time and, I believe, over what would have been spent.

I think this is a big win for the American people, and I think it is a big win for people who want, need, and expect Members of Congress to come to Washington and stick not only to a plan, but to a disciplined approach in trying to balance together the needs of this great Nation and its people and the need for us to look over the horizon at what our future would be.

I think that we have lowered spending and that we have had a chance to shrink the size of government. Certainly, what we are trying to do is to work at lowering the deficit or the amount of money that would have been added to that deficit. These are the discussions that people back home have with their Members of Congress: What lies ahead? And how are you going to be able to make tough decisions?

I hope that the President of the United States is listening to this because we are, on a bipartisan basis, having these same discussions in the House of Representatives and in the committees on which our Members serve. Now is the time not to go back to liberal, reckless spending opportunities. They will always abound.

It is always easier to spend somebody else's money. I just don't think it is right, so the Republican Party is here on the floor today with two more appropriations bills, and it is going to sell to the American people the confidence that we have that we can make this government work more effectively and more efficiently—yes, with fewer dollars but with greater opportunities for efficiency.

I believe that both of these bills strike what is a balance, a balance between funding critical projects while making smart financial decisions. These two can be accomplished, and that is why we are trying to work together to prioritize it.

H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2016, focuses on the true governmental interest: fighting crime; making decisions about how we keep terrorists at bay; keeping the American people safe; and supporting the U.S. economy at the same time by making critical investments in science, space, exports, and manufacturing. Certainly, in tough economic times, tough decisions are required, and that is exactly where we are.

Yesterday, we had a chance to hear from two Members of Congress—Republicans—one of them, the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the subcommittee chairman. He talked about the bill reflecting smart but fair decisions. The decisions that he spoke about were that the legislation provided \$51.4 billion in total discretionary, which was \$661 million below the President's request.

H.R. 2578 also prioritizes vital programs that are, essentially, built around law enforcement—Federal law enforcement—and their ability to aim at the problems that our citizens see and that, certainly, our law enforcement sees and to put a priority on national security and public safety and initiatives that also aim for job creation and economic growth. These are part of the priorities that have to be taken up, and, in fact, they were.

The second bill, H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2016, I believe, similarly had many of the same characteristics.

First of all, they are going to stick to exactly what we talked about in the budget, and they are going to have to strike a balance—a tough balance—but one which is based on the priorities of essential programs and on making responsible reductions to low-priority activities.

This bill provides \$55.3 billion in discretionary funding, which is \$9.7 billion below what the President wanted. Once again, the President does not want to stick to the budget agreement—an agreement which he signed into law—but that is what this body is going to do.

We are going to live within the law, and living within the law is what the American people expect as part of the plan. This bill allows for important investments in national transportation infrastructure, including investments in our national highways, railways, and airports. It also provides help to people who are in dire need of affordable housing options.

Mr. Speaker, I learned a long time ago, when I became a scoutmaster for the Boy Scouts of America, that needs always outpace resources. Needs are always out there, and they are something that you just simply want to continue to be a part of, but money is not always the answer.

Sometimes, a prioritization of the needs that you have to meet will then define you to a better process, one which people can then better understand. That is what we are doing here today.

Like most Members, who will have an opportunity as a result of the work that we did last night in the Rules Committee, I have ideas that, I think, can help improve H.R. 2577. One of those ideas, I have brought to the floor many, many times in a bill; and during the debate on funding, I think I will have good ideas that will help make our country stronger—in this case, make transportation stronger.

It became clear to me a number of years ago that government subsidized rail service on Amtrak does not make economic sense. What we have looked at is that Amtrak takes money. Years and years and years ago, they agreed that they would quit taking government subsidies and would run the railroad as an east and west operation.

Instead, what did they do? They became a cross-country hauler. Every single long-distance route that Amtrak provides—those of more than 400 miles in length—operate at a loss every single month. There are 11 routes that cost double the amount of revenue that they create. That is why I have offered two important opportunities, which were amendments, to eliminate this.

The first would eliminate the funding for Amtrak's long-distance routes, which have a total direct cost of more than twice the revenue. That means, if the cost is twice the revenue, then it would be eliminated.

The second would eliminate the funding for Amtrak's worst performing

line, the Sunset Limited. The Sunset Limited, which is an east-west and west-east operation is subsidized for every single ticket and for every single train by over \$400 in government subsidies, a loss totalling \$41.9 million last year alone.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the ideas. Mr. Speaker, you will be hearing about lots of them over the next 18-some hours of debate that will take place. This is a good thing about this rule. Members just like myself will have a chance to come and put their ideas as opportunities on the floor for other Members to consider. I think that is why we are here today, to work together on a process that will make our country even stronger.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, the chair of the Committee on Rules and my friend, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in opposition to the rule and underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of both H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, as well as H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Both, in my opinion, are woefully inadequate and underfunded pieces of legislation that serve as a slap in the face to hard-working Americans and a reminder of my Republican colleagues' shortsighted and irresponsible attempt at achieving a balanced budget.

Last night, in his testimony before the Committee on Rules on H.R. 2577, Ranking Member DAVID PRICE made a statement that was not only profound but incredibly accurate. He responded to Republican sentiments that slashing domestic appropriations in isolation is a necessary evil by stating that "a great nation must invest in its future."

Indeed, the importance of this investment cannot be overstated. For too long, we have forced austerity measures upon appropriators that prevent the funding of programs that create jobs; bolster our economy; repair and improve our Nation's decrepit highways, transit systems, and infrastructure; that fund medical research; and provide safe, decent, and affordable housing for poor and vulnerable families, the elderly, and disabled.

It both saddens and frustrates me that my Republican friends continue to go after domestic programs that would unequivocally improve the lives of so many Americans while at the same time refusing to address the real drivers of the fiscal crisis, which are tax expenditures and mandatory spending.

It is unconscionable to me that we, as a nation, cannot come up with the

money to fund projects that repair and improve our country's transportation infrastructure. I pointed out yesterday in the Committee on Rules that aside from all of the bridges that I talked about from Florida that are in need of repair, right here in Washington, the Memorial Bridge that leads from Virginia into this city is in need of repair.

The initiative that provides grants to local law enforcement and first responders would also improve in our country. But we provide ourselves with an unlimited budget to fight foreign wars without a mechanism to pay for those costs. Enough already, Congress. How about an authorization for the use of force rather than the methods that are employed now for ongoing, undetermined, indefinite—it appears—wars?

The solution to our current fiscal circumstances lies not in withholding of necessary funding for essential domestic programs, but in comprehensive reform that considers—yes, considers—tax increases in addition to entitlement and appropriations cuts. That is how we balanced the budget in 1994 and to a relative degree in 1997, and we had, at that time, 4 years of balanced budgets. Adherence to these Republican budget limits self-imposed by sequestration is ineffective, detrimental to our national progress, and just plain wrong.

The Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations measure before us today is the instrument used to provide funding for many vital programs and agencies, such as the Department of Justice, Commerce, NASA, and the National Science Foundation. Despite the importance of fully funding these agencies, this bill is a prime example of the mindless austerity of sequestration and the misguided priorities of my Republican colleagues.

Time won't permit to add context to how we got to sequestration, and my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, is absolutely correct. The President did sign this measure, but that was at the instance of an awful lot of negotiations and the government being shut down.

I don't stand here and point fingers at either side in this regard. I said yesterday in the Committee on Rules, and I repeat here, it is the fault of 435 voting Members of Congress that we allow for this measure to put us in the position that we are in on these two measures as well as others to come.

For example, this bill fails to adequately fund several Department of Justice grant programs and outright eliminates others, programs and funding that are critical to many State and local law enforcement activities. Specifically, the bill cuts \$180 million from the Community Oriented Policing Services hiring program. This effectively eliminates a program that would put an additional 1,300 police officers on the streets. At a time when the relationship between many of our communities and law enforcement is strained, why are we decimating a program dedi-

cated to building trust and mutual respect between the police and the communities they serve?

In another startling policy decision by the majority, this bill eliminates, in its entirety, several other important programs, including the substance abuse program.

I come to the floor today from a meeting this morning dealing with institutions for mental disease in which the community of persons who work in substance abuse, addiction, and mental health are pleading for the changes necessary for them to be able to address the significant problem that our population faces from veterans, to civilians, to children, and to the elderly, and yet what we did in this measure is eliminate the Substance Abuse Treatment program.

We eliminate the Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction initiative at a time when we are witnessing, in our Nation, serious gun violence, and many of us today are about the business of trying to highlight, at least on this one day, the epidemic of gun violence in our society and how it has cost lives and treasure.

This program, as offered, eliminates the National Center for Campus Public Safety.

Perhaps the most indicative of the misplaced funding priorities by the majority is the gun policy rider—yep, yep, a rider, not part of this bill, just kind of tacked on like we tacked on something having to do with Cuba. We just tack these riders on, and this has been attached to this legislation.

Not only has the majority completely eviscerated important violence and gun crime reduction programs, they have attached a policy rider that cancels out a narrow, targeted reporting requirement on the sale of certain long guns sold in four border States. The purpose of this requirement is to discourage straw purchasers from buying weapons for Mexican drug cartels. This reporting requirement has been proven to be effective. Courts agreed that it does not restrict Second Amendment rights, so why is the majority including this irresponsible gun rider in a bill that largely funds public safety? The irony of this provision should not be lost on any of us.

Finally, in addition to cutting funding to important public safety programs, this bill showcases my Republican colleagues' remarkable ability to bury their heads in the sand when it comes to climate change, employing their ill-conceived strategy of defunding any program that might help us understand and address this important issue. This legislation intentionally underfunds the Geosciences directorate at the National Science Foundation and the Earth Science Office at NASA, where scientists are studying the most effective ways to respond to climate change.

The second bill, H.R. 2577, provides \$55.3 billion in discretionary funding for transportation and housing pro-

grams for fiscal year 2016. While this allocation appears to be an increase from fiscal year 2015, after inflationary adjustments, including declining Federal Housing Administration receipts and increasing Section 8 renewal costs, this bill actually designates \$1.5 billion less than last year's enacted level.

The shortcomings of this piece of legislation are so numerous that I would far exceed the time allotted to me if I were to attempt to discuss them all. Instead, I will just graze the surface by addressing just a few of the most egregious provisions.

This bill reduces funding for Amtrak by 18 percent from last year's level and \$1.3 billion below the President's request. This reduction eliminates funding for positive train control, a technology that the Transportation Safety Board has stated publicly may have prevented last month's tragic Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia, and provides no funding for intercity passenger rail or the installation of additional safety mechanisms.

It also slashes funding for the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grant program, cuts TIGER funding by \$400 million—it does have a placeholder for something that may take place in the future—and it reduces the Federal Aviation Administration's capital program, which impedes the FAA's ability to implement its NextGen program as well as maintain and improve aging facilities.

In addition to its funding inadequacies, as has become custom under Republican leadership, this bill offers up legislative handouts to the trucking industry and other powerful interests at the expense of the safety of our constituents. Specifically, it is going to allow trucks to carry longer trailers across the country, make it harder for the Department of Transportation to mandate that drivers get more rest before they hit the road, and forbid the Department from raising the minimum insurance it requires trucks and buses to carry.

I wonder if we ever really talk to truckers and really ask them do they want to carry trains on roads—that is what it amounts to—and do they need the rest that they have requested for years. None of us are against the trucking industry, but these measures allow for something that should not occur. The latest data which is available shows that nearly 4,000 people died in accidents involving large trucks.

□ 1300

Last week, there were no less than three in the constituency I serve, including a 17-year-old extremely bright young girl who lost her life at the instance of a trucking incident.

Most of these 4,000 people were riding in another vehicle or were pedestrians. That is a 17 percent increase from the year 2009.

These provisions will make our highways less safe and do not belong in an appropriations bill. Trucking regulations should be openly debated as part

of a comprehensive surface transportation bill, which, incidentally, we have been assured is on the horizon.

Currently, one out of every nine bridges in our country is structurally deficient, and congestion has never been worse. At the same time, our population is expected to grow by 70 million over the next 30 years. Knowing this, we must not continue to wait for our bridges to collapse, our public transit systems to malfunction, and our highways to deteriorate before we agree to provide adequate funding.

Just as it does for transportation and infrastructure initiatives, H.R. 2577 makes dramatic cuts to funding for housing support programs for poor and vulnerable individuals and families. One of the most striking of these reductions is the one levied against the public housing capital fund, making it only slightly higher than the monetary amount allocated in 1989, without accounting for inflation.

I held a housing forum on Saturday in the congressional district that I am privileged to serve, and I saw the pain that was expressed by the people in long waiting lines for section 8 housing and in the deteriorating public housing that is in that 30-year at-risk period. It just pains me even to talk about it and then to come up here and in this very week do more, if we follow our Republican friends, to cut these programs.

This bill also reduces funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Choice Neighborhoods initiative. It slashes funding for Healthy Homes and lead hazard control grants, exposing the most underprivileged children to toxic lead poisoning.

It transfers money from the housing trust fund to fund the HOME program, taking funding away from a program which is reserved for the most economically disadvantaged and in the most need of assistance, and does nothing to increase access to safe and affordable housing for the elderly or disabled.

In short, this legislation undermines the continued viability of our Nation's infrastructure and threatens our country's economic competitiveness.

I fear that without these necessary investments in transportation, housing, science, commerce, and justice programs, the negative implication of Representative PRICE's statement will become a reality. We will fail to remain a great Nation because we will fail to accommodate the demands of the future.

For these very important reasons, and many more that I could express, I oppose both the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I know that I see one of our colleagues from the Rules Committee who wants to come speak, but I want to take just a second and respond in kind for my party, and that is that my party does recognize that there is much that

does get accomplished because of the efforts of this government and the efforts of this Congress that fund good ideas and do things.

A number of years ago, we became faced with, however, a circumstance where what lies in our immediate future is too much spending, which means that this country has to borrow money. It is money that needs to be paid back.

But in the process of taking money, setting priorities, and spending money, there also is something called interest on the debt. And that is, if money were free and you could just borrow money but not pay interest for it, I am sure we would not mind how much we borrowed.

But the bottom line is that is not the reality. The reality is that we have to pay for money that we borrow. And that debt which we have to pay money back for means that every single year the amount of money that we pay and that comes out of the pot of money gets larger and larger and larger. And paying back debt competes against money that we can spend on behalf of people.

And so, at some point, if you just buy off on that we have got to spend more and more and more, that means that we have to take more as debt and pay more of interest. And that competes in a marketplace, in a budget, against projects that we would like to do and that do actually help people and that do focus on the most needy and the most vulnerable in our society.

But we are spending, Mr. Speaker, an incredible amount of money. And we are trying to learn over time how to become more efficient, how to make our cities even better, how to create jobs, and how to educate people and to bring them forth in a mature way. That is what every great nation really will be ultimately charged with: how can you make your country better not just today, but for the future.

And so Republicans do stand for not spending more than what we make so that we have more that we can make in a balanced budget today and spend in a way that creates a better future for our children and grandchildren.

The bottom line is, over the last 6 years, we have gone from a debt of \$9 trillion to \$18 trillion. Some could say that was while we slept, but that is not true. It happened while we were trying to offer better opportunities and resolve.

So, for the last 5 years, Republicans have said we are going to quit this runaway spending, we are going to make tough decisions, and we are going to protect this great Nation at the same time. But we are asking for the American people to also recognize what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. And just as I speak to you today, I speak to people back home, as other Members of Congress do to their constituents, and say we are trying to balance what we do over time with the efficiencies that keep this great Nation great.

I will be honest with you. We live in the greatest Nation in the world. And thank God we are Americans. We trust in God, but we also trust in discipline to make this great Nation even better. And that is what appropriations bills are about: priority, making this great Nation still great tomorrow with discipline. And discipline has a lot to do with our ability to be a great Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Before making my remarks, I just want to say in a challenging way to the chairman of the Rules Committee that if we were to fix a bridge, it takes people to fix that bridge. And the people who fix that bridge spend their money in the local areas and pay taxes, which brings revenue back in. And that is why we need to fix bridges, in my judgment.

I am pleased at this time to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend with whom it is a pleasure to serve with on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for consideration of the Transportation-HUD and CJS appropriations bills.

First, let me express my astonishment at the big giveaways to the trucking industry in this Transportation-HUD bill. This bill is loaded up with pet projects of the trucking industry that threaten the health and safety of the traveling public.

The lack of regard for the safety and well-being of those on the roads and bridges is stunning. It is hard to believe that some of the provisions that are contained as policy riders in these appropriations bills are actually there.

This bill should focus on strengthening America's infrastructure, repairing crumbling bridges, investing in public transportation, and making our roads safer, but instead puts the trucking industry in the driving seat, leaving the average American left behind.

The bill would, one, increase truck weights in Idaho and Kansas; two, allow twin 33-foot trailers on interstates; three, delay full implementation of DOT's hours of service rule, which requires minimum rest periods for truckers; and, four, prohibit the Department of Transportation from increasing minimum insurance requirements for big trucks and motor coaches.

Mr. Speaker, with all that we know, it is simply outrageous that we would allow bigger and heavier trucks on our highways.

Today's bill is intended specifically to appropriate funds, not authorize new policy. Yet this is exactly what these policy riders are doing. They don't belong on this bill.

Furthermore, there was not a single hearing on these trucking riders: not one subcommittee hearing, not one full committee hearing. These issues are important enough where they should be openly debated as part of a comprehensive surface transportation authorization bill, not tacked on to an appropriations bill. They don't belong here. But this process has become so corrupted that anything goes. Committees of jurisdiction are routinely disregarded and disrespected.

Making these controversial policy changes before the Department of Transportation finishes their comprehensive truck size and weight study that was required by MAP-21 would be irresponsible. We should allow the Department of Transportation the time it needs to get their study right.

Simply put, these trucking industry riders will make our highways less safe at a time when our infrastructure funding is woefully inadequate and our roads and bridges are crumbling.

In just the past 4 years, we have seen a dramatic 17 percent increase in the number of truck crash deaths and an alarming 28 percent increase in injuries. Instead of advancing safety measures to make our roads safer, Congress is about to roll back significant safety laws and regulations that will result in more deaths and more injuries on our roads and highways. In fatal truck and car crashes, 96 percent of the fatalities are occupants of the passenger car.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion is clear: Americans do not want bigger trucks or tired truck drivers on the road. Seventy-six percent of Americans opposed longer and heavier trucks, and 80 percent were opposed to increasing truck driver working and driving hours.

Yet here we are with authorizing language on an appropriations bill to make our roads less safe. Why are my friends doing this? It might be good policy for fundraising purposes, but it is lousy policy for the American people.

These dangerous riders don't belong here. They threaten the safety of everyday Americans on the road, and we ought to insist that they be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to express my concern about the dangerous and backward-thinking riders that are included in both the CJS and Transportation-HUD Appropriations bills regarding Cuba.

Obviously, there are several Members here in this House who are nostalgic for the cold war, who are still living in the past. I just want to say, thanks to the leadership of President Obama and this administration, we are making real progress in normalizing relations with Cuba and connecting them with a 21st century economy. We are ending an embarrassing, dumb, and counterproductive policy that by all accounts

has been a miserable failure for the last five decades.

In 2011, after President Obama reinstated the rules allowing Cuban Americans to visit their relatives on the island and permitting all Americans to send remittances to Cuba, hard-liners used the appropriations process to prevent the policies from being implemented. Thankfully, Senate Democrats kept the hard-liners' provisions out of the omnibus bill, and legislation reversing the modest but hopeful travel and remittance reforms never reached the President's desk.

□ 1315

As a result, hundreds of thousands of trips between the U.S. and Cuba have taken place every year since, reuniting families and increasing the number of Cubans receiving the economic support they need to run their own businesses and lead more independent lives.

Instead of celebrating the progress, hard-liners are once again trying to shut down the new openings for greater citizen diplomacy created by this administration. This is the wrong thing to do for America; this is the wrong thing to do for American companies, and it is the wrong thing to do for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in six decades, the United States Government is encouraging citizen diplomacy, greater travel and trade, and telecommunications and other industries to build relationships and stronger ties with counterparts among the Cuban people and new entrepreneurs.

American businesses are already seeing the potential for economic growth. That is why JetBlue and other airlines are expanding charter services and planning commercial routes, why ferry companies are planning to set sail for Havana, why Airbnb and Netflix are hoping to build real businesses in the Cuban market, why Governors in red and blue States alike are trying to position companies in their States to succeed.

The provisions in these bills are antibusiness. Airlines and maritime businesses have already taken steps to initiate travel service to and from Cuba based on the administration's December 17, 2014, announcement, and these provisions in these bills will block them.

Even the United States Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes these provisions, and they have sent a letter to Congress basically making the case why we ought to have better and more open travel and trade with Cuba.

It is why Americans across the country and Cuban Americans in communities where they live are so deeply committed to a policy that puts the cold war behind us and puts our country on a path to creating a new and brighter future with Cuba.

Simply put, these provisions in these appropriations bills are trying to pull the plug on new efforts by U.S. citizens and U.S. companies to expand their

presence in Cuba. As the policy moves forward, they keep trying to pull us back into the cold war and a policy that has failed for over 50 years.

Let's be clear. The Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill would ground new commercial or charter flights that came into being after March 15, 2015. JetBlue and Tampa International Airport are just two beneficiaries of the President's new policy who would be adversely affected.

With new ferries leaving port, as much as \$340 million would be pumped into Florida's economy. These provisions would hold back that economic growth, hurting American businesses in Fort Lauderdale, Tampa, Orlando, and Miami.

Mr. Speaker, the CJS bill would shut down U.S. exports to Cuba in ways that will affect telecommunications firms now in negotiations to open up phone and Internet connections on the island.

Do we want Cubans to be better connected to the outside world? I thought the answer was a huge bipartisan yes, but apparently not. The ugly truth is that these provisions in these bills are hiding their real intent, and that is to shut down the growing connections between Cuba and the United States and our citizens and U.S. companies.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues that these provisions, first of all, do not belong in appropriations bills. They are authorizing language. They don't belong even in this debate.

I would suggest to them that these appropriations bills aren't going to see the light of day as long as these provisions are in this bill. I would urge my colleagues to put the cold war behind them and to get rid of these provisions, and let's move on to a better and more productive relationship.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful part about these last two speakers is that the rule allows them to come to the floor and to present an amendment to strike or to add anything that they would like to add into this bill. That is the beauty of what we are trying to do here today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would just respond to the chairman by saying the thing about this rule that is so frustrating is that important amendments are only given 10 minutes of debate, 5 minutes on each side. Some of these issues are important and deserve more than 5 minutes of debate.

We are not going to have debates. We are going to offer amendments and then, essentially, vote. I am not so excited about the way this rule has been constructed, especially given the fact that very little time is being allotted to discuss some of these important issues.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you ask my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, if he

is ready to close. I have no additional speakers at this time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman asking. I have no further speakers and, in fact, would, as we have done many times, allow the gentleman to offer his close, and then I would also.

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

These bills exemplify the recklessness and the foolishness of the majority's almost exclusive focus on domestic appropriations for deficit reduction, while leaving the main drivers of the deficit unaddressed. We cannot continue on this path if we intend to maintain our country's economic competitiveness.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and underlying bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my two colleagues who serve on the Rules Committee, the gentleman Mr. MCGOVERN and the gentleman Mr. HASTINGS.

They are both not only extremely committed men to their constituency, but also to bettering this House of Representatives. Their voice and their words and their opportunities of which they stand up for, I have great respect for, and want to thank them for the character in which they have come after today's not only debate, but yesterday's debate that took a number of hours as we heard from four Members of this body about their ideas about how we should pursue these two appropriations bills today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to confine my comments to a perspective, and that is satisfaction that I have for the way in which this process is working today. I understand, as acknowledged in the very beginning, we have an issue with how much money we are going to spend.

I recognize we are back at 2008 levels in 2015 in most of these bills. I do acknowledge that. I do acknowledge that we are asking—requiring—on government a chance to run their agencies—spend money back at 2008 spending levels.

I think that the process that we are going through will also be an advantage ultimately, sure, in the short-term, but ultimately, where we will look at this as a prioritization basis, where we will empower the government, if they work with us and if we work with them, to understand how we can keep this country great—even spending less money—how we can continue to prioritize the decisionmaking to where we can pick and choose what needs to be done.

Look, it doesn't make me happy. It makes no Member of this body happy. Certainly, the Speaker, the gentleman from Florida, would recognize—you have needs in your district. I do, from Dallas, Texas, have needs in my immediate district and districts that are around.

The overwhelming need is all of us—and that is not to spend more than we

can say and justify for our future because the dollars that we spend are borrowed. The dollars that we borrow and spend show up on our bottom-line debt, and it impacts everybody.

The bottom line is we have to pay back interest on that money, just like any family that takes out money on a home loan or a credit card or something else. They have to be able to understand that takes away because they are paying for that, their ability to spend money in a different way.

Our Republican majority is well aware of the demand that is placed on us, that we cannot go and do all the things that we would wish to do, but we have accepted and taken a pledge that we have given to the American people that they do get an understanding—that is we are not going to keep in the circumstance of spending money based upon taking out a loan because it is not good for our children, our grandchildren. It is not good for our future.

Mr. Speaker, today, we have had a chance to debate these two bills in this one rule. I think, once again, as I stated earlier, it is a commitment to transparency and openness that this body has and every Member retains here on the floor. You saw part of it today.

Through this open modified rule, each Member will have the opportunity to submit their ideas to two underlying bills, H.R. 2578 and H.R. 2577. Through this rule, the House will be able to work its way through majority rule floor votes and to make sure that the vital appropriations process is vigorous, is timely, and reflects the will of this body.

When this rule is adopted, a robust debate will take place in a way that will allow us to fund these important measures, over \$100 billion.

I think that, as we talk about this, you can see, Mr. Speaker, that this body is getting its work done. It is getting its work done. We passed a budget. We will pass the appropriations bills.

We go home every weekend; we look our constituents in the eye, and we have to justify what we are doing. We are following a process that we said we would do. It is for the betterment of this country, to keep this country strong.

I am proud of the Members of this body; and, as a Republican member of our leadership team, I can tell you that we intend to follow through with the process, the promise that we make to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the underlying bills, for this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of this resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—242

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

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—10

Adams Hudson Neugebauer
 Clyburn Jackson Lee Roe (TN)
 Delaney Lujan Grisham Yoho
 Fitzpatrick (NM)

□ 1353

Mr. BILIRAKIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 170, answered “present” 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—240

Abraham Frelinghuysen Noem
 Allen Gabbard Nugent
 Gallego Gallego Nunes
 Goodlatte Goodlatte O'Rourke
 Gosar Olson Gosar
 Gowdy Palmer Palmer
 Graham Graham Pelosi
 Granger Granger Perlmutter
 Grayson Grayson Peterson
 Green, Al Green, Al Bilirakis
 Grothman Grothman Bishop (GA)
 Guthrie Guthrie Bishop (MI)
 Hahn Hahn Bishop (UT)
 Hardy Hardy Black
 Harper Harper Rangel
 Harris Harris Rice (NY)
 Heck (WA) Heck (WA) Blum
 Hensarling Hensarling Blumenauer
 Higgins Higgins Bonamici
 Himes Himes Brady (TX)
 Hinojosa Hinojosa Brat
 Huelskamp Huelskamp Bridenstine
 Huffman Huffman Brooks (AL)
 Hultgren Hultgren Bustos
 Hunter Hunter Butterfield
 Hurt (VA) Hurt (VA) Calvert
 Issa Issa Johnson (GA)
 Russell Johnson (GA) Johnson, Sam
 Ryan (WI) Ryan (WI) Jolly
 Salmon Salmon Kaptur
 Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta Katko
 Sanford Sanford Keating
 Scalise Scalise Kennedy
 Schiff Schiff King (IA)
 Schweikert Schweikert King (NY)
 Scott (VA) Scott (VA) Kline
 Scott, Austin Scott, Austin Knight
 Scott, David Scott, David Kuster
 Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner Labrador
 Serrano Serrano LaMalfa
 Sessions Sessions Langevin
 Shimkus Shimkus Larsen (WA)
 Simpson Simpson Larson (CT)
 Smith (NE) Smith (NE) Latta
 Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ) Lipinski
 Smith (TX) Smith (TX) Loeb sack
 Smith (WA) Smith (WA) Lofgren
 Speier Speier Long
 Stefanik Stefanik Loudermilk
 Stewart Stewart Lowey
 Stutzman Stutzman Lucas
 Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA) Luetkemeyer
 Takai Takai Luján, Ben Ray
 Takano Takano (NM)
 Thornberry Thornberry Lummis
 Titus Titus Lynch
 Trott Trott Marchant
 Tsongas Tsongas Marino
 Upton Upton Massie
 Van Hollen Van Hollen Matsui
 Wagner Wagner McCarthy
 Walden Walden McCaul
 Walorski Walorski McClintock
 Walters, Mimi Walters, Mimi McCollum
 Walz Walz McHenry
 Wasserman Wasserman McMorris
 Schultz Schultz Rodgers
 Webster (FL) Webster (FL) McNeerney
 Welch Welch Meadows
 Westerman Westerman Meeks
 Whitfield Whitfield Meng
 Williams Williams Mica
 Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL) Miller (MI)
 Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC) Moolenaar
 Womack Womack Mooney (WV)
 Young (IA) Young (IA) Moulton
 Young (IN) Young (IN) Mullin
 Zeldin Zeldin Murphy (PA)
 Zinke Zinke Nadler
 Napolitano Napolitano
 Newhouse Newhouse

NAYS—170

Aderholt Brown (FL) Clarke (NY)
 Aguilar Brownley (CA) Clawson (FL)
 Amash Buchanan Cleaver
 Bass Buck Coffman
 Benishek Bucshon Collins (GA)
 Bera Burgess Connolly
 Beyer Capuano Costa
 Boyle, Brendan Bost Cárdenas
 F. Boyle, Brendan Carson (IN)
 Brady (PA) F. Castor (FL)
 Brooks (IN) Chabot
 Chaffetz Chaffetz

Denham Kind Richmond
 DeSantis Kinzinger (IL) Rigell
 Dingell Kirkpatrick Rogers (AL)
 Dold Lance Rooney (FL)
 Duffy Lawrence Ros-Lehtinen
 Ellison Lee Rouzer
 Ellmers (NC) Levin Roybal-Allard
 Farenthold Lewis Rush
 Fleming Lieu, Ted Ryan (OH)
 Flores LoBiondo Sarbanes
 Foxx Love Schakowsky
 Fudge Lowenthal Schrader
 Garamendi MacArthur Sewell (AL)
 Garrett Maloney, Sherman
 Gibbs Carolyne Shuster
 Gibson Maloney, Sean Sinema
 Graves (GA) McDermott Sires
 Graves (LA) McGovern Slaughter
 Graves (MO) McKinley Smith (MO)
 Green, Gene Green, Gene Griffith Stivers
 Griffith Meehan Miller (FL)
 Guinta Moore Thompson (CA)
 Hanna Moore Thompson (MS)
 Hartzler Mulvaney Thompson (PA)
 Hastings Murphy (FL) Tiberi
 Heck (NV) Heck (NV) Neal
 Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler Nolan
 Hice, Jody B. Hice, Jody B. Norcross
 Hill Hill Palazzo
 Holding Holding Pallone
 Honda Honda Paulsen
 Hoyer Hoyer Payne
 Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI) Pearce
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX) Perry
 Israel Israel Peters
 Jeffries Jeffries Peterson
 Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
 Jenkins (WV) Jenkins (WV) Poe (TX)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH) Poliquin
 Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B. Price, Tom
 Jones Jones Ratcliffe
 Jordan Jordan Reed
 Joyce Joyce Reichert
 Kelly (IL) Kelly (IL) Renacci
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA) Rice (NY)
 Kilmer Kilmer Rice (SC) Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert Tonko

NOT VOTING—20

Adams Hudson Pascarell
 Amodei Amodei Jackson Lee Pingree
 Clyburn Clyburn Kildee Pitts
 Delaney Delaney Lamborn Roe (TN)
 DesJarlais DesJarlais Lujan Grisham Sánchez, Linda
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick (NM) T.
 Grijalva Grijalva Messer
 Gutiérrez Gutiérrez Neugebauer

□ 1401

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 268—“yea;” rollcall No. 269—“yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcalls Nos. 265 through 269.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 265, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 266, I would have voted “yea.”

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 267, I would have voted “no.”

On this bill, H.R. 1335, I want to emphasize that I oppose this legislation because it would roll back the progress we've made in protecting fisheries, damaging our environment and economy, especially in the Chesapeake Bay.

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 268, I would have voted “nay.”

Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 269, I would have voted “nay.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1994

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 1994. While I strongly support our American veterans, I am concerned about permanent changes to hard-won labor agreements.

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

There was no objection.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE,
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2578, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2578.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1403

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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I am very pleased to present to the House the fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill with my colleague, Mr. CHAKA FATTAH of Pennsylvania.

I would like to begin by thanking my ranking member CHAKA FATTAH of Pennsylvania. It has been a pleasure to work with him. We have worked together closely on this legislation. I appreciate Mr. FATTAH's approach to the bill. His input has improved the bill

considerably. I look forward to working with him and all the members of the subcommittee as we move forward and go into conference with the Senate on this important legislation. I also want to thank Chairman HAL ROGERS of Kentucky and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY of New York for their help in putting this legislation together.

This is my first year chairing the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. It is an extraordinarily important committee that oversees so many noble and worthwhile efforts that the Federal Government is engaged, both in preserving and protecting lives and property of the American people and advancing scientific research and space exploration.

I am especially grateful to Chairman HAL ROGERS for his trust in me in this extraordinarily important assignment. I want to thank him also for his generous allocation to this subcommittee. As the Congress under the Republican leadership has done our very best to live within our means, as every American must do, every business and every private citizen knows how important it is to only spend the money that you have on hand. Don't spend more than you have got. We have in this Republican Congress done our very best through the appropriations process to live within our means.

Our subcommittee has—with that in mind, I am a personal follower of Dave Ramsey's advice. I do so in my personal life and try to do so in representing the people of west Houston—don't spend more money than you have got, and the money you have got you want to prioritize—and we have in this subcommittee prioritized the many agencies that we have responsibility for. In priority order, we have approached it with law enforcement number one and made sure that the FBI has got the resources they need to do their job of protecting this Nation against terrorists and espionage, cyber espionage. They are a growing problem that we see in so many ways. The enemies of the United States have figured out how to hardwire Trojan horses and back doors into telecommunications equipment. The FBI has just done a spectacular job of protecting this Nation in the area of cyber espionage and terrorism, and we have made the FBI a top priority in this legislation and made sure that they have got all the money that they need to do their job.

We have also prioritized the work the Department of Justice is doing in enforcing our laws. We have made sure that scientific research, space exploration are prioritized, and America will preserve its leadership in the world in space exploration.

We have made sure that weather forecasting is funded and taken care of. Managing the Nation's fisheries is extraordinarily important.

As you work down that list of priorities, we have made sure those at the top of the list are fully funded and

those that tend to fall towards the bottom—we have just simply had to drop some programs that are no longer authorized, the length of time for which Congress approved them is expired, or they weren't fulfilling the function for which they were originally intended.

But we in the bill before us today, Mr. Chairman, have provided \$51.4 billion in funding for this year, which is a \$1.3 billion increase over last year but \$661 million below the President's request. The President's budget assumed a number of tax increases and fee increases that are simply not going to happen. We, again, wanted to live within our means and do our very best to minimize the debt that we are passing on to our children and grandchildren, so we have done our best in this environment to fund the priority programs while reducing funding for activities that are not essential to the operations of the Federal Government.

Once we have taken care of the FBI and made sure they have got the funding they need to protect this Nation in an era of evolving threats, we have also included funding, Mr. Chairman, for 55 new immigration judges. Our committee has jurisdiction over these executive branch judges who handle immigration cases. Because of the tremendous backlog of immigration cases, we have added 55 new immigration judges to reduce that backlog and made sure at the same time that we are providing for fully funding the U.S. Attorney's Offices, the Marshals Service, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the ATF—Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—and our prison system.

Now, for State and local law enforcement, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has increased funding for priority programs such as the Byrne Formula Program and the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program funding, which compensate State and local taxpayers for the cost of housing people who are in the country illegally and have committed criminal acts in violation of State law and are housed in State prison facilities—that is the responsibility of the Federal Government—and we have funded that program to the highest extent that we can.

We have also funded youth mentoring programs, which have done such great work. We have created, in addition, Mr. Chairman, in this bill a \$53 million community trust program that will fund police body cameras, body camera demonstration programs, and justice reinvestment initiatives.

I want to say a special thanks to our Texas State Senator Royce West, who just concluded the Texas legislative session. Texas became the first State in the Union to pass legislation controlling when, where, and how body camera data can be provided to law enforcement or in a criminal trial to make sure to protect the privacy rights of individuals. We respect that. In our legislation we make sure that State law controls when, where, and how police body camera data will be used.

We have also made sure, Mr. Chairman, that NASA is fully funded in this legislation. We have provided an \$18.5 billion funding level this year for NASA, which is a \$519 million increase and is equal to the request we received from the President.

We have made sure to preserve America's leadership role in manned space exploration, planetary science, and made sure that we are also continuing to advance aeronautics research that NASA does such an extraordinarily important job in.

We have funded the continued development of the Orion crew vehicle at the level asked for by the White House and increased our resources for the Space Launch System to speed up when we will use that important launch system to get Americans back into orbit.

We have made sure that the National Science Foundation is fully funded. We increased the funding level for the National Science Foundation by \$50 million above the historically high level they had in last year's bill.

We also included full funding for the very important BRAIN Initiative, which Ranking Member FATTAH has championed over the years, which promises to unlock the secrets of the single most important organ in the human body and promises great things for the future.

Mr. Chairman, we have also funded the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, prioritizing weather forecasting and fisheries management in particular.

We made sure the Joint Polar Satellite System is funded, as well as the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite series.

We have, though, in order to live within our allocation, had to reduce funding in some other areas, eliminating those that no longer were necessary, those whose authorizations had expired, and, in fact, cut funding for more than a dozen bureaus and agencies that can operate with a little less.

Let me also point out in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that we have in this legislation extraordinarily important oversight language that requires each agency under our jurisdiction to submit a spending plan to the subcommittee. We have capped the life cycle costs for poorly performing programs. And we have also withheld some funding for the Department of Justice until the new Attorney General can demonstrate to us that the inspector general's recommendations regarding sexual harassment and inappropriate conduct are being implemented. I cannot stress that highly enough. When I met with the new Attorney General, that was one of the first things I brought to her attention.

We have also required, Mr. Chairman, that agencies that purchase very sensitive information technology or telecommunication systems conduct a supply chain risk assessment in consultation with the FBI to be sure that there are no hardwired Trojan horses or back doors in that communications equipment or computer equipment being purchased by the Federal Government in those agencies under our jurisdiction.

We are also requiring quarterly reporting on immigration judge performance and requiring agencies to provide inspectors general with timely information.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that our legislation today continues Second Amendment protections that have been built into the bill before. We have withheld funding, for example, to make sure that the United Nation's arms control treaty there has been some discussion about is not funded.

We have also prohibited the transfer or housing of GTMO prisoners into the United States.

But above all, the bottom line on this legislation is we want to ensure that the law as enacted by Congress is enforced. If an agency wants to have access to our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, Mr. Chairman, they are going to need to demonstrate that they are enforcing the law as written by Congress, not based on some memorandum or some internal document. The law as written by Congress is fundamental to our entire system of government. Our liberty lies in the enforcement of law. It is the most fundamental principle of a republic. This great Nation was founded on that principle that no one is above the law and the law shall be enforced equally and fairly to everybody with due process.

Through our work on this subcommittee with the checks and balances that we have built into this legislation, the agencies under our jurisdiction are going to need to demonstrate that they are enforcing the law as written by Congress in order to entitle them to access to our taxpayers' very precious and hard-earned tax dollars.

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

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2578)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration.....	472,000	506,750	472,000	---	-34,750
Offsetting fee collections.....	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000	---	---
Direct appropriation.....	462,000	496,750	462,000	---	-34,750
Bureau of Industry and Security					
Operations and administration.....	66,500	79,086	74,000	+7,500	-5,086
Defense function.....	36,000	36,000	36,000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Industry and Security.....	102,500	115,086	110,000	+7,500	-5,086
Economic Development Administration					
Economic Development Assistance Programs.....	213,000	227,500	213,000	---	-14,500
Salaries and expenses.....	37,000	45,528	37,000	---	-8,528
Total, Economic Development Administration.....	250,000	273,028	250,000	---	-23,028
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority Business Development.....	30,000	30,016	32,000	+2,000	+1,984
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses.....	100,000	113,849	100,000	---	-13,849
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses.....	248,000	---	---	-248,000	---
Current Surveys and Programs.....	---	277,873	265,000	+265,000	-12,873
Periodic censuses and programs (old structure).....	840,000	---	---	-840,000	---
Periodic censuses and programs (new structure).....	---	1,222,101	848,000	+848,000	-374,101
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	1,088,000	1,499,974	1,113,000	+25,000	-386,974
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	38,200	49,232	35,200	-3,000	-14,032
United States Patent and Trademark Office					
Salaries and expenses, current year fee funding.....	3,458,000	3,272,000	3,272,000	-186,000	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-3,458,000	-3,272,000	-3,272,000	+186,000	---
Total, United States Patent and Trademark Office.....	---	---	---	---	---
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and Technical Research and Services.....	675,500	754,661	675,000	-500	-79,661
(transfer out).....	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	---	---
Industrial Technology Services.....	138,100	306,000	130,000	-8,100	-176,000
Manufacturing extension partnerships.....	(130,000)	(141,000)	(130,000)	---	(-11,000)
Advanced manufacturing technology consortia.....	(8,100)	(15,000)	---	(-8,100)	(-15,000)
Manufacturing innovation institutes coordination..	---	(150,000)	---	---	(-150,000)
Construction of research facilities.....	50,300	59,000	50,000	-300	-9,000
Working Capital Fund (by transfer).....	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	---	---
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	863,900	1,119,661	855,000	-8,900	-264,661

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2578)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, Research, and Facilities.....	3,202,398	3,413,360	3,147,877	-54,521	-265,483
(by transfer).....	(116,000)	(130,164)	(130,164)	(+14,164)	---
Promote and Develop Fund (transfer out).....	(-116,000)	(-130,164)	(-130,164)	(-14,164)	---
Subtotal.....	3,202,398	3,413,360	3,147,877	-54,521	-265,483
Procurement, Acquisition and Construction.....	2,179,225	2,498,679	1,960,034	-219,191	-538,645
Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery.....	65,000	58,000	65,000	---	+7,000
Fishermen's Contingency Fund.....	350	350	350	---	---
Fisheries Finance Program Account.....	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000	---	---
Pacific groundfish fishing capacity reduction loan....	---	10,300	---	---	-10,300
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	5,440,973	5,974,689	5,167,261	-273,712	-807,428
Departmental Management					
Salaries and expenses.....	56,000	71,095	50,000	-6,000	-21,095
Renovation and Modernization.....	4,500	24,062	3,989	-511	-20,073
Office of Inspector General.....	30,596	35,190	32,000	+1,404	-3,190
Total, Departmental Management.....	91,096	130,347	85,989	-5,107	-44,358
=====					
Total, title I, Department of Commerce.....	8,466,669	9,802,632	8,210,450	-256,219	-1,592,182
(by transfer).....	118,000	132,164	132,164	+14,164	---
(transfer out).....	-118,000	-132,164	-132,164	-14,164	---
=====					
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	111,500	119,437	105,000	-6,500	-14,437
Justice Information Sharing Technology.....	25,842	37,440	25,842	---	-11,598
Total, General Administration.....	137,342	156,877	130,842	-6,500	-26,035
Administrative review and appeals.....	351,072	488,381	426,791	+75,719	-61,590
Transfer from immigration examinations fee account	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	---	---
Direct appropriation.....	347,072	484,381	422,791	+75,719	-61,590
Office of Inspector General.....	88,577	93,709	92,000	+3,423	-1,709
United States Parole Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	13,308	13,547	13,308	---	-239
Legal Activities					
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	885,000	1,037,386	885,000	---	-152,386
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.....	7,833	9,358	8,000	+167	-1,358
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	162,246	164,977	162,246	---	-2,731
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-100,000	-124,000	-124,000	-24,000	---
Direct appropriation.....	62,246	40,977	38,246	-24,000	-2,731
Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys.....	1,960,000	2,032,216	1,995,000	+35,000	-37,216
United States Trustee System Fund.....	225,908	228,107	225,908	---	-2,199
Offsetting fee collections.....	-225,908	-162,000	-162,000	+63,908	---
Direct appropriation.....	---	66,107	63,908	+63,908	-2,199

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2578)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Salaries and expenses, Foreign Claims Settlement					
Commission.....	2,326	2,374	2,326	---	-48
Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	270,000	270,000	270,000	---	---
Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service....	12,250	14,446	13,000	+750	-1,446
Assets Forfeiture Fund.....	20,514	20,514	---	-20,514	-20,514
Total, Legal Activities.....	3,220,169	3,493,378	3,275,480	+55,311	-217,898
United States Marshals Service					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,195,000	1,230,581	1,220,000	+25,000	-10,581
Construction.....	9,800	15,000	11,000	+1,200	-4,000
Federal Prisoner Detention.....	495,307	1,454,414	1,058,081	+562,774	-396,333
Total, United States Marshals Service.....	1,700,107	2,699,995	2,289,081	+588,974	-410,914
National Security Division					
Salaries and expenses.....	93,000	96,596	95,000	+2,000	-1,596
Interagency Law Enforcement					
Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement.....	507,194	519,301	510,000	+2,806	-9,301
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,378,089	3,413,813	3,444,306	+66,217	+30,493
Counterintelligence and national security.....	4,948,480	5,000,812	5,045,480	+97,000	+44,668
Subtotal.....	8,326,569	8,414,625	8,489,786	+163,217	+75,161
Construction.....	110,000	68,982	57,982	-52,018	-11,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	8,436,569	8,483,607	8,547,768	+111,199	+64,161
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,400,000	2,463,123	2,445,459	+45,459	-17,664
Diversion control fund.....	-366,680	-371,514	-371,514	-4,834	---
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration.....	2,033,320	2,091,609	2,073,945	+40,625	-17,664
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,201,000	1,261,158	1,250,000	+49,000	-11,158
Federal Prison System					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,815,000	7,204,158	6,951,500	+136,500	-252,658
Buildings and facilities.....	106,000	140,564	230,000	+124,000	+89,436
Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated.....	2,700	2,700	2,700	---	---
Total, Federal Prison System.....	6,923,700	7,347,422	7,184,200	+260,500	-163,222
State and Local Law Enforcement Activities					
Office on Violence Against Women:					
Prevention and prosecution programs.....	430,000	473,500	479,000	+49,000	+5,500
Office of Justice Programs:					
Research, evaluation and statistics.....	111,000	151,900	---	-111,000	-151,900
State and local law enforcement assistance.....	1,241,000	1,142,300	1,015,400	-225,600	-126,900
Juvenile justice programs.....	251,500	339,400	183,500	-68,000	-155,900

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2578)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Public safety officer benefits:					
Death benefits.....	71,000	72,000	72,000	+1,000	---
Disability and education benefits.....	16,300	16,300	16,300	---	---
Subtotal.....	87,300	88,300	88,300	+1,000	---
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	1,690,800	1,721,900	1,287,200	-403,600	-434,700
Community Oriented Policing Services:					
COPS programs.....	208,000	303,500	237,500	+29,500	-66,000
Total, State and Local Law Enforcement Activities.....	2,328,800	2,498,900	2,003,700	-325,100	-495,200
Total, title II, Department of Justice.....	27,030,158	29,240,480	27,888,115	+857,957	-1,352,365
TITLE III - SCIENCE					
Office of Science and Technology Policy.....	5,555	5,566	5,555	---	-11
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Science.....	5,244,700	5,288,600	5,237,500	-7,200	-51,100
Aeronautics.....	651,000	571,400	600,000	-51,000	+28,600
Space Technology.....	596,000	724,800	625,000	+29,000	-99,800
Exploration.....	4,356,700	4,505,900	4,759,300	+402,600	+253,400
Space Operations.....	3,827,800	4,003,700	3,957,300	+129,500	-46,400
Education.....	119,000	88,900	119,000	---	+30,100
Safety, Security and Mission Services.....	2,758,900	2,843,100	2,768,600	+9,700	-74,500
Construction and environmental compliance and restoration.....	419,100	465,300	425,000	+5,900	-40,300
Office of Inspector General.....	37,000	37,400	37,400	+400	---
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	18,010,200	18,529,100	18,529,100	+518,900	---
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities.....	5,866,125	6,118,780	5,916,125	+50,000	-202,655
Defense function.....	67,520	67,520	67,520	---	---
Subtotal.....	5,933,645	6,186,300	5,983,645	+50,000	-202,655
Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction..	200,760	200,310	200,030	-730	-280
Education and Human Resources.....	866,000	962,570	866,000	---	-96,570
Agency Operations and Award Management.....	325,000	354,840	325,000	---	-29,840
Office of the National Science Board.....	4,370	4,370	4,370	---	---
Office of Inspector General.....	14,430	15,160	15,160	+730	---
Total, National Science Foundation.....	7,344,205	7,723,550	7,394,205	+50,000	-329,345
Total, title III, Science.....	25,359,960	26,258,216	25,928,860	+568,900	-329,356
TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES					
Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,200	9,413	9,200	---	-213
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	364,500	373,112	364,500	---	-8,612

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2016 (H.R. 2578)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	84,500	131,500	84,500	---	-47,000
Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation.....	375,000	452,000	300,000	-75,000	-152,000
Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,340	3,431	3,340	---	-91
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses.....	54,250	56,268	54,250	---	-2,018
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,121	5,121	5,121	---	---
=====					
Total, title IV, Related Agencies.....	895,911	1,030,845	820,911	-75,000	-209,934
=====					
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
DOC Departmental Management, Franchise Fund (rescission).....	-2,906	---	---	+2,906	---
DOC, National Technical Information Service (rescission).....	---	---	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000
DOC, Economic Development Assistance Programs (rescission).....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
DOJ, Working Capital Fund (rescission).....	-99,000	-55,000	-100,000	-1,000	-45,000
DOJ, Tactical Law Enforcement Wireless Communications (rescission).....	-2,000	---	---	+2,000	---
DOJ, Detention Trustee (rescission).....	-23,000	---	---	+23,000	---
DOJ, Assets Forfeiture Fund (rescission).....	-193,000	-304,000	---	+193,000	+304,000
FBI, Salaries and Expenses, nondefense (rescission)...	---	-49,000	-49,000	-49,000	---
FBI, Salaries and Expenses, defense (rescission).....	---	-71,000	-71,000	-71,000	---
DOJ, Salaries and expenses, general legal activities (rescission).....	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
DOJ, Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division (rescission).....	-6,000	---	---	+6,000	---
DOJ, Salaries and expenses, U.S. Attorneys (rescission).....	-9,000	---	---	+9,000	---
Federal Prisoner Detention (rescission).....	-188,000	-69,500	-69,500	+118,500	---
DOJ, ATF, Salaries and expenses (rescission).....	-3,200	---	---	+3,200	---
Violence against women prevention and prosecution programs (rescission).....	-16,000	-5,020	-15,000	+1,000	-9,980
Office of Justice programs (rescission).....	-82,500	---	-40,000	+42,500	-40,000
COPS (rescission).....	-40,000	-10,000	-20,000	+20,000	-10,000
=====					
Total, title V, General Provisions.....	-679,606	-563,520	-374,500	+305,106	+189,020
=====					
Grand total.....	61,073,092	65,768,653	62,473,836	+1,400,744	-3,294,817
Appropriations.....	(61,752,698)	(66,332,173)	(62,848,336)	(+1,095,638)	(-3,483,837)
Rescissions.....	(-679,606)	(-563,520)	(-374,500)	(+305,106)	(+189,020)
(by transfer).....	118,000	132,164	132,164	+14,164	---
(transfer out).....	-118,000	-132,164	-132,164	-14,164	---

□ 1415

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first, since this is my first appearance on the floor since the tragic news of the Vice President's son's death, offer my condolences. I am sure all of my colleagues and the people of Philadelphia consider the Biden family one of our own since they are nearby neighbors.

I also want to offer my sincere condolences and concern for the people of Texas, given the tragedy of the deaths and the severe weather incidents there that have occasioned the flooding.

We rise today in moving an appropriations bill, the Commerce, Justice, Science bill. The chairman and the ranking member from New York have assisted the subcommittee in its work. I want to thank the subcommittee chairman for all of the cooperation that has been extended.

He has pointed to a number of the circumstances in which he has helped make sure that priorities that we were interested in were accommodated in the bill, and I want to talk a little bit about that.

One is in the area of brain science, neuroscience. The BRAIN Initiative is critically important. We have some 50 million Americans suffering from brain-related diseases or disorders. Fifty million in a country of a little over 300 million is a very significant number.

The diseases themselves, everything from Alzheimer's to epilepsy, autism, brain cancer—in the case of the Vice President's son—a whole host of challenges that cost our country in not just financial ways, but affect so many families.

I want to thank the chairman for his continued cooperation and work with me on what I think is the most important area of scientific discovery that we need to be focused on as a nation.

Also, in the area of youth mentoring, the work in terms of supporting our efforts to make sure that millions of the Nation's young people have the appropriate guidance that they need, such as the great congressionally chartered organizations like the Boys & Girls Clubs of America; the YMCA; and Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, which is celebrating their 100th anniversary this month. I want to thank him for that.

I could go on through a laundry list of areas, manufacturing and the like, in which we have worked very closely together; and there is nothing that could be improved upon in terms of the process between the interactions between the majority and the minority on this bill.

There is an elephant in the room, no pun intended, in the sense that the majority has an absolute view about the budget allocations, given the Budget Control Act, and see that as something that limits our ability to meet the challenges of our great Nation.

The minority has the view that we need to move away from that budget

control agreement and move away from these automatic caps and meet the needs, as the Constitution indicated that the Appropriations Committee's job was, to meet the needs of our great Nation. We know that there are needs that are not going to be met.

The chairman just talked about how important our system of laws were. Well, in this bill, we fall short, at least at this moment, of what we need to fully do to fund the Legal Services Corporation, which was established under a Republican administration; but it provides services, not to Democrats or Republicans, but to Americans all across our country, to provide access to the courts and to make sure that they can have due process in civil litigations. We know that we are short there.

We have a constitutional responsibility to fund the Census. We are going to, at this moment, fall shy of that.

Now, we hope that we will improve this bill. We can't improve the process, but we can improve the product as we go toward a conference with the Senate.

There are areas related to NASA, even though we funded above \$18 billion, which is a historic commitment to NASA, that we still are not dealing with the pressing issues of fully funding Commercial Crew which requires—we have now paid out \$500 million to our Russian counterparts to transport astronauts to the International Space Station, and we are going to have to continue that longer than we need to because we are not able, under the allocation, to meet our responsibilities and the needs on the Commercial Crew appropriations.

Now, Galileo, 400 years ago, pointed us toward Europa. I agree with the chairman that the need to fully explore and to bring back a sample and to do everything else necessary to fully understand what the potential may be is an important effort, but also funding space technology and our Commercial Crew Program—and I know the chairman agrees with me—are going to be important efforts for us to try to improve in this bill as we go towards conference with the Senate.

The minority can't shirk its responsibility to point out these shortcomings. Having pointed them out, I do want to make the point, though, that the working relationship is one that I think appropriately reflects the kind of process we want to have in the House. We want all views to be considered, and I know that every offering of a view from the minority has been fully considered by the chairman.

I thank him, and I want to thank his staff, and I want to thank my staff of the committee because they have worked very hard for us to come to this moment.

We are at a point in the process in which the majority will have its way. There eventually will be a Senate bill, but we also have to weigh in the administration's viewpoint in order to have a law of the land.

The administration has issued a statement on this bill, and in appropriate ways, it compliments the subcommittee for its foresight on a range of points, but it also strongly recommends changes in directions in appropriations in a variety of areas that the administration thinks would hold our country back.

I think that there is a lot to be said about fiscal prudence. We need to make sure that we are operating in a fiscally responsible way.

This Nation at its founding, at the point in which we had to separate ourselves from the British, we borrowed a few dollars. It costs us something at almost every point in the history of our country, as in the case for most families and most businesses, in which you have to make investments and which sometimes those investments cause you to have an imbalance for a moment or for a period of time.

There is a reason why we have mortgages, so that people can buy homes, and we invest in student loans so that young people can get an education. There is a need for our country, from time to time, to look beyond the immediate balance of the books to understand what our calling is.

We say, sometimes, that we are an exceptional nation. Exceptionalism requires us to have some foresight. We know that this is an age of innovation and scientific discovery. Some have suggested that there is nothing new under the Sun, but we know that that is not so.

Just in recent months, we found the largest volcano on Earth—just discovered. We found in drought-stricken parts of Africa, deep down underneath the earth, some of the largest aquifers of water. We have now discovered a warmblooded fish for the first time ever and a new species of bird in China. This is not an age in which discovery is not possible.

This is a time for our country where we should be investing in science and innovation. We have a need to as a country, as I mentioned, of just some 300-million plus, when we compete against billion-plus populated countries like China and India, we can't afford to leave any of our young people in the shadows. We can't afford to not invest in science and innovation.

I want to thank the chairman for what he has done. I want to tell him that we will continue to work with him as we go forward because I believe what we have here today is not a perfect bill, but the foundation for what will be, I think, the best Commerce, Justice, Science bill that could be produced.

It is a beginning of that process, and I want to thank him. I look forward to the debate in the amendment process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank Chairman CULBERSON for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to announce my support of this bill. It contains \$51.4 billion for effective, proven programs within the Departments of Justice and Commerce, as well as NASA and the National Science Foundation. Within that total, funding is targeted at programs that are vital to our economic development, our public safety, and national security.

These important programs, overall, receive a boost of \$1.3 billion over last year, allowing us to make critical investments in law enforcement, counterterrorism, cybersecurity, and science and research activities.

For example, the legislation increases funding for the Department of Justice by \$852 million above last year's levels, enhancing the way we protect and secure communities across the Nation. That increase will provide the FBI with greater resources to fight terrorism and cyber crime.

It will also allow the DEA to amplify activities, including \$372 million to combat prescription drug abuse, what the CDC calls a national epidemic that is taking more lives than car wrecks.

Funding is targeted to high-priority national grants with increases for violence against women programs and the Byrne JAG Program.

The bill also creates a new community trust initiative that will help improve the safety of communities across the Nation and work to facilitate a supportive relationship between these local communities and the police. This includes funding for body camera pilots and research, training, justice reform efforts, and upgraded statistics collection.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also directs funding toward key programs that will help secure America's role as the leader in scientific innovation, grow our economy, and promote job creation. For instance, NASA receives a \$519 million increase above last year, keeping us on the forefront of the space frontier.

The National Science Foundation receives a \$50 million increase, directing funds to programs that will spur U.S. economic competitiveness. To help protect communities from devastating natural disasters, we provided \$5.2 billion for NOAA to help boost weather warning and forecasting efforts.

As with any appropriations bill, Mr. Chairman, the committee had to make some tough choices to live within a tight budget allocation, but that is what the Appropriations Committee does. We make hard decisions.

I believe that this bill does that in a very responsible way, eliminating unnecessary or unneeded programs, reducing funding for other lower-priority programs. This sort of smart budgeting will help improve the way our government operates and show that we can live within our means.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate Chairman CULBERSON for his successful first go as chairman of this subcommittee. He wanted this tour and is

happy to have it and is doing a good job with it, Mr. Chairman, and I am proud of him.

I think he and Ranking Member FATTAH and their subcommittee have drafted a good bill that I am proud to have before the House today. As always, I want to thank the staff for their tireless work in drafting and bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth appropriations bill we have brought to the floor this year, and I am glad we are progressing at a great pace on these very important bills.

I am told that this is the earliest and quickest start to appropriations bills in recorded history. I am proud of the work that our committee is doing and, I think, doing good work.

□ 1430

So I urge my colleagues to continue this forward momentum and vote in favor of this very important and very well done Commerce, Justice, Science funding bill.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member and a great leader for our team on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Chairman CULBERSON on his first Commerce, Justice, and Science bill, as well as Ranking Member FATTAH and full committee Chairman ROGERS for their efforts. I know how hard they worked to try and put together the best bill possible.

Before I go further, I want to thank my friend, Ranking Member FATTAH, and join him in expressing our heartfelt condolences to the Vice President on the loss of his son. I just can't imagine the pain that one feels at such a tragedy. I know our hearts and prayers go out to the Biden family.

The pictures of the floods in Texas were so horrifying, and I know how hard everyone was working to minimize the loss of life. I also want to express my condolences to Chairman CULBERSON as well.

The House Republican "work harder for less" budget resolution was opposed by every Member on my side of the aisle in part because it really makes it impossible to give hard-working Americans the opportunity to succeed. Democrats want to end the sequester, and we need more reasonable and realistic budgeting that could help families afford college, a home, and a secure retirement.

The insufficient overall allocation for discretionary investment hurts initiatives in all the appropriation bills that grow the economy, create jobs, and make us more secure. While I appreciate the chairman's efforts, the grossly inadequate allocation creates shortcomings that are evident in the fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, and Science bill.

Instead of providing the desperately needed investments in community po-

licing and improving the juvenile justice system, the COPS hiring program would receive no funding, and the Office of Juvenile Justice would receive \$68 million less than fiscal year 2015 and \$156 million less than the President's request. These failures are particularly shameful, given the inclusion of a number of gun riders, including language blocking a reporting requirement on multiple purchases of rifles or shotguns by individual buyers. We must eliminate riders such as these that prevent law enforcement from sensibly addressing gun crimes.

While Violence Against Women prevention and prosecution programs would appear to receive an increase above both fiscal year 2015 and the President's fiscal year 2016 request, it is actually below the request when you account for a transfer in Victims of Trafficking grants. Similar gimmicks are also included in the portion of the COPS program that would be funded.

The Legal Services Corporation would fare far worse: \$75 million below fiscal year 2015, \$152 million below the request. This is unacceptable for a vital service that provides legal help for hard-working Americans.

Turning to science, the bill continues the majority's practice of burying its head in the sand instead of focusing on the stark climate change realities. As in previous years, the bill severely cuts funding for NOAA climate research by 19 percent below fiscal year 2015, a \$30 million decrease. We should be supporting, not hindering, this important work to help save our environment.

The bill also cuts Geosciences and Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation by \$257 million below the fiscal year 2015 level, an approach universally opposed by the scientific community.

Rather than properly preparing for the constitutionally mandated 2020 Census, the mark is \$387 million below the President's request for the U.S. Census Bureau. Failure to provide these funds now will only cost taxpayers more in the long run, as the Census Bureau would be unable to thoroughly develop and test innovative, cost-saving business practices. Developing a well-designed and thoughtful Census now could save up to \$5 billion in 2020 Census costs.

As in other bills, the majority has included a number of controversial riders. In addition to those on firearms I already mentioned, another provision is aimed at placing restrictions on exports to Cuba.

However, despite the numerous shortcomings, I want to thank the chairman again for his work related to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, Byrne Justice Assistance Grants, and the community Backlog Reduction Program to process sexual assault kits. These evidentiary kits have historically gone untested for decades, giving violent and culpable offenders the ability to strike again. So it is important we fund this program at a workable level.

I want to make it clear that Democrats are more than willing to support bills that include adequate spending levels to ensure public safety, promote economic growth, and that exclude unnecessary riders. Unfortunately, although this bill does such wonderful things, and I am a great supporter once again of all the brain research, the important investments that are being made to address Alzheimer's, autism, and other serious, serious diseases of the brain, the bill does not make appropriate investments that hard-working Americans need but, instead, advances misguided policy changes. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Thank you again to our chair and ranking members.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), my colleague on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman for a bill that invests responsibly in law enforcement, space science research, ocean and marine resources, and weather sciences. I also want to thank the chairman for his support of an innovative data collection initiative in this bill to improve fish stock assessments and research of the fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico.

As we discussed in many of our hearings, we as a nation need to utilize all tools and technology and work with all fisheries sector participants, including recreational, for-hire, and commercial, that provide the most accurate assessment of the health of our fish stocks, including the red snapper species so critical to our quality of life in Gulf States like Florida and Texas as well as our regional economies. This innovative data collection initiative will better enable the National Marine Fisheries Service and the regional council to make more informed decisions about the length of various fishing seasons.

Mr. Chairman, without constantly improving and accurate and quantifiable data, data that is believed to reliably reflect the fisherman's experience on the water, our commercial and recreational fishermen, alike, find it difficult to understand decisions by government to shorten fishing seasons and limit catches.

To be clear, this new provision included in this year's CJS bill is intended to provide the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office new tools to utilize data collection efforts from our recreational, for-hire, and commercial fishermen, from State and local officials, from third-party researchers, and from academia. Data collection and research focus on the unique stock assessment challenges of Gulf fisheries. By working with our recreational, for-hire, and commercial fishermen, and by engaging them directly in data collection, NMFS Southeast Regional Office will ultimately collect more and better data and will

begin to restore trust between the sectors and regulators.

This public-private effort will allow officials tasked with managing our fishery resources to strike the right balance: balance for our recreational fishing communities' quality of life and right to fish on our waters, balance for our regional economy fueled by the commercial and for-hire fishing industry, and balance for our strong interests in stock rehabilitation, species preservation, and protecting our critical natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with you as we continue to work through this appropriations process on this important provision, as well as working with NOAA and the NMFS Southeast Regional Office, during implementation of this funding to stand up to this critical innovative stock assessment initiative and make it a success for Florida and for all five of our Gulf States, including your home State of Texas.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The chairman and the staff have done a remarkable job working on a whole range of issues related to fish, not just in the Gulf of Mexico and Texas, but throughout the questions around salmon in Washington State and the issues related to even our part of the country where we fish a little bit. So I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. HONDA), my colleague on the subcommittee, who has really helped us on the subcommittee, particularly around areas related to innovation and science and advanced manufacturing.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me start by thanking Chairman CULBERSON and Ranking Member FATTAH for their ongoing enthusiasm and support for many of the key programs funded by this bill. I am grateful for their support, including provisions addressing key concerns of mine such as the growing rape kit backlog and long delays in testing DNA evidence; preventing the politically motivated termination evaluation of a fundamental science observatory, SOFIA; and ensuring the Federal Marine Debris program, which will focus on plastics in our Nation's waterways and oceans. Despite the inclusion of these and other beneficial programs, this bill unfortunately falls short of supporting a robust and effective portfolio of Commerce, Justice, and Science programs.

This bill was crafted under the restrictive spending cap imposed by sequestration. This unworkable funding cap has forced unacceptable cuts that greatly weaken key programs serving our country. For example, at a time when the funding for the constitutionally mandated decennial Census should be on a significant ramp-up, this bill underfunds the Census Bureau by \$387 million.

At the direction of Congress, the Census Bureau is testing sweeping reforms to Census methods that would reduce the overall cost of the enumeration substantially by bringing the Census into the 21st century. But without sufficient money next year, the Census Bureau may have to abandon plans for a modern Census and go back to the more costly, outdated, manual 2010 design, which will end up costing \$5 billion more—\$5 billion. We cannot afford to waste \$5 billion. We need to be fiscally responsible and have an understanding of cuts beyond the time scale of a 1-year funding bill, which means investing in the Census now.

Additionally, this bill severely underfunds and deprioritizes earth science. The bill proposes generous funding to support NASA for planetary science but seems to overlook the most important planet of all—our own. That is why I offered an amendment in committee to fully fund the earth and geoscience research at NASA and NSF instead of the \$520 million underfunding being proposed.

Research in the earth and helio sciences helps protect lives, business, and infrastructure because economic and public welfare consequences of natural hazards such as droughts, hurricanes, space weather, and earthquakes can be devastating. As our climate continues to change, this research is even more important, and yet this bill proposes to cut earth and geoscience research. We should be increasing funding in these fields to better understand natural systems and allow for more informed policy decisionmaking and not cutting them.

Additionally, this bill seeks to micromanage the NSF by singling out earth science and social sciences as lesser research priorities. This is a prime example of political meddling into scientific research. The draconian spending caps have forced the cannibalization of these and other essential programs and resulted in a bill that is unworkable.

□ 1445

We need to adopt the President's proposed overall funding levels to ensure that key programs such as the Census and NASA's Earth Science Research Program are able to be effective and serve our Nation.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS), my colleague and good friend from the committee.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. I thank the Chairman for his good work.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of serving on the Appropriations Committee, which enables me to have input into our spending priorities.

This bill has a number of important programs. I want to highlight drug courts. Drug courts have a proven track record. Drug courts are effective and efficient. Drug courts work.

A respected pastor and community leader in my State said: "Prisons are

for people we are really scared of, not just mad at.”

The drug epidemic continues to ravage my State, and drug courts give a needed alternative to sending those suffering from addiction to jail. Drug courts allow individuals to undergo treatment, get help staying clean, and reenter society as a productive individual.

West Virginia drug courts are succeeding. Earlier this year, West Virginia honored the first 1,000 adults and juveniles to successfully complete the program.

While no single program will solve the drug epidemic, we must continue to support programs that work. This bill maintains critical funding for a number of other programs that will help those trying to end this crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a fellow appropriator.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for yielding but also for his very steady and competent leadership of this subcommittee on our behalf. Also, I want to thank the chairman for his consistent work at bipartisanship, even though this is still yet another funding bill brought to the floor that woefully underfunds our critical Federal programs.

The fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill really should reflect our Nation’s commitment to growing our economy, keeping our communities safe, and driving innovation. Instead, it makes critical cuts to programs at a time when they are needed most.

In the Justice title, this bill includes no funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services Hiring Program and a \$68 million cut to juvenile justice programs from fiscal year 2015.

It also includes a \$75 million cut to the Legal Services Corporation, which provides critical legal services to low-income Americans. Given what is happening in communities around the country, especially in terms of communities of color and law enforcement, these are truly unwise and misguided cuts.

Under the Science title, the National Science Foundation, which funds critical research at the University of California at Berkeley in my congressional district, is funded at \$50 million below the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. These cuts are a huge blow to investments we should be making in scientific research to keep our Nation competitive.

In the Commerce section, this bill also includes cuts to critical programs, such as a \$274 million cut to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and funds the Census Bureau at \$387 million below the President’s budget request.

Add to all of this an inappropriate policy rider about exports to Cuba and you have a bill that, despite the hard work of the chair and our ranking member, is deeply flawed.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. LEE. Finally, let me just say we need to stop starving our critical Federal programs. We need to protect our communities in crisis and drive scientific breakthroughs in the future.

In committee, I sponsored an amendment along with Ranking Member LOWEY to increase COPS Hiring funding and also introduced an amendment to require jurisdictions receiving Byrne-JAG grants to put their officers through training to better work with diverse communities that they protect and serve. Congressman LACY CLAY has championed this idea, and later in this debate we will enter into a colloquy regarding this important issue, and I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their support.

Mr. FATTAH. May I inquire of the time remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), my good friend.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies.

I want to thank the chairman and Ranking Member FATTAH for their efforts to forge a truly bipartisan bill to fund critical programs within the Departments of Justice, Commerce, and the scientific community. This diverse bill provides a wide range of support, from continued scientific research in space to the funding our law enforcement officers need to keep our families and communities safe. It is truly a diverse, vital bill.

Chairman CULBERSON, please permit me one point of clarification in the bill. The NASA budget includes a space operations account. This account provides funding for everything from space communications to research on the International Space Station to supporting space launch complexes. I would like to specifically discuss the space communications function within this account.

Regardless of age or mission, NASA must be able to communicate with the system it has in orbit. The space and ground networks that comprise NASA’s space communications system are the foundation for all of NASA’s orbital work. The network provides constant, real-time communications for all aspects of our space mission, from the unmanned probes at the very edges of our solar system to the ISS and Hubble Space Telescope. Without this capability, our Nation would be jeopardizing the safety of our manned operations and depriving the world of the discoveries made by our space systems.

It should be a commitment of the House to ensure that the funding for our space operations ensures strong support for the infrastructure and support needed to maintain strong and capable space communications.

Again, I thank the committee for its work in crafting this legislation and strongly supporting space communications in the past. It is my understanding that the committee has provided the space operations account with nearly \$130 million more than it did in fiscal year 2015, and that it intends to support a robust level of funding for the space communications component within this account.

Is that understanding correct? I yield to the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague from New Mexico. He is absolutely right. We have increased funding for the space operations account by \$129.5 million, and we will make sure that that funding is adequate to support the space communications components with that increase.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a fellow appropriator.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding, number one. Number two, I want to thank him for the steady leadership he has provided as the ranking member. I also want to thank my good friend from Texas, JOHN CULBERSON. We go back to the State legislature. I thank him for his leadership on this one particular issue that I want to bring up today, and that is the work that we are doing together in adding 55 new immigration judges—the largest amount of immigration judges that we are going to have at one time.

So I want to thank him for working together to add that money, as well as the accountability for those judges. We have got to make sure that we not only have the judges, but we have got to make sure that they move those cases with all due process given to everybody—and to move them as soon as possible. I also thank him for the work that we have done on Stone Garden and other border law enforcement needs.

Why do we need those new judges? Because right now there are more than 450,000 pending cases. There is a large backlog of immigration cases. There are about 250 judges right now, with about 58 courtrooms across the Nation, but we need to do more.

If you look at the casework of an immigration judge, that person will handle about 2,100 cases. If you look at a Federal judge, that judge will handle about 440 cases. You can see the large amount of cases that we have.

So, basically, some of those cases are taking about 2½ years to handle, and therefore we need to make sure that we

have the judges in place to handle the backlog that we have.

Just to give you an example, just in the last 6 months, 170,000 people crossed the border. Therefore, we need those judges.

To conclude, I want to thank the chairman and his staff, as well as the ranking member and his staff.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my good friend.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today deeply concerned by the increase of heroin and opioid abuse in Michigan and around the country.

In Jackson, six heroin-related deaths have happened since March. In April, in Monroe County, three people overdosed in a 24-hour period. Last year, Lenawee County, my home county, had seven drug-related deaths in the first three quarters. Sadly, we hear similar stories in far too many communities across Michigan.

Today's CJS Appropriations bill includes essential funding to assist States and localities to combat drug-related problems, including over \$400 million to advance strategic plans to address the growing heroin and opioid epidemic and \$372 million to tackle prescription drug abuse.

It will take all of us working together—concerned citizens, treatment providers, law enforcement, elected officials at every level—to fight this growing epidemic and keep our homes and streets safe.

I appreciate the work of the chairman of the committee on this, and I support it.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), who has led the Democratic effort in terms of science, and I particularly thank her for her leadership on NASA.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation and respect for the chair as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee.

I really do respect the work, but I do rise in opposition to H.R. 2578. It represents a missed opportunity to help the Nation's research and innovation enterprise at a time when that help is urgently needed.

Until the mismatch between the House budget resolution and the needs facing our country is addressed, we are going to continue to fall behind, both in our efforts to maintain our global competitiveness and our efforts to maintain R&D capabilities we need right here at home.

As ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I would like to use some of my time to address some specific concerns that I have with the bill, which I elaborate on in my statement for the RECORD.

In short, the bill's report language would make arbitrary and ideologi-

cally driven cuts to NSF social sciences and geoscience research programs. In addition, the bill's funding would put NSF's new headquarters building at risk, adding cost growth and schedule delays.

With respect to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in addition to the funding cuts, I am particularly concerned about the report language that would gut the critical forensic standards activities already underway at NIST, as well as the bill's language that would covertly, without any hearings, debate, or authorizing legislation, eliminate an entire agency, the National Technical Information Service.

The bill would also make significant cuts to NOAA's budget, including climate research and NOAA's Polar Follow On weather satellite program.

Finally, the bill would make deep cuts to NASA's Earth Science Program, disrupting activities that will help us better understand our home planet and the climate change that is occurring right now.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, as I said before, the bill is a missed opportunity, and I cannot support it in its current form.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2578. While I respect the work put into the bill by my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, I am afraid that it represents a missed opportunity to help the nation's research and innovation enterprise at a time when that help is urgently needed.

As other speakers have noted, this bill is the result of a fundamentally flawed House budget resolution that provides insufficient allocations for critically important activities of the federal government, including investing in our future. Until that mismatch is addressed, we are going to continue to fall behind, both in our efforts to maintain our global competitiveness and our efforts to maintain the R&D capabilities we need here at home.

As Ranking Member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I would like to use my remaining time to address some specific concerns I have with the bill.

With respect to the National Science Foundation, I have two specific concerns beyond the overall funding level. Following the direction contained in the report accompanying this bill would result in a 15–20% cut to each of the social sciences and geosciences directorates at NSF. Let me be clear. These are arbitrary and ideologically-driven cuts that reflect a lack of understanding of how science works, and a lack of understanding of the great importance of these fields of research to our national interests. Moreover, with these cuts we stand to lose a generation of talent and expertise in fields essential to the wellbeing of this nation, and we may never recover from that loss.

Second, I must comment on the flat-funding for the NSF operations account. NSF is already in the midst of building a new headquarters in Alexandria, and the funding provided to NSF in this bill may very well result in delays and therefore increased cost for that building. This is a clear-cut case of the Congress being penny-wise and pound foolish.

With respect to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, I am concerned

about the funding cuts to all of the accounts. I am particularly concerned about the report language that would gut the critical forensics standards activities already underway at NIST, and the bill language that would covertly, without any hearings, debate, or authorizing legislation, eliminate an entire agency, the National Technical Information Service. NTIS performs both essential and perhaps nonessential activities. This bill would throw out the baby with the bathwater without any consideration given to the consequences.

The CJS bill we are considering today fails short in a number of ways in its treatment of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It cuts the NOAA budget 5 percent below current spending and more than 13 percent below the President's request. This cut will have a significant impact on NOAA's ability to provide local communities and decision-makers with the information they need to effectively manage the nation's resources and protect the lives and property of every American.

I am especially concerned about the lack of support for NOAA's efforts to maintain continuity in our polar observing capabilities. The President's budget request included \$380 million to fund a Polar Follow-on program. This program would help mitigate a potential gap in this critical data by building robustness into our satellite constellation. As many of you know, accurate weather forecasts and warnings are vital for the economic security of the United States, and we must ensure NOAA has the resources it needs now to ensure the long-term health of our satellites.

Additionally, I am concerned about the bill's \$30 million dollar cut to NOAA's climate research activities. Addressing climate change is our most pressing environmental challenge and NOAA's climate research furthers our understanding and the implementation of effective adaptation and mitigation strategies. We should be doing more to combat climate change, not less.

Finally, with respect to NASA, while I'm pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has proposed a strong top-line for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that is consistent with the President's overall request, I am troubled by the way that funding is allocated. In particular, I cannot support the deep cuts made to NASA's Earth Science program. Given the leadership role NASA plays nationally in studies of the Earth system, including climate change, these cuts will do serious long term damage if enacted into law.

In addition, I question the proposed reduction to the Orion crew vehicle program from the FY 2015 funding level, especially given the concern expressed in the report language about NASA's ability to test all human-rated systems on the first Exploration Mission-1. I also question the proposal to fund the Safety, Security, and Mission Services account, which is critical to maintaining a world class workforce and infrastructure, below the President's request.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, as I said before, this bill is a missed opportunity, and I cannot support it in its current form.

I yield back.

□ 1500

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Chairman CULBERSON, and thank you for presenting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of an important amendment that will be offered by my colleague, Representative BLAINE LUETKEMEYER, to defund the Department of Justice program known as Operation Choke Point.

Created under the guise of a program to root out banking fraud and money laundering, Operation Choke Point has been used by administration bureaucrats to pressure and force banks to end relationships with legitimate businesses it considers objectionable or a "reputational risk."

This administration has targeted legitimate small businesses such as firearm and ammunition dealers, cigar shops, pawn stores, payday lenders, and others. The backdoor effort to target legitimate law-abiding businesses it does not like and to coerce banks to choke off relationships with these legitimate businesses is contrary to our Nation's fundamental principles of freedom.

In voting to defund Operation Choke Point, I will be voting to rein in this out-of-control administration and its assault on small, legal, legitimate businesses.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), a gentleman who, in this House, has spent a great deal of time providing leadership in terms of small businesses and connecting them up with our research institution.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank my friend for yielding and for his work on the Appropriations Committee.

I want to say that, Mr. Chairman, I understand the constraints that the chairman is working under, and I appreciate his work on those items that were mentioned by Ranking Member FATTAH and other Members on this side.

I rise in opposition to this bill because it fails to fund scientific research at levels we need to spur innovation and remain competitive as a Nation. In particular, I want to call attention to report language in the bill that will result in cuts to the social sciences and geosciences of over \$250 million.

The NSF is the largest single source of funding for basing research in our country in a variety of fields, and that is especially true for the social sciences.

Some will say these cuts are needed to prioritize research in other areas, but this approach of limiting funding for social science is misguided for several reasons.

First, other areas of research are already heavily prioritized at the NSF. In fiscal year 2015, the NSF will spend only 3.7 percent of its budget on social science research—clearly not an outsized priority.

This is especially true when you consider that social science research saves lives and money. It was NSF-funded social science research that developed

the kidney transplant program that has led to thousands of successful donor-patient pairings that had not been possible before.

Spectrum auctions conducted by the FCC were made possible by economic research sponsored by the NSF. These auctions raise billions of dollars for taxpayers and will free up chunks of spectrum so we can stay at the cutting edge of wireless technologies.

Social science research is also critical for cybersecurity, as we have heard from many expert witnesses in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. Most cyber breaches occur because of human factors, and social science is vital in addressing this grave security risk.

For these reasons, I am urging my colleagues to oppose these cuts and to oppose this bill. We need to do better for scientific research for the sake of our country, our economy, and our jobs.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest innovations that has ever been developed by man to connect people from every corner of the Earth, whether in cafes or homes or in schools, is the Internet.

The reason the Internet has expanded and grown around the world and has been such an engine for innovation is the fact that the Internet embodies the American idea of free speech. That very idea of free speech in the Internet is under attack because the administration and some people in this institution want to see the core functions of the Internet be transferred to a foreign body that doesn't share our idea of free speech.

Let's keep the Internet open. Let's make sure that we continue with the great American idea of free speech not just here in America, but in every corner of the globe because the Internet will embody that idea of free speech.

The Internet was made in America. Let's keep the core functions of the Internet in America.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I have one remaining speaker, so I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentlemen from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the full Science, Space, and Technology Committee, my colleague and good friend.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for yielding me time.

I thank the chairman, also, and his staff, especially John Martens, Leslie Albright, and Ashley Schiller, for working with the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

I especially appreciate the chairman's support for prioritizing the funding of the basic research at the National Science Foundation. This research—especially in the areas of math and physical sciences, biology, computing, and engineering—holds the promise of breakthroughs that will trigger technological innovation, jump-start new industries, and spur economic growth.

This bill ensures that NSF is transparent and accountable to American taxpayers about how their hard-earned dollars are spent and that NSF-supported research is in the national interest.

The House CJS Appropriations bill also addresses concerns about the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's costly satellite program. In addition, this bill encourages NOAA to include private sector involvement in the space-based weather industry.

Finally, I thank Chairman CULBERSON for his reprioritization of NASA planetary science, which implements the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's NASA authorization reported in April.

I further look forward to working with Chairman CULBERSON and Chairman ROGERS to fully fund the Orion and Commercial Crew programs so that we can once again launch American astronauts on American rockets from American soil.

Again, I thank my friend from Texas, Chairman CULBERSON, for his enthusiasm and initiative and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman CULBERSON and the staff of the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations Subcommittee, especially John Martens, Leslie Albright and Ashley Schiller for working with the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. I particularly appreciate your support for prioritizing the funding of the basic research at the National Science Foundation.

This research, especially in the areas of math and physical sciences, biology, computing and engineering, holds the promise of breakthroughs that will trigger technological innovation, jumpstart new industries and spur economic growth.

This bill also supports other language in the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, which passed the House two weeks ago.

It ensures that NSF is transparent and accountable to American taxpayers about how their hard-earned dollars are spent and that NSF-supported research is in the national interest.

The National Science Foundation has played an integral part in funding breakthrough discoveries in numerous scientific fields such as lasers, the Internet and nanotechnology.

However, NSF has also approved dozens of grants for which the scientific merits and national interest are not obvious, to put it politely.

These include a climate change musical, a Norwegian tourism study, a grant on human-set fires in New Zealand in the 1800's, a study of lawsuits in Peru in the 1600s, and a grant on the causes of stress in Bolivia.

This bill supports the policy that every NSF public announcement of a grant award must be accompanied by a non-technical explanation of the project's scientific merits and a certification of how it serves the national interest. This reinforces the standards set forth in the America COMPETES Act of 2015.

The House CJS appropriations bill also addresses concerns about the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) costly satellite program.

It ensures that appropriate oversight access is given to the Office of the Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office, and NOAA's own Independent Review Team. Likewise, recommendations from these bodies will help guide the satellite programs as they move closer to their anticipated launch dates.

In addition, this bill encourages NOAA to include private sector involvement in the space-based weather industry.

NOAA's costly satellite programs have historically been plagued with management problems. Encouraging NOAA to purchase services from the private sector will allow for a more robust, cost-effective and efficient weather forecasting system that will help save lives and property.

I look forward to offering an amendment shortly, with Chairman CULBERSON's support, to further enhance NOAA's weather research of near-term, affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing and modeling capabilities. The amendment will result in substantial improvements in weather forecasts.

Finally, I thank Chairman CULBERSON for his re-prioritization of NASA planetary science, which implements the Science Committees' NASA Authorization reported in April.

I further look forward to working with Chairman CULBERSON and Chairman ROGERS to fully fund the Orion and Commercial Crew Programs so that we can once again launch American astronauts on American rockets from American soil.

The Commercial Crew program will allow the U.S. access to the International Space Station without depending on Russia. The Orion program will expand human reach into deep space and serve as an emergency backup for the Commercial Crew program.

As we move forward with a Conference with the Senate, I hope that we can identify ways to support these programs more robustly, perhaps by moderating the growth of other accounts such as Earth Science, which has increased 63 percent since 2007 while other areas of NASA have remained flat.

Again, I thank my friend from Texas, Chairman CULBERSON, for his enthusiasm and initiative on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We are going to move into a process of amendments in which the House will work its will, but I think the general debate has illuminated a host of areas where we agree and a few areas where we disagree.

The last speaker, my good friend from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, who has done a lot of work, as he mentioned, there are some areas where we remain in disagreement, which is the notion that we should make some of these changes in terms of science prioritization are issues that not just are there disagreements between the parties, but there is vast concern in the scientific enterprise in the Nation, that we would interject perhaps a viewpoint into science that would move away from merit-based processes.

On that point, I look forward to the amendment process, and I thank the House for listening to our points of view.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we conclude the debate on this bill, it is important for all of us here today to know that, Members of the House, this process is open. Members can come down to the floor and offer an amendment, 5 minutes per side.

We have in this bill prioritized our funding, as we all do in our private life and our business life. Following the good advice of financial guru Dave Ramsey, you don't spend money you don't have, and try to eliminate debt at all possible costs.

We in the majority have done our very best to make sure that we are living within our means. Although the budget caps—I know there is a great deal of frustration among my Democrat colleagues on the limitations on spending. That is the law that was suggested initially by the White House.

It is important that we do all that we can to minimize the debt that we pass on to our children and grandchildren. The budget caps are reality, and we have, within the limitations that we have, prioritized the funding in this bill to make sure that law enforcement is number one; the FBI and the Department of Justice are taken care of; that the National Science Foundation, in fact, is funded at a historically high level. We have given them a \$50 million increase.

We have also funded NASA at a historically high level since the Apollo program. I would certainly like to see the American space program given more. As more money becomes available, if we find an opportunity as we move through conference, of course, we will work hard to make sure that we will plus-up funding for the sciences and space exploration everywhere we can.

I heard my colleagues mention the Legal Services Corporation, which does important work in representing the poor. We will certainly do our best to find additional funding there.

I will also be filing legislation to give attorneys a tax deduction, dollar for dollar, for work that they do donating their time to the poor. I think that is a far better way to get legal services to the poor, through the Tax Code, rather

than by appropriating our taxpayers' hard-earned tax dollars.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Members that, above all, this legislation will ensure that the laws, as enacted by Congress, are enforced. If Federal agencies want the privilege of spending and using our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, they will need to demonstrate through their spending plans, through their presentations to this committee, that they are actually enforcing the law as written by Congress.

We will, throughout the course of the year, engage in vigorous oversight to ensure that our money is not only wisely spent, that it is prudently spent, that it is only spent when absolutely necessary, but that our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars are only spent to enforce the law as written by the people's elected representatives.

I urge my colleagues to join us today in voting for this important legislation.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2578.

The Internet is one of the great American success stories in our history, benefiting billions of people around the world. Congress has a longstanding and bipartisan commitment to a global, open Internet, free from governmental control. Our support for the decentralized, multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance has enabled its growth as an unparalleled platform for economic opportunity and democratic participation.

Last year the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) announced that the U.S. government would take an important step to transition technical functions of the domain name system to the multi-stakeholder community. This transition of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) to the private sector has been a U.S. policy goal for two decades, through Republican and Democratic administrations alike.

Since NTIA's announcement, the multi-stakeholder community has stepped up to the plate to craft a transition proposal and enhanced accountability measures needed in the absence of U.S. government stewardship. NTIA has articulated specific criteria for the transition proposal and made clear that any plan must advance our vision of a free and open Internet.

Despite this significant progress, H.R. 2578 includes language that blocks NTIA from using funds to relinquish the IANA functions. This limitation of funds is not only unnecessary, it sends the wrong message to the international community. Our diplomats point to the IANA transition announcement as a key factor helping us win allies and support for an Internet free of government control. As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated, this funding restriction "could result in harm to U.S. businesses and Internet users as a whole."

While I oppose this provision in H.R. 2578, I agree with my colleagues that the IANA transition must be conducted carefully and transparently. That's why I'm working with my Republican colleagues at the Energy and Commerce Committee on legislation to ensure NTIA implements the IANA transition consistent with the principles we all support. Our

legislation will address concerns about transparency and accountability, while reaffirming our commitment to the transition.

While I cannot support the funding restriction in H.R. 2578, I stand ready to work with my colleagues on responsible oversight of the IANA transition.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment. No pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The Chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Amendments so printed shall be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2578

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and for engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to sections 3702 and 3703 of title 44, United States Code; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the International Trade Administration between two points abroad, without regard to section 40118 of title 49, United States Code; employment of citizens of the United States and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$294,300 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed \$45,000 per vehicle; obtaining insurance on official motor vehicles; and rental of tie lines, \$472,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which \$10,000,000 is to be derived from fees to be retained and used by the International

Trade Administration, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided*, That, of amounts provided under this heading, not less than \$16,400,000 shall be for China antidumping and countervailing duty enforcement and compliance activities: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities; and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$23,600,000)”.

Page 28, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,733,000)”.

Page 30, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$293,000,000)”.

Page 47, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$45,000,000)”.

Page 49, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$52,500,000)”.

Page 72, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$270,000,000)”.

Page 72, line 7, after the second dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$266,900,000)”.

Page 72, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 72, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$1,000,000)”.

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment restores necessary funding for the Federal Prisoner Detention program.

The Marshals Service assumes custody of individuals arrested by all Federal agencies and is responsible for the housing and transportation of prisoners from the time they are brought into Federal custody until they are either acquitted or transferred to the Federal Bureau of Prisons' custody for incarceration.

The FPD program provides housing, medical care, and transportation for Federal prisoners housed in non-Federal facilities and has an average daily population of approximately 45,000 prisoners. This funding is critical to ensur-

ing that the United States Marshals Service can provide safe, human care and custody for the approximately 204,000 Federal prisoners it will be responsible for in fiscal year 2016.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2016 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill falls nearly \$400 million short of the funding necessary to maintain the Marshals Service's prisoner detention operations. This matter must be corrected. My amendment would simply reduce less critical accounts to make up for this astounding shortfall.

This amendment reduces youth mentoring programs by \$45 million, leaving a generous sum of \$50 million for youth mentoring.

My amendment also zeros out the new, unauthorized grant program to improve police-community relations. While this concept may have merit, the creation of such a program is the responsibility of the House Judiciary Committee.

This amendment also reduces funding for the International Trade Administration by 5 percent and for the Community Relations Service by 20 percent.

Finally, my amendment leaves \$30 million in funding for the Legal Services Corporation to administer existing grants and to promote pro bono efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the subcommittee, who has worked with my staff very diligently on a number of issues related to this matter, and I would be prepared to withdraw this amendment in lieu of all the difficulties he has in finding funds for the priority he has but, nonetheless, hoping that he will acknowledge that this is a priority that has been shortchanged and that we need to make sure that not only are these prisoners able to be held, and held according to law, but also that it does not give rise to prisoners being released in circumstances where they otherwise should be held in incarceration.

So I am hoping that, if the gentleman would agree moving forward to help us try to find additional funds for this account, perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be willing to help as well, and I would be willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to ensure that these prisoners are not released. I will work diligently with my colleague from Philadelphia to find additional funds as we move forward in the process. The last thing we want is these people being released.

It has been a privilege for me to work with you and your staff. I am very privileged to follow in the footsteps of your colleague from Virginia, Frank Wolf, who was chairman of the CJS Subcommittee, and I have continued that close working relationship. We will do everything we can to find funding to make sure that these Federal

prisoners are not released early. That is a subject near and dear to my heart. I am very sensitive to it.

We had a Federal judge in Texas running our prisons for 25 years, William Wayne Justice; and I sued him, as a State representative, to end his control over the prisons because one of the main things he was doing was causing the early release of prisoners to go victimize Texans, which is utterly unacceptable. So this is a top priority. I will work with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I obviously would work with the chairman on this and a whole range of other items. The offsets that you have identified would be very problematic, from my point of view. But I will work with the chairman. We need to make sure we fully fund the U.S. Marshals Service.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 42, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 44, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Hampshire and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill to increase the funding for our Nation’s drug courts by \$5 million.

Drug courts keep people in treatment and can be one of the most effective intervention programs for those suffering from drug addiction. And just as important, these courts reduce crime, save money, and serve families and children affected by substance abuse.

Drug and substance abuse directly impacts our States, communities, law enforcement, and families across the country. In the past 5 years alone, in my home State of New Hampshire, overdoses have increased fivefold. Last year in the Granite State, deaths from heroin and illicit drug use exceeded

auto-related deaths in the State. Drug use and abuse have devastated countless families from the Granite State.

Drug courts are transforming the criminal justice system across our Nation by creating a systematic response to substance abuse and crime as an alternative to incarceration. It is not every day that we get to directly save lives in government. The drug courts program has proven to do just that.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank my colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman LYNCH, for working with me on this amendment to ensure this much-needed funding.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment as we continue to tackle the drug abuse epidemic that is plaguing communities around our Nation.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUINTA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman’s amendment.

Drug courts are a proven way to get a good outcome for people who are arrested for drug offenses. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) and the subcommittee have already funded the drug courts at \$41 million, \$5 million above the request. I think the gentleman’s amendment is a worthwhile increase, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GUINTA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, on that, I want to say something, and then I will yield to my colleague.

I led the effort in my home State to create drug courts when I was in the State senate before any of my gray hairs. They have worked out spectacularly well in many places throughout the country. So I support the gentleman from New Hampshire’s amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA). He and I were of a similar mind in terms of this amendment, and I am delighted that the chairman has accepted the amendment.

We understand the good that drug courts do in our society and in our system. It actually combines the resources of family, the courts, law enforcement, substance abuse agencies, our local and town governments, State governments, and, of course, the Federal Government as well.

Drug addiction in the United States is an epidemic that affects every city and town across America, and it cuts

across every demographic. It leaves in its wake shattered lives and families and costs taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars annually.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse estimates that the total overall cost of substance abuse in the United States, including lost productivity and health and crime-related costs, exceeds \$600 billion every year. The institute also reports that drug addiction treatment has been shown to reduce associated health and social costs by far more than the costs of treatment, itself. Drug courts can be the first step on the road back for those suffering with addiction.

Drug addiction is a disease, and people under the influence often act out of character. Society is beginning to recognize that we need to deal with addiction and its outcome in a way that can have a positive effect on individuals and their families and communities. I believe drug courts offer this opportunity by providing a support system and a road map for moving forward.

The drug courts are specialized dockets which handle cases involving drug- and/or alcohol-dependent offenders charged with nonviolent offenses determined to have been caused or influenced by their addiction.

I have visited many of the prisons in my State, and I would say, in some cases, 80 to 90 percent of those inmates who are in there have dual addictions at the root of their problems.

I do want to recall the support that we received in the past from the former chairman, Frank Wolf of Virginia, who is a good and decent man, and we miss him here. But I am glad to see that the current chairman is of a similar mind, and I want to thank him as well.

Mr. GUINTA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo the sentiments of the gentleman from Massachusetts. This is a worthwhile attempt to try to help and heal families, address our process of incarceration, but also to make sure that we are doing the right thing for families across not just our region in New England, but across the country.

I would also like to thank Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS and Subcommittee Chairman CULBERSON for their hard work not just on this component, an amendment to the bill, but the overall bill and the commitment to this particular issue. Again, I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1)”.

Page 4, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1)”.

Page 7, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 43, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON and Chairman ROGERS for working together with Representatives PASCRELL, DENT, and HERRERA BEUTLER to develop this amendment.

I rise today to offer this critical amendment with the colleagues that I just mentioned. This amendment increases the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program by \$100 million and decreases the Census Bureau by an equal amount.

Last year, the COPS Hiring Program received bipartisan support and was funded at \$180 million in the omnibus. Unfortunately, the underlying legislation completely eliminates the COPS Hiring Program.

While we cannot restore COPS Hiring Programs and add them back into the bill due to House rules governing consideration of appropriation measures, we can help ease the burden and mitigate the impact of the program's elimination on local law enforcement by passing this bipartisan amendment.

To continue to meet the needs of police departments across the country, this additional \$100 million for Byrne JAG should specifically be used for grants to police departments for hiring. Ensuring the safety of our communities and neighborhoods should be one of our first priorities, and we cannot do without a sufficient number of police officers.

Mr. Chairman, the police officers and law enforcement agencies across this country are asked to do more and more with less and less, and let me just give you some examples.

When I was the sheriff in Seattle, I provided deputies to Federal task force efforts, the Joint Fugitive Task Force; the Joint Terrorism Task Force; the HIDTA Task Force, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Task Force; the fusion center; and I could go on with some others.

The role that local law enforcement plays in the efforts of Federal law enforcement are integral. They are interconnected. They can't be separated. It is a team effort from the Federal law enforcement agencies to the local law enforcement agencies. And sometimes people in this Chamber get confused as to what the local law enforcement's role is when it comes to Federal responsibility.

I will just give you an example of one of my own personal experiences. Early

in my career as a police officer, a sheriff's deputy on the streets in the mid-seventies, I made a traffic stop. I came across a young lady who happened to be in the employment of somebody who was connected to a crime syndicate within the Washington State area who was operating human trafficking operations from Texas to Anchorage, and not only that, but they were involved in drug trafficking.

So I developed this informant as a patrol officer driving around in my patrol car. You would never think that I might have the opportunity to bust a big case like this. But this is just an example of the day-to-day activity that police officers operate in, and they collect this information. I took it to the Federal agency responsible. I went to the DEA.

I had a secret meeting in a hotel room in downtown Seattle. The informant wouldn't trust the Federal operatives, but she trusted me. So I had to bring her there. We came up with a plan for me to travel to Texas. It is a long story. I won't get into the rest of it. But I think that everyone in this room gets the picture of how critical it is for us to integrate Federal and local law enforcement and that we have a responsibility, as the United States Congress, on the House side and on the Senate side, to support those efforts.

□ 1530

As matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I was hired under a Federal grant in 1972 called the PEP program. I would not have had a 33-year career if I wasn't hired with Federal money. So this \$100 million is going to be so much appreciated by our men and women.

I want to mention just one other criminal aspect of this bill. It is not perfect. No bill is perfect. The law enforcement community is not perfect. We are not perfect. Congress is not perfect. The community is not perfect. We need to stop looking at the negative and the bad in all of these organizations together and start looking at the good, come together, and figure out a solution to bringing police and community together.

Today there aren't enough cops on the street. The community policing program has, in some parts of this country, been eliminated or cut back. So school resource officers are gone in some communities. Storefront officers are gone. They are gone, Mr. Chairman, and we need to bring them back. We can do it together. We can solve this problem and keep our community safe.

I appreciate the gentleman and the time you have allowed me.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I gladly yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), my chairman, if he has any more to add on this matter before I yield to my colleague over here.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman, just to say that, as you know, we discussed in full committee that the purpose of our bill was to shift the COPS hiring because it has not been reauthorized a number of years over to the Byrne JAG Program, which can be used for hiring because these are grant applications that can be tailored for your specific community. You can be sure the money is targeted precisely for your needs in Seattle or Philadelphia, so the Byrne JAG Program money can indeed be used for hiring police officers.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment because it will allow more community hiring of police officers, and that is a good thing. God bless all our law enforcement officers, and we can't give them enough support.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and my brother in the Law Enforcement Caucus, DAVID REICHERT, from Washington.

I want to thank my colleagues who have joined in a strong show of bipartisan support for the COPS program, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. DENT included.

Let us be clear what this amendment does. The Reichert amendment increases funding for the Byrne JAG by \$100 million for hiring purposes, a critical step—I think, an important message.

Our amendment is supported by the major voices in the law enforcement community, including the National Association of Police Organizations, the Major County Sheriffs Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the Sergeant Benevolent Association, so I urge my colleagues to support it.

But despite all of the debate about community policing happening across our Nation, as Mr. REICHERT referred to, the American people need to know that, despite what our amendment does, the underlying bill eliminates the Federal COPS Hiring Program. It is simply unacceptable that every year we ask the law enforcement community to do more and more with less and less.

Mr. Chairman, in last year's House bill, the COPS program was cut by \$109 million, 61 percent. So we can pontificate all we want about how we are behind the police officers of this country, but what we continue to do with successful programs, successful programs by any account, cut and cut. We were able to restore some of the money thanks to DAVID REICHERT and a few other people from both sides of the aisle, thanks to you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member.

This year—this, despite being joined by over 150 of our colleagues from both

sides of the aisle in asking the committee to support the COPS program—you gutted it. We can't even amend it. It is done. It is over.

As a cornerstone of the Federal Government's efforts to assist State and local law enforcement, COPS Hiring has funded over 127,000 public safety officer positions. DAVID REICHERT was on the front line. He can speak to the issue over and over again. He has been there and done it. I just can talk about it.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, it is plain and simple. Fewer cops on the beat mean more crime on the street. Fewer cops on the beat mean more crime on our streets. I ask you—I ask you to do everything in your power, as you have done in the past—to restore what I think is probably one of the most efficient programs in the entire Federal Government, the COPS program.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that I join with the chairman. I support this amendment. I support the COPS program.

For 20 years, the Federal Government has been engaged in this, launched under President Clinton, which has reduced crime in our country, has saved lives, has made communities safer. And even though there is some disagreement about the authorization, there is no disagreement, I don't believe, that we should be providing resources. I think the gentleman articulated on the front end of this discussion how intertwined local police are with our Federal law enforcement efforts and how critically indispensable they are in these efforts.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, if I could point out to my good friend from New Jersey what we have done is simply shift the program over to the Byrne JAG Program, because with Byrne JAG you can customize your application for New Jersey, for Philadelphia, or for Seattle. You can hire police officers under the Byrne JAG Program. We shifted the program over to Byrne JAG because it is far more effective and can be tailored to your community.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment because with this amendment we are restoring the funding for the COPS Hiring Program, but doing it through a far more effective and locally tailored program, the Byrne JAG Program. So I would urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, we are in agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$44,000,000)".

Page 6, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,000,000)".

Page 7, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$36,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Maine and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, families in northern, central, western, and downeast Maine are some of the hardest working, most honest people you can find in the country. They expect and they want a more effective and a more accountable government that works for them, sir, and not against them.

Now, one of the most important jobs of the Federal Government is to make sure that we protect American workers against unfair and unlawful trade practices. This is very clear in our Constitution, and the Founding Fathers made this clear to us all.

Today, here in Washington, the International Trade Administration is responsible for enforcing these trade rules. Last year, three of our major paper mills in our district, the Second District of Maine, in Bucksport, Old Town, and Millinocket, closed. Mr. Chairman, 1,000 of the most skilled paper makers in the world are no longer working, and those 1,000 paychecks are no longer flowing to their families to help them care for their kids.

This year in central Maine, in Madison, Maine, a fourth paper mill is now facing difficulty and has temporarily shut down a couple of times and furloughed another 200 workers. Now, if you talk to the folks that own the mill and work on the floor in Madison, they cite two reasons: number one is the high cost of energy to run their machinery; secondly, a provincial government in Canada has provided about \$125 million of unfair subsidies to a competing paper mill across the border. These subsidies, which are unlawful and unfair, have allowed this competing paper mill to buy new equipment and to subsidize the cost of energy to run their machinery. As a result, the price of supercalendered paper that is made across the border and also in Madison, Maine, has plummeted, causing our mill in Madison to temporarily shut down and furlough its workers.

Now this, Mr. Chairman, is not right, and this is not fair. American workers are the best in the world. We can compete with anybody in any industry in the global marketplace as long as it is a level playing field.

As our office, Mr. Chair, got involved in this issue, the ITA made it very clear to us that they did not have the staff able to fully address this issue in what we believe to be a full, thorough, and comprehensive investigation, including a number of different paper mills, when it comes to these unfair subsidies.

Up in our district, we are very frugal. We are fiscal conservatives. The folks in Maine can stretch a dollar, Mr. Chair, wider than anybody else in the country. So I am not suggesting that we increase the size of government and we increase spending. Quite the opposite. I believe our government is too big and too intrusive. However, I do have a solution to this problem.

My amendment, Mr. Chair, asks that we transfer less than 5 percent of the funding this year going to the Census Bureau to the ITA such that they have the resources to thoroughly and effectively conduct an investigation dealing with these unfair provincial subsidies in Canada.

Now, not only will a thorough and fair investigation help our workers at the Madison mill in central Maine, but it will also help the backlog of cases at the ITA that affect tens of thousands of workers in various industries all throughout America. We all know in this room, on both sides of the aisle, that fair trade results in more jobs.

All of us here in this Chamber want to make sure we do everything humanly possible to help our companies grow, be more competitive, more successful, and hire more workers. When that happens, Mr. Chairman, our workers have better lives with more opportunities, more freedom, and less government dependence.

This is about jobs, Mr. Chair, and it is all about national security. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, to please support this amendment to make sure that we have fair trade in this country.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleague to consider withdrawing the amendment. I would like to work with him to ensure that this case is investigated. The ITA is funded at a level of over \$470 million.

I can only imagine how devastating this must be to the families there in Madison, Maine, that have lost their jobs and had their jobs furloughed and suspended because of an unfair subsidy right across the border. This is exactly what ITA is supposed to be doing. The Appropriations Committee has extraordinary influence over these agencies, and this is exactly the kind of case the ITA should be working on.

I want to pledge to you my full support and assistance in making sure that this case is investigated and pursued aggressively if you consider withdrawing the amendment, because the

Census has gotten hammered pretty hard. They just had \$100 million transferred over to COPS Hiring. And if we could, I would certainly like to work with you as we move forward in ensuring that this case is investigated and handled.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I would also work with the chairman on this matter to make sure this is fully reviewed and investigated.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

□ 1545

Mr. POLIQUIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it very much.

Although I do believe, sir, that jobs are more important than counting people, we will use the full authority of our office to help our workers at the Madison Mill to make sure that we do everything to have a level playing field.

I will withdraw this amendment, and I accept your pledge to do everything within your power and authority to please help our paper workers, the most skilled in the world, in central Maine.

Mr. CULBERSON. We will be on it and help you. I look forward to doing so aggressively and in a timely manner. Thank you very much.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY
OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of citizens of the United States and aliens by contract for services abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$13,500 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by section 1(b) of the Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 223; 22 U.S.C. 401(b)); and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law, \$110,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange

Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities: *Provided further*, That payments and contributions collected and accepted for materials or services provided as part of such activities may be retained for use in covering the cost of such activities, and for providing information to the public with respect to the export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce and other export control programs of the United States and other governments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk involving page 3, line 10.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$311,788,000)".

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$311,788,000)".

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I think we have passed that point in the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I had risen before we had passed that point in the bill and was not recognized.

Mr. FATTAH. I don't think it is any fault of your own. I am just saying for the technical matter I think that we have.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has two amendments at the desk, one to the pending paragraph and one to the previous paragraph.

The Chair is entertaining the one to the previous paragraph by unanimous consent.

Mr. FATTAH. Is this the one that the Clerk just read?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is correct. That is the amendment that the Clerk just read and addressing page 3, line 10.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment enacts a CBO recommendation to eliminate the trade promotion activities of the International Trade Administration to save almost \$312 million.

What does the ITA do exactly? Well, it has some legitimate functions enforcing trade agreements and treaties. This amendment leaves these functions untouched.

But the ITA also does trade promotion activities. To quote from its own material, it "provides counseling to American companies in order to develop the most profitable and sustainable plans for pricing, export, and the full range of public and private trade promotion assistance... as well as market intelligence, and industry and market specific research."

Well, this is all well and good, but isn't that what businesses and trade associations are supposed to do and used

to do with their own money? Why should taxpayers pay for the profits of private companies?

If a specific business or industry is the sole beneficiary of these services, shouldn't it be the sole financier of them, either individually or collectively through trade associations?

True, this program has been around for generations, but Franklin Roosevelt, who was hardly a champion of smaller government, had the right idea when he slashed its budget in 1932 and closed 31 of its offices. The problem is that reform didn't take. ITA now has over 250 offices and several thousand personnel around the world.

The ITA's authorization lapsed in 1996—19 years ago. It has not been reviewed or authorized by Congress since then, but we still keep shoveling money out the door.

Although it hasn't been reviewed by Congress in all of these years, it has been thoroughly weighed by the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, and the President's fiscal commission, and they have all found it sadly wanting. The Simpson-Bowles report summed it up nicely when they said:

"Services provided by ITA's U.S. Commercial Services and other divisions directly providing assistance to U.S. companies should be financed by beneficiaries of this assistance. While the agency charges fees for those services, its fees do not cover the cost of all of its activities. Additionally, it is argued that the benefits of trade promotion activities are passed on to foreigners in the form of decreased export costs."

Simpson-Bowles then goes on to say: "According to a study by the Office of Management and Budget, businesses can receive similar services from State, local, and private sector entities."

This CBO option to eliminate ITA's promotion activities saves \$312 million in 2016 and \$3.5 billion through 2024.

Mr. Chairman, if the CBO, the OMB, and the President's fiscal commission all agree this is wasteful and Congress hasn't bothered to reauthorize it since it expired 19 years ago, why do we continue to spend money that we don't have duplicating services the beneficiaries of those services either don't need or are perfectly capable of funding on their own?

And if the companies that we are told directly benefit from these so-called "essential" services aren't willing to fund them, maybe that is just nature's way of telling us we shouldn't be fleecing our constituents' earnings to pay for them either.

And why would we tap American taxpayers to subsidize the export activities of foreigners, as Simpson-Bowles notes?

The rules of the House were specifically written to prevent this type of unauthorized expenditure, and they provide for a point of order to be raised if it is included in an appropriations

bill. That is exactly what we have here. But alas, that rule is routinely waived when these measures are brought to the floor, making this amendment necessary.

This is a prime example of corporate welfare, and we ought to be done with it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I share my colleague Mr. MCCLINTOCK's feeling about programs that are unauthorized and share his passion for ensuring we don't spend money we don't have.

But as the gentleman from Maine was just out here a moment ago, Mr. POLIQUIN has a perfect example of one of the really valid and very important functions of the ITA, and that is to identify subsidies that are unfair, that imbalance our trade with a foreign nation. As he pointed out, the Canadian Government is unfairly subsidizing a paper mill right directly across the border from his constituents in Madison, Maine, and caused the furloughing of workers at the Madison paper mill. And as I just pledged to Mr. POLIQUIN, I want to make sure that ITA is doing its job when it comes to identifying and enacting some measures to counterbalance unfair trade practices like that.

I would agree with my friend from California: when it comes to promoting American business, that is the job of the Chamber of Commerce; when it comes to making sure that American businesses get the word out and shares information, that is something American businesses ought to do; but when it comes to unfair subsidies given by foreign governments to their businesses that cause American workers to lose their jobs, that is exactly what the ITA is designed to do. We need trade enforcement, we need countervailing duties, and we need export assistance.

The amendment which the gentleman from California has offered looks to be about a 70 percent cut. I would be happy to work with you and find some ways to find savings within the agency when it comes to promoting American businesses because I am a big believer. Let the Chamber of Commerce do it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. This amendment leaves all of those legitimate activities of the ITA intact. It still leaves \$160 million of activities. All it does is to defund the trade promotion activities that the CBO recognized as being wasteful, as did OMB, as did Simpson-Bowles.

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, the scale of the reduction to reduce the agency by \$311,788,000 so abruptly is going to eliminate the ability, for example, to help Mr. POLIQUIN and other businesses

like theirs across the country that are suffering from unfair subsidies by foreign governments. So, unfortunately, I need to oppose the amendment. A 70 percent cut is simply not sustainable. And Mr. POLIQUIN, I think, made a very eloquent case just a moment ago for the type of work the ITA needs to do. So I would need to urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Philadelphia.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman.

I also oppose the amendment. The business of our country is, I think, appropriate in making sure that our businesses are not locked out of a market around the world. Only 2 percent of American businesses export anywhere, and we need to have a robust effort because 90 percent of the world's consumers live somewhere else. We do have a reality that other governments are aggressive about promoting their business opportunities. If we want Americans to have jobs here, some of those are connected to these opportunities. So I thank the chairman, and I suggest that this is not an amendment that would be in the interest of the American business community or workers.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the scale of the cut would be devastating to the agency. Houston, Texas, is one of the premier exporting centers of the United States, and it is important that we do everything in our power. The Federal Government does have an obligation to enforce trade agreements to make sure that trade is fair and free and that subsidies that are unfairly used by foreign governments to support their own industries, that we have got some way to counterbalance that. That is the essential function of this agency. So, therefore, I would ask Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that this does not in any way affect the enforcement activities of the ITA. It does not in any way affect the measures that Mr. POLIQUIN of Maine just referenced. It affects only the trade promotion activities of the ITA that have been singled out time and again as being duplicative of what the companies profiting from these activities should be paying for themselves or are duplicative of other programs. It is only the trade promotion activities. None of the enforcement activities are affected by this amendment. I would ask for an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, for trade adjustment assistance, for grants authorized by section 27 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722), \$213,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, \$37,000,000: *Provided*, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, section 27 of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3722), and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, \$32,000,000.

ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS ANALYSIS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, \$100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
CURRENT SURVEYS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing and publishing statistics, provided for by law, \$265,000,000: *Provided*, That, from amounts provided herein, funds may be used for promotion, outreach, and marketing activities: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of the Census shall collect data for the Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey using the same health insurance questions included in previous years, in addition to the revised questions implemented in the Current Population Survey beginning in February 2014.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 44, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 46, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, each day more and more Americans are realizing that we need to take action to deal with mental health issues in this country. We need to make it a priority.

My amendment, in keeping with that sentiment, would provide additional funding for programs under the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act and for Veterans Treatment Courts.

□ 1600

These are programs with proven track records of effectively addressing some of the important issues associated with mental health illnesses. My amendment would offset this increase by taking \$4 million from the periodic censuses and programs account.

Mr. Chairman, both of the programs that would receive an increase in funding under my amendment highlight the need for our justice and mental health systems to work together. As a former sheriff, I can tell you that cooperation is vital. If our justice and mental health systems are collaborating, we can provide more positive outcomes not only for those with mental health illnesses, but for our taxpayers as well.

Grants provided under MIOTCRA are used, among other purposes, to set up mental health courts, for community reentry services, and for training State and local law enforcement officers to help identify and deescalate mental health crises, which saves the lives of both the mentally ill and of the responding officers.

During my 37 years as a cop, I saw firsthand how our jails were becoming warehouses for people with mental health needs. No one is well served by this process, not those with mental illness, not our taxpayers, and, certainly, as I spoke earlier, not our veterans. Let me provide you with some numbers to illustrate what actually is going on within our jails.

According to the Florida Mental Health Institute, over a 5-year period, 97 individuals from Miami-Dade County accounted for 2,200 bookings in the county jail; 27,000 days in the jail; and 13,000 days in crisis units, State hospitals, and emergency rooms.

The cost to the State and to local taxpayers was nearly \$13 million for just 97 people. However, the type of programs my amendment supports have been shown to dramatically reduce those rates.

In Pinellas County, for instance, which is another Florida county, a mental health jail diversion program showed an 87 percent reduction in rearrests for the nearly 3,000 offenders who were enrolled. Not only does my amendment support these programs, but it also recognizes the unique responsibility that we have to our veterans.

Veterans are disproportionately affected by mental health illnesses. Even more, they would likely not have these issues if it weren't for their service to this country. We owe them a better

outcome, and Veterans Treatment Courts can help. My point is that they are some of the best investments we can make.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment. Veterans courts and mental health courts do great work. It is a very important role that they serve.

I want to also thank the gentleman for his service as a police officer. We just simply cannot thank our police officers enough for the good work that they do, and I strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I support the gentleman's amendment, and I thank him for offering it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Nugent-Collins amendment, which provides critical additional funding for Veterans Treatment Courts and mental health courts.

I have seen firsthand the difference that mental health courts and Veterans Treatment Courts can make. Over the course of the past few months in and around the Ninth District and all over Georgia, this is something that I have worked on not only in the State of Georgia, but also now in working nationally here with my friend from Florida.

Our jails are not mental health facilities, but we continue to use them that way, despite the fact that they are not in anyone's best interest. By treating the mentally ill with compassion, we can provide them a second chance to get better.

We can also cut costs, empower States, reduce recidivism, and ensure that law enforcement officers can focus on protecting the safety of the public. By investing in Veterans Treatment Courts, we can better serve those who have served us, and we can address PTSD and related issues in a more meaningful way.

I appreciate Mr. NUGENT and his tireless leadership on this issue in advocating for a better, more sensible approach. Together, we introduced the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act, which would expand and further improve upon the mental

health and Veterans Treatment Court programs that are funded by H.R. 2578.

I just want to encourage everyone to support this amendment. Again, let's take an honest, serious look at how we are dealing with those with mental health issues.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I talked to our colleague from Georgia, who just spoke on this matter, and I know he has talked about how this is really critically important for veterans.

It is a population that we have to be concerned about, so I want to thank you again for offering this, and the chairman and I agree.

Mr. NUGENT. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman of the subcommittee and I appreciate the ranking member in their support of this because it really is about how we deal with our fellow man.

It is about a way that we shouldn't be criminalizing mental health disorders. That is the worst thing that we can do. As a police officer and as a sheriff for over 38 years, I have seen the effects of untreated mental illness, particularly in the county jails where they are now warehoused.

I truly do appreciate the support across the board, and I will tell you that our law enforcement officers and our correctional officers will support it also.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing and publishing statistics for periodic censuses and programs provided for by law, \$848,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That, from amounts provided herein, funds may be used for promotion, outreach, and marketing activities: *Provided further*, That within the amounts appropriated, \$1,551,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" account for activities associated with carrying out investigations and audits related to the Bureau of the Census: *Provided further*, That not more than 50 percent of the amounts made available under this heading for information technology related to 2020 census delivery, including the Census Enterprise Data Collection and Processing (CEDCaP) program, may be obligated until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a plan for expenditure that (1) identifies for each CEDCaP project/investment over \$25,000 (a) the functional and performance capabilities to be delivered and the mission benefits to be realized, (b) the estimated lifecycle cost, including estimates for development as well as maintenance and operations, and (c) key milestones to be met; (2) details for each project/investment (a) reasons for any cost

and schedule variances, and (b) top risks and mitigation strategies, and (3) has been submitted to the Government Accountability Office.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$17,300,000)”.

Page 38, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$17,300,000)”.

Page 41, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$17,300,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, Congress has made it clear that it will not stand for this new scourge that we are finding in our country of human sex trafficking. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act passed the United States Senate 99-0, and it passed the House of Representatives before that with only 3 Members voting against it and all 400-plus voting for it.

Modern-day slavery does happen in the United States. It is a multibillion-dollar business. It is second only to the international crime syndicates of drug trafficking for the amount of money that is raised. It is not time for us to lower the amount of money we have for grants that will assist the victims of this scourge. That is why my amendment brings in just \$17.3 million to this fund that was cut. This \$17.3 million will bring it up to last year's level so that \$43 million will go for victim services and victim grants.

Where does this money come from? From where are we taking it? We are taking it out of the periodic censuses and programs and applying it to this fund.

The periodic censuses and programs—let me make it clear—is not the constitutional census counting that is required to be done by the Census Bureau. This is another program that the Census Bureau has. It is sometimes called the American Community Survey, which is very intrusive.

Without really much choice, it asks citizens numerous questions that are an invasion of their privacy. For example: What time do you go to work? What time do you get home from work? Does anybody in your household have a mental illness or disease? They are questions such as these that are very intrusive. The Census Bureau shouldn't be asking these questions.

Set aside that anyway. With this money, rather than asking people in the community—citizens—to tell us what time they go to work or what time they go during the day to different appointments, like doctors' appointments, we should show the pri-

ority of putting just \$17 million of that money back into this appropriation to help the victims of trafficking.

It will bring it up to last year's level of a mere \$43 million of grant money. That is what this legislation does. It ensures that we are telling trafficking victims there will be money available for grants to assist them and money available for law enforcement to assist them in their training.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this is where you can find the contradictions of public policy with the interjection of politics, right?

I totally agree with the purpose, but I totally disagree with the underlying notion that this money is not important to the Census. First and foremost, I agree with the amendment and that we should invest in another \$16 million in helping victims of human trafficking.

It is a major problem in our country—in my part of the country, in your part of the country, and throughout our Nation. We should do more, so I support the amendment.

I don't want us to assume that the periodic census dollars are not important, however, and are not part of the constitutionally mandated census as they are part of the 2020 preparation. We will have to deal with that in some other way, but I don't want to because I agree with the amendment. That is not to suggest that I agree with the underlying thought that this money is not important to the Census.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to join him in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have a terrible problem in this country with human slavery and with human sex trafficking. My colleague from Texas is exactly right, and I strongly support his amendment.

I also share his concern about the American Community Survey, and I intend to pursue aggressive oversight during the months ahead. I do think it is intrusive. Our right to be left alone as Americans is one of our most important rights, so I share the gentleman's concern about the American Community Survey.

We have a responsibility to make sure the Census is funded, but this is a very important amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it to help combat this disgraceful scourge of human trafficking.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, I am glad that we are all in agreement.

I don't want families to be left alone, though, if they have someone who is suffering from mental health illnesses.

The reason that question is asked in a community survey is so that, when we are doing funding for communities for mental health services, we know where the impact of those dollars can be most applied. The census is taken for a good reason, but let us agree for the moment on the amendment, and let's move on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the ranking member and I thank the chairman, as well, for their comments.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is not the American Community Survey. The issue is where we are going to get this money to bring this fund up to last year's level. It is going to come from that portion of the Census that is about \$800 million, and that is why that section was picked. We need to have this lively debate about the American Community Survey in some other setting.

Right now, let's take care of trafficking victims in the United States and provide them grants, and let's provide law enforcement grants and victim services grants so that they can help minor sex trafficking victims who are being trafficked throughout the United States.

I appreciate the ranking member's support and the chairman's support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), \$35,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1535(d), the Secretary of Commerce shall charge Federal agencies for costs incurred in spectrum management, analysis, operations, and related services, and such fees shall be retained and used as offsetting collections for costs of such spectrum services, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to retain and use as offsetting collections all funds transferred, or previously transferred, from other Government agencies for all costs incurred in telecommunications research, engineering, and related activities by the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of NTIA, in furtherance of its assigned functions under this paragraph, and such funds received from other Government agencies shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES,
PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

For the administration of prior-year grants, recoveries and unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated are available for the administration of all open grants until their expiration.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the USPTO, \$3,272,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as offsetting collections of fees and surcharges assessed and collected by the USPTO under any law are received during fiscal year 2016, so as to result in a fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at \$0: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2016, should the total amount of such offsetting collections be less than \$3,272,000,000 this amount shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That any amount received in excess of \$3,272,000,000 in fiscal year 2016 and deposited in the Patent and Trademark Fee Reserve Fund shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Director of USPTO shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for any amounts made available by the preceding proviso and such spending plan shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That any amounts reprogrammed in accordance with the preceding proviso shall be transferred to the United States Patent and Trademark Office "Salaries and Expenses" account: *Provided further*, That from amounts provided herein, not to exceed \$900 shall be made available in fiscal year 2016 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2016 from the amounts made available for "Salaries and Expenses" for the USPTO, the amounts necessary to pay (1) the difference between the percentage of basic pay contributed by the USPTO and employees under section 8334(a) of title 5, United States Code, and the normal cost percentage (as defined by section 8331(17) of that title) as provided by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) for USPTO's specific use, of basic pay, of employees subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 of that title, and (2) the present value of the otherwise unfunded accruing costs, as determined by OPM for USPTO's specific use of post-retirement life insurance and post-retirement health benefits coverage for all USPTO employees who are enrolled in Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) and Federal Employees Group Life Insurance (FEGLI), shall be transferred to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, the FEGLI Fund, and the FEHB Fund, as appropriate, and shall be available for the authorized purposes of those accounts: *Provided further*, That any differences between the present value factors published in OPM's yearly 300 series benefit letters and the factors that OPM provides for USPTO's specific use shall be recognized as an imputed cost on USPTO's financial statements, where applicable: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, all fees and surcharges assessed and collected by USPTO are available for USPTO only pursuant to section 42(c) of title 35, United States Code, as amended by section 22 of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (Public Law 112-29): *Provided further*, That within the amounts appropriated, \$2,000,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" account for activities associated with

carrying out investigations and audits related to the USPTO.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND
TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND
SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), \$675,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$9,000,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund": *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That NIST may provide local transportation for summer undergraduate research fellowship program participants.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE
JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$3,000,000) (reduced by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment is intended to ensure that the important forensic standards work at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, is fully funded.

The criminal justice system relies on forensic science to identify and prosecute criminals and to exonerate the falsely accused. Justice is not served by either the falsely accused or the victims and their families when the wrong person is imprisoned.

In a series of investigations over the last few years, The Washington Post, the Innocence Project, and the FBI itself have reported on a flawed forensic work that may be responsible for wrongful convictions in thousands of criminal cases.

□ 1615

Innocent people have spent decades in prison, and our State certainly knows about many of them—my home county, as a matter of fact. Some may have already been put to death while the guilty have gone free.

These investigations have covered hair analysis, bite mark analysis, and even DNA, which most people previously believed to be 100 percent accurate and reliable. In short, there has been a steady stream of bad news about flawed forensic work being used in criminal court. And I worry that we are just seeing the tip of the iceberg.

In a year 2009 report, "Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward," the National Academy of Sciences found that the interpretation of forensic evidence is se-

verely compromised by the lack of supporting science and standards.

Many forensic techniques and technologies lack a scientific foundation. Operational principles and procedures are not standardized, and there are often no standard protocols governing the reporting of forensic evidence.

Since then, I have worked with colleagues in the Senate to develop legislation that would strengthen forensic science and standards. The administration also took notice and has initiated several activities, even without direct action from Congress. The Department of Justice and NIST have become strong partners in this effort. Now, some of my colleagues on Appropriations would like to gut one of these core activities, the standards development work managed by NIST.

For reasons that I cannot comprehend, the report language accompanying this bill would forbid NIST from continuing the voluntary consensus standards development work already underway through the forensics scientific area committees. These committees coordinate development of standards and guidelines for the forensic science community to improve the quality and consistency of forensics evidence used by our justice system.

These committees were established according to the longstanding and well-respected NIST process for developing voluntary consensus standards. As such, the membership of these committees represent the full breadth and depth of stakeholder organizations, including forensic science practitioners, as well as academic scientists and engineers, law enforcement, and others.

To the best of my knowledge, these committees have the support of the full range of stakeholders. Why would we stop, in its tracks, a voluntary consensus standards process that has proven itself effective time and time again? I can see no justifiable reason for trying to keep sound science out of the courtroom.

Mr. Chair, since the language in question is in the committee's report rather than the bill text and will not be sufficiently addressed with this amendment, I plan to withdraw this amendment but seek the approval of both the chair and the ranking member to help correct this language as we move toward the conference report.

My colleagues, I hope, will work with the Senate to rectify this unjustified and unjust restriction.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I look forward to working with my colleague from Texas and with my colleague from Philadelphia on this matter as we move forward in the conference.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I also would work with the gentlewoman and the chairman on this. You know, the premise of our entire judicial system is that we would rather a guilty person go free than any innocent person be in prison.

Forensic science has brought a lot to the business of better understanding actually what has taken place and to make sure that we don't have innocent people incarcerated.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. With that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$130,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$11,000,000)".

Page 36, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$31,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, we should invest in manufacturing, which plays such a vital role in innovation and competitiveness. The Federal Government is uniquely situated to help ensure that manufacturing remains the backbone of the U.S. economy.

My amendment fully funds the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program by increasing funding for the industrial technologies account by \$11 million. This program is the top priority for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Just earlier today, the Chamber listed fully funding the Manufacturing Extension Partnership at \$141 million as its highest priority for the Commerce, Justice, Science bill.

My amendment is also fiscally responsible. It decreases funding for the Federal prison system by \$31 million to ensure that this investment in manufacturing does not affect our national spending.

In Connecticut, we are proud to be a national leader in manufacturing. Our State is home to more than 5,000 manufacturers that provide stable, good-paying jobs for our families. For more than 20 years, our Manufacturing Extension program, the Connecticut

State Technical Extension Program, known as CONNSTEP, has been a trusted adviser for our small- and medium-sized manufacturing companies looking to grow their business and increase their workforce in sales.

Since 2013, CONNSTEP's clients have helped create 511 jobs, retained more than \$527 million in sales, and realized cost savings of \$81 million statewide. In Thomaston, in my district, Metallon, Incorporated, a metal stamping and assembly facility, partnered with CONNSTEP to help conduct internal quality auditing and secure new products. Thanks to the partnership with CONNSTEP, Metallon expanded their workforce and increased sales by half a million dollars.

Metallurgical Processing, Incorporated, a metal processing facility in New Britain, Connecticut, saw a 20 percent increase in production capacity and \$181,000 in cost savings after working with CONNSTEP to streamline product flow and improve production efficiency.

CONNSTEP's support for Connecticut business is critical to our continued leadership in manufacturing, as we not only retain but grow these jobs statewide. I have seen firsthand how CONNSTEP's support has successfully helped our manufacturers to be competitive in an increasingly globalized economy.

But make no mistake, these successes are not just in Connecticut. The Manufacturing Extension program has a proven track record of effective partnerships with manufacturers all across the country. Since the MEP program started more than 25 years ago, centers across America have created more than 729,000 manufacturing jobs, saved companies more than \$13.4 billion, and turned every dollar of Federal investment into \$19 in new sales growth.

The additional funding of the MEP program will enable our centers to fully execute their mission and undertake a robust technology transfer program to help manufacturers take new discoveries from the research lab to the marketplace.

I encourage all my colleagues to support my amendment to fully fund the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program and invest in our manufacturing future.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because our Federal prison system is already between 30 and 50 percent overcrowded. We have not built a new prison in the United States since 2009. It is vitally important that we have got these prisons in place to keep our most dangerous criminal offenders off the streets.

The amendment that the gentlewoman has offered would immediately

prevent the Bureau of Prisons from expanding its capacity and do severe damage to their ability to reduce overcrowding, which is a threat to the staff, a threat to the inmates, and a threat to the public.

The gentlewoman's amendment—I understand she is concerned—to support the Manufacturing Extension program, we cannot do so at the expense of public safety.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, the full committee chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

It is no secret, Mr. Chairman, that there is a strain on our Nation's prison system. As the inmate population continues to rise, our prisons get more and more crowded every day. As the inmate population continues to rise, with 216,000 individuals currently serving Federal sentences, our prisons get more and more crowded every day.

At the end of fiscal 2013—listen to this—25 percent of our medium security inmates and 85 percent of our low security inmates were triple bunked—triple bunked. Considering that 8 out of every 10 medium security inmates has a history of violence, this creates some very serious questions about the safety of the BOP staff, the public, and even other inmates. Updating our prisons will provide greater efficiency and staffing and permits staff to safely oversee more inmates.

Our medium and maximum security prisons house some of the world's most dangerous and violent criminals. The bill before us provides critical funding to the Federal Bureau of Prisons in order to modernize and strengthen our Nation's prison infrastructure. These funds will help protect the public as well as the men and women who work at these facilities. It is imperative that we provide them a safe and secure environment within which to work.

The Federal Government has a commitment to keep the public and prison staff safe, and these dollars are needed to fulfill that commitment. So I oppose this effort to reduce funding for the Bureau of Prisons and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to point out the Manufacturing Extension program is already fully funded. They have got \$130 million set aside for the program in the bill; and, quite frankly, the amendment would endanger the public because we would not be able to proceed with the urgently needed construction of new prison facilities. So I urge my colleagues to join us in opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ESTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I rise in support of the amendment, and I think this shows the bigger picture here if the country has to choose between promoting manufacturing and whether or not we can safely operate the world's largest prison system. We incarcerate more people than any other country in the rest of the world on a per capita basis. We need to be employing more people in manufacturing. This makes sense. I support the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation and maintenance of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by sections 13 through 15 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278c–278e), \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall include in the budget justification materials that the Secretary submits to Congress in support of the Department of Commerce budget (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) an estimate for each National Institute of Standards and Technology construction project having a total multi-year program cost of more than \$5,000,000, and simultaneously the budget justification materials shall include an estimate of the budgetary requirements for each such project for each of the 5 subsequent fiscal years.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft and vessels; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and relocation of facilities, \$3,147,877,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, except that funds provided for cooperative enforcement shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That fees and donations received by the National Ocean Service for the management of national marine sanctuaries may be retained and used for the salaries and expenses associated with those activities, not-

withstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That in addition, \$130,164,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries", which shall only be used for fishery activities related to the Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant Program, Cooperative Research, Annual Stock Assessments, Survey and Monitoring Projects, Interjurisdictional Fisheries Grants, and Fish Information Networks: *Provided further*, That of the \$3,295,541,000 provided for in direct obligations under this heading \$3,147,877,000 is appropriated from the general fund, \$130,164,000 is provided by transfer, and \$17,500,000 is derived from recoveries of prior year obligations: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration corporate services administrative support costs shall not exceed \$208,100,000: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the report accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act: *Provided further*, That in addition, for necessary retired pay expenses under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plan, and for payments for the medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. 55), such sums as may be necessary.

□ 1630

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)".

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increase by \$200,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a minute to tell you how we got here.

As someone who fished in the Gulf of Mexico long before I got elected to Congress, when they started reducing the snapper season back in 2007, we had approximately 190 days to fish as the recreational angler. They have now taken that down to 10 days.

Through the Gulf councils, the National Marine Fisheries Service has worked through the councils to reduce the American recreational fishermen's opportunity to fish for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico by 95 percent since 2007. At the same time, they have increased quotas and allocations for the commercial sector. And most recently through the Gulf council, they cast a vote, 7–10, to split the recreational sector, and they gave the for-hire recreational sector 45 days and the not-for-hire 10 days.

Now, let me just explain what that means to you. It means that if you

want to just take your family fishing, you have 10 days to do it. If you want to go in the other 35 days of that recreational season, you have to pay a charter boat captain to take you out.

What happened with the council is three of the members who voted had a vested interest in the charter boat industry that they did not disclose prior to the vote, even though Federal law required that they do it. Then, they turned around and cast that vote which personally benefited them, which, again, was illegal.

I appreciate the committee working to put in the money for more data in an effort to get the recreational season back for the not-for-hire recreational angler, but to be honest with you, if you give them all the data in the world, no matter what it says, if they continue to conduct themselves in that manner, it won't matter. They will simply allocate themselves more fish.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand the gentleman is going to withdraw his amendment, and he has identified a serious problem that he has brought to our attention that I want to work with my ranking member on.

I understand that it sounds to me like we have got a clear violation of Federal law involved here, and I am very distressed to hear of this reduction. It is a 95 percent reduction in the time available to individual Americans to fish, which is a very important part to all of us who live next to the Gulf of Mexico who go out and fish for red snapper.

I am very concerned to hear about this failure to disclose the conflict of interest, and I would like to work with the gentleman from Georgia to help rectify this and make sure that the law not only is obeyed, but the agency is responsive to the needs of private fishermen. I would like to work with my colleague from Philadelphia on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I thank the chairman and ranking member. This is something that needs to be rectified. If an illegal action was taken, it needs to be reversed.

Based on your commitment to work with us on this amendment at this time, I look forward to having those discussions, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, lines 1, 18, and 19, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$60,760,000) (increased by \$60,760,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Sadly, the funding in this bill for NOAA's climate research is shamefully inadequate and puts at risk efforts to mitigate and respond to the impacts of climate change. It cuts NOAA's climate research by \$30 million relative to the current fiscal year's inadequate level and is \$61 million below the President's request. I am offering an amendment to restore the funding to the President's level.

All across America, we are dealing with the impacts of climate change. Extreme weather events, whether it is the recent floods in Texas, or the persistent 4-year drought in California, are regular events. They claim lives and cost billions of dollars each year. Floods, droughts, superstorms, wildfires, heat waves, and sea level rise are all made worse as a result of climate change.

We are no longer talking just about preparing for the future. It is happening now. And the evidence is clear as we go from one extreme weather event to another that it is getting worse.

NOAA climate research funds atmospheric and oceanic research, cooperative institutes, universities, climate research laboratories, and others that will advance climate science and enable better decisionmaking and better policies to make our communities more resilient.

It makes no sense to defund programs to help us prepare for extreme weather events; mitigate the impacts of such events; prevent the loss of human life, infrastructure, and property; and better predict these occurrences.

Choosing to deny climate change does not stop it from happening, and failing to study and authorize these programs will not make the problem go away. In fact, it will only make us more vulnerable and hurt our ability to prepare for and respond to the impacts of climate change.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has a record level of funding in this bill for weather forecasting, which is where they need to focus their work: predicting the future and telling American farmers, American workers, American industry, and the American people what the future holds. What does the next week, the next month, or hurri-

cane season hold for the people of the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Coast?

So, in an era of scarce resources we have funded NOAA with a record level of funding for weather forecasting. We have made sure they have got all the money they need for maritime safety and for supporting and monitoring America's fisheries.

We have made sure in this bill that NOAA is focusing on their core function, and that is looking to the future. That, of course, is going to involve looking at climate. But over the past several years climate funding within NOAA has received more than adequate funding, and we have to use the scarce, very precious, hard-earned taxpayer dollars that we are entrusted to appropriate very carefully. We have to prioritize that funding, and within this bill, we have chosen to prioritize weather forecasting.

I respect the gentleman's judgment but would ask him if he could withdraw the amendment, and I look forward to working with him to ensure that NOAA has got everything they need to accurately predict the weather in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Blumenauer amendment.

In business, we are always fighting the tendency of the long term giving away to the short term, the important giving away to the urgent and the immediate.

I am deeply disappointed that this budget for climate research has been cut by \$30 million. Now is not the time to cut climate research.

From the floods in Houston to the drought in California, shifts in climate over the next few decades will cost American companies and American communities hundreds of billions of dollars. NOAA has the ability to do advanced forecasting predictions certainly for weather- and for ocean-related phenomena, but they also have it for climate short- and long-term change. This ability is crucial to support the future of our businesses, coastal cities, and environmental health.

This Congress has repeatedly affirmed that climate change is real. We may have different ideas about the cause of climate change and certainly what we can do to combat it, but it makes no sense to slash the very research which will enable us to find effective, bipartisan solutions.

We must robustly fund climate science research, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. In this bill there are three cuts: at NASA on the Earth Science program, the cut to the National Science Foundation in terms of the ability to focus on geosciences, and the issue that is raised by my great friend from Oregon, and they combine to make the point that there is not yet a consensus in one place. Even though there is a consensus in the scientific community, the majority still is not yet clear that climate is something that we need to focus on.

I urge support for the Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I respect my friend from Texas. I appreciate his willingness to work with me and his notion of putting more resources in forecasting, but that is not the issue here.

What we need to be doing is having a robust effort at NOAA to be able to deal comprehensively with climate, being able to deal with how we help communities be more resilient, how we are able to deal with the forces that are down upon us to help the scientific bases to be able to maybe even encourage this Congress to step up and do its job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman be more specific about what it is he is asking NOAA to do?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is our ability to provide reliable, long-term drought forecasts, projections of regional drought indicators, and issues dealing with the prediction of what happens in terms of flood research and performance of climate and weather models.

This is not simply a matter of predicting next week's weather. This is dealing with long-term consequences and helping communities deal with the impact of climate change and being able to understand it better.

Mr. Chairman, this is an entirely self-imposed constraint from my Republican friends. They have passed hundreds of billions of dollars of unfunded tax cuts out of committee. There is more than adequate money.

Because the budget is so hopelessly inadequate, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$70,000,000) (increased by \$70,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Hampshire and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I plan to withdraw this amendment, but I would like the opportunity to briefly explain.

The Saltonstall-Kennedy Act of 1954 imposed a special duty on fish and fish products imported into the United States and required that 30 percent of the money collected by NOAA would go toward supporting fisheries and research and development on the industry's long-term sustainability. However, NOAA has not been properly paying into its regional fishing grant programs and is using these tariffs as part of its operational expenses.

To ensure a thriving fishing industry, we must invest in initiatives that increase the stock of our Nation's fisheries by providing grants to research and monitor them as well as management programs.

During my first term, I introduced legislation that would ensure that key programs critical to sustainably managing ocean fish populations and the fishermen and communities that depend on them would receive increased and sustained funding.

I sincerely thank Chairman CULBERSON for considering my appropriations letter and including the transfer of \$130 million in existing funds to be used exclusively on Saltonstall-Kennedy fishing activity, particularly the S-K regional fisheries investment grant program.

This transfer of funds will directly provide grants to regional fishery management councils that would work with area fishermen to identify investment priorities. These investment priorities include disaster assistance, improving shoreside infrastructure, seafood promotion, and managing highly migratory species.

The transfer of these funds will help; however, it is a temporary fix to a much larger issue.

□ 1645

This year, I, along with my friend Congressman BILL KEATING, have introduced the same legislation that would ensure that NOAA follow the requirement laid out in the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act of 1954.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON for taking my letter and thoughts into consideration. I appreciate the hard work of the committee on this issue and the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to work with the gentleman from New Hampshire on this issue as we move forward. I understand the importance of the issue. I appreciate very much you raising it here with us today, and we look forward to working with you.

We do include language stating that certain funds may be used only for activities related to the Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant Program.

We have worked with NOAA for the past several years to reduce their administration costs. We will continue to do so this year, and I will continue to work with you as we move forward through the process.

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, lines 1, 18, and 19, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000) (increased by \$30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to several of the critical accounts in the bill that have been cut, which my amendment would address.

The CJS Appropriations Act specifically targets funding for NOAA's climate research programs by \$30 million over currently enacted levels, a program so important for farmers, for businesses, for air safety, for so many different reasons. That is a 20 percent cut to programs that are imperative to our Nation's ability and resilience in the face of climate threats.

Twenty-five people were killed in the floods that saturated Texas last month. Damage from Hurricane Sandy was estimated at \$700 billion back in 2012, and at least six people died in Boulder and Larimer County during the flooding that overtook my region in 2013. None of these places had ever seen storms like the ones they encountered over the last 5 years, and each were unprepared to handle it.

NOAA and its partner institutions have made a huge dent in preventing disasters like these by keeping first responders, weather forecasters, businesses, communities, and families on the cutting edge of data predictability and resilience, providing quality raw data, as well as helping to develop new algorithms for interpreting existing data.

Two of our partner institutions, CU and CSU, are located in my district in Colorado. Together with NOAA, these institutions are developing unmanned atmospheric assessment aircraft that allow us to foresee changes in weather patterns, incoming storms, days before we could otherwise, saving lives and saving property damage.

These are very real tangible benefits that benefit all and protect Americans, regardless of whether one believes in climate change or what is causing it. I

urge my colleagues to consider a world without these capabilities and what that would look like.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We have, as I said earlier, scarce resources this year. We have to prioritize the very precious and scarce hard-earned taxpayers dollars that we are entrusted to look after, and we have prioritized funding within NOAA for forecasting in the future.

As I was telling Mr. BLUMENAUER earlier, Mr. POLIS, we have made sure that NOAA has got a record level of funding for weather forecasting and most of the things that Mr. BLUMENAUER was mentioning, in terms of forecasting drought, identifying where floods are going to occur.

Looking forward, we have made sure that NOAA's got all the money they need for forecasting in the future, and we have to, I think, do everything we can to avoid cutting other parts of NOAA that would impair the weather forecasting or the development, maintenance, and operation of the weather satellites which could help NOAA inform people of severe weather.

We, on the Gulf Coast in particular and on the Atlantic Coast as well, depend on NOAA to give us accurate forecasts of the paths of hurricanes. Hurricane season this year, they are predicting—because of the increase in computing power of supercomputers, they are able to predict it looks like it is going to be—the hurricane season this year is not going to be as severe.

That capacity of NOAA to use supercomputing power to look that far into the future is of vital importance, so we have made sure that they have got a record level of funding for forecasting.

We also do not want to reduce NOAA's capacity to support maritime navigation or to appropriately manage their fisheries. We just have limited resources, is the problem, Mr. POLIS; and I just have had to prioritize NOAA's funding.

We have put weather forecasting at the top of the list because of its vital importance for the economy and for the safety and security of the American people.

I understand you are planning to withdraw the amendment, and I would certainly look forward to working with you. As Mr. BLUMENAUER mentioned a number of worthwhile endeavors that NOAA is engaged in, if you feel there are areas we need to work together on to get NOAA focused on to do a better job of forecasting in the future or other concerns, I would be happy to work with you.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado if he would like to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to emphasize the importance of climate science with regard to predicting weather. The more we know about climate and climate patterns, the more it enhances our ability to predict short-term weather phenomena; therefore, a disproportionate cut to the climate science piece hampers our ability to anticipate weather patterns as well.

Mr. CULBERSON. I look forward to working with you as we move forward in the process. I understand you are planning to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I have additional speakers.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most concerning things about this budget proposal is, without question, the proposal to cut \$30 million to NOAA. That represents an approximately 20 percent cut, as my colleague from Colorado was pointing out.

Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that those who would deny the science of climate change often like to say, Well, the jury is still out, we need more research; yet here we are, with a budget that will cut that very research.

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of years ago, in my house in Philadelphia, we were riding out a hurricane. Hurricane Sandy ended up becoming Superstorm Sandy. We never imagined that, in Philadelphia, we would be experiencing the kind of hurricane that typically is experienced by Florida and the Gulf Coast States.

As even a Republican Governor said at the time, it seems as if the storm of the century is now happening once every couple of years.

Mr. Chairman, we desperately need this research. We need this funding. Let's restore NOAA funding.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am still trying to identify what precisely you are asking for because I think we are on the same page when it comes to forecasting and prediction. That is what you are asking for.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I wanted to inquire with regard to how the funding cuts would impact the development of the unmanned atmospheric assessment aircrafts that are critical to foreseeing changes in weather pattern.

Mr. CULBERSON. If I could, we are going to make sure that NOAA has got all the—we have given them a record level of increase this year so they can engage and make sure we have got accurate forecasting. Whether it be through their aircraft or their supercomputers or their modeling, they have got the resources they need to do accurate forecasting for the future.

I am just trying to get a precise idea what it is you are looking for because

I think we have given them all they need for forecasting, and that is what you are asking for.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, very specifically, this amendment would restore the \$30 million of cuts—namely, a 20 percent cut—a disproportionate cut to climate science activities, including unmanned atmospheric assessment aircrafts and including creating raw data streams that can be used by those who predict weather, as well as by farmers and businesses, because you can't separate out weather and climate.

I think, perhaps because of political reasons—I don't know why—there is a disproportionate cut, 20 percent, to the climate science piece of NOAA. Now, that climate science piece of NOAA, just because it has the word "climate" in it, that doesn't mean it is something where they are out there doing things that are political.

What they are doing is they are trying to research the macro effects of climate on weather, on population and patterns, on dangers on ships. If the gentleman would simply allow that discretion within NOAA, undo the 20 percent cut, we fund that within NOAA.

We are not, nor can we, under the budget, seek new money. We are simply taking the \$30 million and putting it back into the climate science program.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you for yielding because I have just checked with my staff, and it appears that the money that we have allocated, a record level of funding for NOAA's forecasting, takes care of that aircraft. The money that we have allocated for NOAA for forecasting takes care of the data stream.

That is why I kept asking what are y'all specifically asking for. We have taken care of it. We are deeply concerned with making sure that NOAA has got the money they need to predict hurricanes, to predict floods, to predict the terrible flooding that has taken place in Houston or the drought that has taken place in California.

I think we are on the same page. I want to be sure the gentleman knows that I will work with him as we move forward in conference. If you can identify something specific that NOAA does not have as a result of our record increase for forecasting, we will help you restore it.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, one of the areas we would love to work with you on is Cooperative Institutes funding, the partnerships that NOAA has with our institutions of higher education to better leverage our taxpayer dollars.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,000,000) (increased by \$21,000,000)".

Page 14, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment takes direct, strong action to address America's weather forecasting shortcomings in order to reduce the loss of life and property from severe storms.

The amendment I offer on behalf of myself; Science, Space, and Technology Committee Vice Chairman FRANK LUCAS; and Environment Subcommittee Chairman JIM BRIDENSTINE directs that the full \$120 million authorized in House-passed H.R. 1561, the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2015, be provided in the NOAA Operations, Research, and Facilities appropriation account.

The recent flooding in Texas and tornados in Oklahoma demonstrate the immediate need to quickly implement better weather research and forecasting by fully funding H.R. 1561.

The House unanimously passed that bill just 2 weeks ago. We also unanimously passed it over a year ago in April 2014.

Now, thanks to Chairman CULBERSON's initiative and support, the CJS bill will add the needed resources to transform our antiquated 1980s weather forecasting system into a 21st century weather enterprise in the next few years.

Specifically, this amendment will provide \$5 million more for weather lab research in NOAA, to total the \$80 million authorized. The amendment will also provide \$16 million more for weather research technology transfer in NOAA's Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, to total \$20 million authorized to implement a labs and Cooperative Institutes research-to-operations program.

This program will improve the understanding of how the public responds to warnings and transfer new technology to the National Weather Service, the American weather industry, and the academic partners.

This new joint Technology Transfer Initiative should include support for the Vortex-SE project and development of advanced national and global cloud resolving models; quantitative observing system assessment tools; atmospheric chemistry needed for weather

prediction; and additional sources of weather data, which includes commercial observing systems.

Once again, I appreciate Chairman CULBERSON's accepting the amendment, which will help save lives and reduce property damage.

As the CJS Appropriations chairman, Mr. CULBERSON has proved himself to be capable, knowledgeable, and committed to the country's best interest.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Texas seek to rise in opposition?

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, I would like to seek some time in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment. We have agreed to accept it and work this out.

The Acting CHAIR. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed?

Mr. FATTAH. I am authentically opposed to the amendment, but I would also make an allowance to yield to my chairman after I make my comments.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1700

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to stress, if I could, that Chairman SMITH has been very supportive and cooperative. We have worked together arm in arm, as has his ranking member, who is also from Texas. This amendment is one that will help the Weather Service do a better job of forecasting. I think it is a good amendment. It is one that we have worked out together. I do urge Members to support it.

I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielding to me.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time in opposition, in all good, there is some bad. It is true that this amendment would offer some additional dollars for weather forecasting. But \$16 million of it—the bulk of the \$21 million—would go into technology transfer. Now, I am not opposed to technology transfer, but to take it out of the administrative work at NOAA, I have visited NOAA, and I understand how the operations there work. I have spent a lot of time learning about its operations. And I can tell you that NOAA cannot perform the duties that our Nation needs without the administrative capabilities.

It would be just like coming here to the Hill and expecting the Congress to function without our back office operations. We would not be able to proceed forward. So I think that it is more important for us to have an appropriate allocation so that we can meet these needs than it is to rob the administrative capability of NOAA at a time when we want to place more demands on it.

I think that the amendment—even though moving towards additional help for weather forecasting—the bulk of it is for a technology transfer to the private sector, which I am all for, but it sounds to me like it is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

On the floor, it may be easy to pass an amendment that cuts administrative costs at a government agency, but it may be something that we live to regret. So I stand in opposition to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), who is the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership on this important amendment as well as Chairman CULBERSON. I thank them for working with us on this amendment. I know we have been working very hard to make sure that this is adequately funded and from the right sources.

By fully funding the weather research and technology transfer that was authorized by my bill, H.R. 1561, this appropriations bill now reflects the House's will that NOAA prioritize activities that save lives and property. The funding will go to support critical work to increase the lead times that we receive for tornadoes. A lot of this critical work is being done at the University of Oklahoma. I have heard already that we were looking for more funding for some Cooperative Institutes, and that is what this is.

This is of extreme importance to my State, as I have already lost constituents this year from tornadoes. It is my sincere belief that this appropriations bill now ensures that programs are funded that will eventually move us to a day where no one is killed in a tornado or other severe storm event.

Again, I thank Chairman CULBERSON and Chairman SMITH for their leadership on this issue. We need to adopt this amendment so that we can save lives and property, especially as it relates to my constituents in Oklahoma.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,750,000) (increased by \$1,750,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to offer and withdraw my amendment.

I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the chairman and the gentlewoman from Maine.

Since 1972, the National Marine Fisheries Service has utilized trained fishery observers to monitor and assess the health of fish populations along the coast of the United States, providing critical data gathered from commercial vessels that is then used to guide NOAA in determining best practices for conservation and sustainable management.

The fishing industry is a willing and engaged partner in supporting the use of on-vessel observers. However, following a legal challenge, this August, NOAA will run out of funding to continue paying for this mandated program.

I have heard from fishermen from the south coast of Massachusetts, to Cape Cod and the islands, to the south shore who are still struggling from the impacts of diminishing groundfish stocks and worry they will be unable to cover the burden of this cost.

Our region is still reeling from the collapse of the groundfish industry that prompted Federal disaster relief. This is particularly true for some small fishing businesses, where this added burden can be the difference between success and failure as a business.

I am working with my New England and Massachusetts colleagues and NOAA to find an interim solution. And as we look to 2016, I ask that we work to provide adequate funding for at-sea and dockside monitoring for fisheries with approved catch share management plans that impose observer coverage as a condition for new and expanded fishing opportunities. We also can use this time, I believe, to seek cost-effective technological alternatives, where appropriate.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts and Chairman CULBERSON for chatting with us about this particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, as has been already stated here by my colleague today, there is never a good time to ask our fishermen to take on a cost of this size that we are discussing here. But now is an even worse time than most because it will be asking those who make their living on the Gulf of Maine to pay for onboard monitors when the ground fishery is struggling. I understand the tough position that NOAA is in due to tight budgets, but times are even tougher on the men and women who make their living from groundfish right now.

I hope NOAA can find a way to avoid making them pay for onboard monitors, and whatever the short-term solution is, I think NOAA should look at

ways to conduct monitoring through the use of onboard cameras or other cost-effective electronic technologies.

I hope the chairman will be willing to work with us on this and with NOAA on this issue that affects so many of our hard-working constituents.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to thank the chair and ranking member for their willingness to engage in what really is an important issue. I look forward to working together with Chairman CULBERSON and Ranking Member FATTAH on this issue.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I recognize how important the Northeast Multispecies Sector Management Program is, and I look forward to working with the gentleman and my colleague from Philadelphia as we move forward through conference.

Mr. FATTAH. We are going to work to get to a more satisfactory resolution.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the ranking member and the chair.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 25, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I am introducing an amendment which would take \$2 million from the Department of Justice's legal activities, salaries and expenses, general legal activities current budget of \$885 million, which has been flat over the last several years, and I would put this \$2 million, instead, to NOAA in their operations, research, and facilities fund—specifically directed to NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service Habitat Conservation and Restoration initiative.

This nationwide initiative includes hundreds of community-based habitat restoration projects that conserve or restore America's precious native species and critical water quality restoration.

This amendment is consistent with the focus of my office to cut govern-

ment spending and motivate our civil servant management teams to achieve higher cost efficiencies throughout the Federal Government and to focus more on critical environmental priorities. In short, less administration expense; more money for water, fish, and atmosphere.

Back in April, I introduced an amendment to H.R. 2028, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, with Representative PATRICK MURPHY of Florida that would move \$1 million of the Army Corps of Engineers' salary and expense budget to construction projects in the Corps, like the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration and the Herbert Hoover Dike.

This amendment today likewise will help fund critical habitat projects across America, including important work in my district, like the Galt Preserve Restoration Project in St. James City; the Clam Bayou Oyster Reef Restoration and Evaluation of Seagrass and Water Quality on Sanibel Island; the Ding Darling Mangrove Restoration Project on Sanibel Island; Florida's Bay Scallop Metapopulation Stabilization at Pine Island Center; the Mangrove Conservation Initiative in Naples; and the Sam Williams Island Mangrove Restoration and Tarpon Bay Hydrologic Restoration on Marco Island.

Habitat restoration plays an important role in all of our communities and in the lives and welfare of our constituents, especially mine. America's ecosystem is the lifeblood of so many of our American communities, economies, and culture. Let's do everything we can to preserve it.

Fisheries contribute more than \$70 billion to the gross domestic product. Nationwide, commercial and recreational fishing, boating, tourism, and other industries provide more than \$28 million jobs. Together, coastal watershed counties contribute more than \$4.5 trillion to the GDP. An estimated 53 percent of the current population live in coastal communities. More than 60 percent of our coastal rivers and bays are moderately or severely degraded by nutrient runoff. This was my original reason for getting into politics. We live with this nutrient runoff in my district, in my backyard, every day. It looks bad. It smells bad. It is a pitiful situation.

One added fact: according to NOAA's studies, 17 to 33 jobs are created for every \$1 million invested in habitat restoration.

I say today, let's save a little bit of money, save a lot of jobs. It is good economics. It is good policy. It is good conservation. And I urge both sides to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. It is a worthwhile cause and one that we have worked together closely on. So I would urge Members to support the amendment. I look forward to working with you as we move through conference to make sure this is addressed. It is a problem throughout the Gulf Coast and one you are very right to focus Congress' attention on.

I urge Members to support the amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this. This is a big deal in the Gulf. My appreciation is heartfelt for them making this move and showing this symbol of importance. So in the name of all of my constituents, I thank both of them for their leadership and support on this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 4 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,559,000) (increased by \$21,559,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to increase funding for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to support its Integrated Ocean Acidification research and fulfill the administration's requested funding level of \$30 million in fiscal year 2016.

The administration's requested funding increase for ocean acidification research reflects a growing consensus in the scientific community and in the coastal and fishing communities that so many of our colleagues and I represent. Ocean acidification is already affecting marine organisms and could irreversibly alter the marine environment and harm our coastal ecosystems.

On the West Coast alone, a \$270 million shellfish industry has experienced disastrous oyster production failures and faced the risk of collapse in recent years because of changes in water condition that have been attributed to ocean acidification. This change in chemistry is caused by carbon dioxide in the atmosphere dissolving into the ocean, and the increased acidity of the ocean is harming basic building blocks for life in the sea. This makes it more difficult for marine organisms to build their skeletons and shells, and it slows the formation of important ecosystem features like coral reefs. These changes can ripple through the food chain, disrupting delicate marine ecosystems and threatening major commercial fisheries.

In the Pacific Northwest, the combination of seasonal upwelling of acidic waters, low alkalinity, and increased anthropogenic carbon dioxide creates some of the most corrosive ocean conditions in the world.

In the last few years, Mr. Chairman, the scientific community has increasingly raised concerns about the ocean. Researchers at Oregon State University have been working with the fishing community in Oregon to determine the effects of acidification. They have been helping the shellfish hatcheries assess the oyster die-off and finding ways to mitigate the harmful upwelling events by monitoring the water entering their facilities. This exemplifies the kind of academic and industry partnerships that are possible when the Federal Government supports academic research.

NOAA's Integrated Ocean Acidification research program supports extramural research awards that fund studies on acidification in ocean, coastal, and estuary environments. Not only does this program support studies on the effects of acidification, it also allows NOAA to run the observing system that helps monitor areas of increased acidity.

These examples have focused on the effects in Oregon and on the West Coast, but our changing ocean conditions can have far-reaching implications for fisheries throughout the U.S., including the East Coast and Gulf shellfish industries. It also affects the people across the Nation who eat seafood and the stores and restaurants that sell it.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that we need more information, which is why NOAA's Integrated Ocean Acidification research program must be fully funded. Unfortunately, this bill falls short of what the American people and our fishing communities deserve.

I urge support of the amendment, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand the gentlewoman is going to withdraw this amendment.

I agree with the gentlewoman that ocean acidification is a serious problem. That is why you see funding in the bill for it. We just have a limited amount of resources.

I will listen to your other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, can I please inquire about the remaining time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), my colleague.

Mr. FARR. I wish the chairman was accepting this amendment because the faults that we hear are that we have limited resources. We have limited resources, but it is a priority where you give them. This ocean acidification is a serious problem. It is the most serious problem of mankind that we can do something about. When the ocean is starting to melt all the shellfish, the lobster industry, the crab industry, the oyster industry, and the clam industry, all of these industries have a huge effect on not only where they are farming, but where the tourism that is attracted to them.

Mr. Chairman, we can do something about it. We need more money. The President asked for \$30 million in this program. The committee cut it to \$8.4 million, says he is funding it. However, the President asked for the same amount of money for the exploration of the moon of Jupiter called Europa. The committee decided to give them \$110 million more than the President asked for. So don't tell me that there isn't money available. It is just the priority where you give it.

Are you going to save this planet or put all the money into the moon of Jupiter? I think it is more important that we research ocean acidification, and that is why DON YOUNG and I are introducing a bill to tackle this problem more than just this amendment in this moment.

Mr. Chairman, we have to get serious about this. The planet is melting, and the ocean acidification is melting the organisms in the ocean; and when they die, we die.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my colleagues we have \$8.5 million in the bill for studying ocean acidification. I share your concern. It is a vitally important issue. And the thrust of our work in NASA, as you know from reading the bill, is we have prioritized those missions in the bill that are the top priority of the Planetary Decadal Survey.

We have encouraged NASA to follow the recommendations of the best minds in the scientific community. Every 10 years they get together and prioritize the earth science missions, heliophysics missions, astrophysics missions, those missions aimed at the

outer planets, and the Europa mission has been the single highest priority of the Decadal Survey last decade and this decade. The past administration and this one continue to resist the best recommendations of the best minds in the scientific community. I can't think of a more exciting question that science could answer as to whether or not there is life on another world, and that is going to be answered by this mission to Europa.

I agree strongly that we need to research ocean acidification, and that is why there is \$8.5 million in the bill for it.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Even though I am in a totally opposite position on the matter than you.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am happy to engage in a colloquy with my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. We have an Earth in which the majority of it is covered by oceans. As a nation, we have more responsibility territorially for the world's oceans than any other nation. You agree that this is a major issue. It is funded at a level that we think should be increased. I hope that the chairman will work with us as we go forward to see whether we can improve and make even more robust our stewardship, which is our responsibility, as I would understand it. Even though there are other areas in the bill where we have made important sacrifices, maybe this is an area where we can do more.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is one in which I look forward to working with you on to do more to research ocean acidification. That is why you see in the bill a major investment in oceanographic mapping and research, the economic zone of the United States which is unmapped and uncharted and loaded with rare earths and great mineral wealth that Dr. Bob Ballard and his team and other scientists are exploring, and we are investing there.

I look forward to working with you in conference.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, we will work together on this. This is a very important area of interest for me, and I thank the gentlewoman for offering her amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, I do plan to withdraw this amendment. I do want to emphasize the seriousness of this issue in addressing it. I do contend that the amount in this bill is inadequate. So I do look forward to working with the committee chairman, the ranking member, and the committee going forward to address this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For procurement, acquisition and construction of capital assets, including alteration and modification costs, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$1,960,034,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, except that funds provided for construction of facilities shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the \$1,973,034,000 provided for in direct obligations under this heading, \$1,960,034,000 is appropriated from the general fund and \$13,000,000 is provided from recoveries of prior year obligations: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the report accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall include in budget justification materials that the Secretary submits to Congress in support of the Department of Commerce budget (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) an estimate for each National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration procurement, acquisition or construction project having a total of more than \$5,000,000 and simultaneously the budget justification shall include an estimate of the budgetary requirements for each such project for each of the 5 subsequent fiscal years: *Provided further*, That, within the amounts appropriated, \$1,302,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" account for activities associated with carrying out investigations and audits related to satellite procurement, acquisition and construction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000) (increased by \$9,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment designates \$9 million within NOAA's Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction account for the purposes of funding a pilot program for space-based commercial weather data as authorized by H.R. 1561, the House-passed Lucas-Bridenstine Weather Research and Forecasting Act of 2015.

Although I intend to withdraw my amendment, I intend to use this time to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, the commercial satellite industry has revolutionized ev-

eryday life. From telecommunications to imaging to navigation, we reap the benefits of private sector innovation. I truly believe we have that opportunity when it comes to weather satellites as well. By introducing newer, more innovative, more resilient and additional forms of data into our numerical weather models, we can improve our ability to forecast weather and save the lives of our constituents.

By providing NOAA with the funds to purchase commercial data, it sends a clear signal to the burgeoning, nascent weather satellite industry: NOAA is interested in commercial data from the private sector. This pilot program has the potential to shift paradigms within our weather enterprise and serve as the first step toward moving to a day where the government does not have a monopoly on weather satellites.

NOAA operates huge, monolithic, billion-dollar satellite programs that have experienced cost overruns and launch delays. These programs are important to ensuring we have robust weather data, but we need a mitigation strategy when problems arise, a role that commercial sources can play. In addition, they can augment our programs of record, and for a fraction of the cost. In fact, to fully fund this program, NOAA would only need to find the equivalent of one dime out of a \$20 bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe, in the long run, purchasing data from the private sector will lead to lower costs for the taxpayers, as well as better data, more data, and more innovation. However, I understand the constraints that the gentleman from Texas is under when crafting this appropriations bill, and I appreciate his willingness to work with me on this issue. The question I pose to him is: Does the chairman intend to have NOAA provide \$9 million from within its Procurement, Acquisition, and Construction appropriation for NESDIS Systems Acquisition to carry out this pilot program in fiscal year 2016 as is authorized in H.R. 1561?

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I agree completely with the gentleman that NOAA should work with the private sector when data is available. It is cost effective and can save the taxpayers money, and, in fact, that is why we included a statement on this in the committee report. I look forward to working with you as we move forward in conference to ensure that this worthwhile goal is achieved.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I thank the chairman. I look forward to working together with you and with NOAA to ensure that congressional intent is clear and to make this critically important pilot program a reality. I appreciate your leadership and assistance on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 5 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, lines 16, 19, and 20, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$380,000,000)".

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to ensure the continuity of NOAA's polar satellite program by restoring its funding. There are many important priorities in this bill, but the technical nature of this satellite program and its value to our Nation are being overlooked.

The importance of these satellites and the need to maintain the information they collect is not daily news, but the accurate, timely data the satellites provide to our weather forecasters is crucial. This data is needed not only in severe weather scenarios, but also for the wide-ranging accessibility to everyone in our Nation, from those who hear a weather forecast on the local news to the millions across the Nation who open up an app on their phones.

Weather is important. It affects everything from our commute to the food on our table. In fact, a 2009 study from the American Meteorological Society stated that U.S. weather forecasts generate \$31.5 billion in benefits for \$5.1 billion in cost.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, past trouble and mismanagement in the polar satellite program means that a gap in coverage within the next decade is possible, with the worst-case scenario being a gap lasting more than 5 years. Any loss of coverage from the polar satellites would have serious consequences on the accuracy and timeliness of our weather forecasts, warnings, and the capabilities of the National Weather Service.

Thankfully, NOAA and NASA have worked very hard to get the polar satellite program back on track. Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today has the potential to undermine that progress. The President's fiscal year 2016 budget request included \$380 million for a polar follow-on program. This important program will minimize the risk of a gap in polar weather data and address a recommendation from various independent groups, including the Government Accountability Office,

regarding the need to develop a robust satellite program, a program that can withstand a launch failure.

By not funding the polar follow-on program in 2016, the continuity for the polar weather mission is put at risk and the Nation will be exposed to the vulnerabilities and impacts of a potential gap.

Mr. Chairman, working families in my district and across the country are balancing enough already. They need to rely on accurate and timely forecasts, not worry about a gap or where the weather data comes from. We need this program to continue so we do not lose the gains we have made. Americans deserve to have access to the best available scientific data.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the funding levels in this bill are stretched so thin that it is impossible for me to find more than \$300 million to provide an offset. So I do ask the subcommittee chairman and ranking member to work with me on ways that we can find to preserve and maintain this essential program.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PACIFIC COASTAL SALMON RECOVERY

For necessary expenses associated with the restoration of Pacific salmon populations, \$65,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That, of the funds provided herein, the Secretary of Commerce may issue grants to the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, California, and Alaska, and to the Federally recognized tribes of the Columbia River and Pacific Coast (including Alaska), for projects necessary for conservation of salmon and steelhead populations that are listed as threatened or endangered, or that are identified by a State as at-risk to be so listed, for maintaining populations necessary for exercise of tribal treaty fishing rights or native subsistence fishing, or for conservation of Pacific coastal salmon and steelhead habitat, based on guidelines to be developed by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That all funds shall be allocated based on scientific and other merit principles and shall not be available for marketing activities: *Provided further*, That funds disbursed to States shall be subject to a matching requirement of funds or documented in-kind contributions of at least 33 percent of the Federal funds.

FISHERMEN'S CONTINGENCY FUND

For carrying out the provisions of title IV of Public Law 95-372, not to exceed \$350,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to that Act, to remain available until expended.

FISHERIES FINANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2016, obligations of direct loans may not exceed \$24,000,000 for Individual Fishing Quota loans and not to exceed \$100,000,000 for traditional direct loans as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the management of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed \$4,500 for official reception and representation, \$50,000,000.

RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for the renovation and modernization of the Herbert C. Hoover Building, \$3,989,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,082,000 shall be for security systems and \$2,907,000 shall be for blast-resistant windows.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$32,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations and funds made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 1514), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the Act, and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3324, may be used for advanced payments not otherwise authorized only upon the certification of officials designated by the Secretary of Commerce that such payments are in the public interest.

SEC. 102. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act for salaries and expenses shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Commerce in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall notify the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days in advance of the acquisition or disposal of any capital asset (including land, structures, and equipment) not specifically provided for in this Act or any other law appropriating funds for the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 104. The requirements set forth by section 105 of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55), as amended by section 105 of title I of division B of Public Law 113-6, are hereby adopted by reference and made applicable with respect to fiscal year 2016: *Provided*, That the life cycle cost for the Joint Polar Satellite System is \$11,322,125,000 and the life cycle cost for the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite R-Series Program is \$10,828,059,000.

SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may furnish services (including but not limited to utilities, telecommunications, and security services) necessary to support the operation, maintenance, and improvement of space that persons, firms, or organizations are authorized, pursuant to the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 or other authority, to use or occupy in the Herbert C. Hoover Building,

Washington, DC, or other buildings, the maintenance, operation, and protection of which has been delegated to the Secretary from the Administrator of General Services pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 on a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis. Amounts received as reimbursement for services provided under this section or the authority under which the use or occupancy of the space is authorized, up to \$200,000, shall be credited to the appropriation or fund which initially bears the costs of such services.

SEC. 106. Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent a grant recipient from deterring child pornography, copyright infringement, or any other unlawful activity over its networks.

SEC. 107. The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is authorized to use, with their consent, with reimbursement and subject to the limits of available appropriations, the land, services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, or of any State, local government, Indian tribal government, Territory, or possession, or of any political subdivision thereof, or of any foreign government or international organization, for purposes related to carrying out the responsibilities of any statute administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

SEC. 108. The National Technical Information Service shall not charge any customer for a copy of any report or document generated by the Legislative Branch unless the Service has provided information to the customer on how an electronic copy of such report or document may be accessed and downloaded for free online. Should a customer still require the Service to provide a printed or digital copy of the report or document, the charge shall be limited to recovering the Service's cost of processing, reproducing, and delivering such report or document.

SEC. 109. The Secretary of Commerce may waive the requirement for bonds under 40 U.S.C. 3131 with respect to contracts for the construction, alteration, or repair of vessels, regardless of the terms of the contracts as to payment or title, when the contract is made under the Coast and Geodetic Survey Act of 1947 (33 U.S.C. 883a et seq.).

SEC. 110. In fiscal year 2016, the National Institute of Standards and Technology may use unobligated balances from the "National Institute of Standards and Technology—Industrial Technology Services" account for the purposes of and subject to the limitations in section 34(e)(2) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278s(e)(2)).

This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce Appropriations Act, 2016".

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, \$105,000,000, of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 for security and construction of Department of Justice facilities shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(decreased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 72, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, many small businesses around the country are struggling, struggling to compete against low-priced foreign imports benefiting from unfair trade practices. They are constantly intimidated by the cost of the legal challenges that they face.

The intent of this amendment is simple. It transfers \$2 million to the International Trade Commission to provide legal and technical assistance to small businesses seeking a remedy.

I offered this amendment last year to the bill and it was approved.

Time and time again small companies are losing business against unfair, low-cost imports which flood our country. Something needs to be done. Small businesses need help.

They don't have access to the same legal resources as larger companies. They can't afford the cost to file a claim against large state-supported industries like we see coming from China. These small businesses in America deserve to be treated better.

In West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, we have one particular company which manufactures glass, lead-free marbles. The company has less than 50 employees. They, among other firms like that, have asked our office a simple question: When an average cost to file an antidumping claim is \$1 million or more, how can small manufacturers afford access to justice?

The Federal Government provides pro bono attorneys in criminal cases for those who can't afford representation. Mr. Chairman, why not offer something similar to our small businesses across America who are facing unfair competition?

A recent contract was for 300 million marbles per year. Currently, this company manufactures 1 million per day. This contract would have guaranteed 300 days of manufacturing production for hard-working West Virginians.

The Chinese company undercut their bid. Unfortunately, we have seen this story far too often where the Chinese currency manipulation and state subsidies have cut our tin, steel, and hot-rolled steel industries, among others.

The ITC must have the tools to protect our small businesses, and this amendment is a step in the right direction.

Let's be clear, Mr. Chairman: Do we want to keep talking about jobs, or do we want to offer a solution? Supporting this amendment will be an immense help for small business employers who are trying to fight back against unfair trade.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. We are willing to accept the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I join you in supporting the amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 42, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 44, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, trust between law enforcement and the public that they are sworn to protect is not just important but essential to safe, collaborative, and constitutional community policing. Trust promotes healthy relationships and interactions that are in the best interest of the both the public and the police.

Unfortunately, the public's trust in law enforcement has eroded in many communities across the country, including my own. The Federal Government needs to make targeted investments to ensure that law enforcement has the tools to rebuild and strengthen that trust, which is the cornerstone of successful policing.

That is why I am so proud to introduce this bipartisan amendment, along with my colleagues Congressman MURPHY and Congressman BLUMENAUER, to add \$2 million to the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act programs. These programs provide a broad range of services, including crisis intervention training for State and local law enforcement agencies to identify and improve responses to people with mental illnesses and substance abuse issues. Crisis intervention training can help prevent injuries to officers, deescalate potentially dangerous situations, and alleviate harm to the person in crisis.

Interactions between the mentally ill and law enforcement too often end in tragedy. Since the beginning of the year, 385 people have been shot and killed by police, and about a quarter of these individuals have been identified as mentally ill. The more training we can provide law enforcement to improve their skills to interact with the public, the more likely crises will be resolved peacefully. And the more non-violent peaceful interactions police have with the public, the more we can strengthen trust between police and the public that they are sworn to protect.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not supposed to the gentlewoman's amendment because it is a good amendment and I support it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the Chairman, and I also thank Representative GRISHAM for this thoughtful amendment we are working on together, which will put \$2 million towards crisis intervention training for State and local law enforcement and also work towards substance abuse treatment and mental health courts.

In the 1950s, this country had 550,000 psychiatric hospital beds for the population of 150 million. Now, with a population twice that size, we only have 40,000 psychiatric hospital beds.

So what happened? Some people got better. But sadly, what we ended up with is huge increases in homelessness and visits to emergency rooms. Last year in this country there were 40,000 suicides and 1 million suicide attempts.

With this critical bed shortage we have many people who end up committing crimes. Of the 2.4 million incarcerated Americans, about half of them, according to the U.S. Department of Justice, are estimated to have a mental health condition. That is 64 percent in our county and local jails, 56 percent in State, and 45 percent of Federal prisoners. By comparison, there are only 35,000 patients with severe mental illness in State psychiatric hospitals. And, according to a report from April 2014, the number of mentally ill persons in prison is ten times higher than that in psychiatric hospitals.

The largest jails in the country—Cook County in Illinois, Los Angeles, and New York—have 11,000 prisoners combined with serious mental illness. Now, that is over twice as large as the three largest State-run mental hospitals.

Mentally ill inmates are twice as likely to be charged with rule violations when incarcerated and actually

remain in prison four times longer than a non-mentally ill person with the same original crime. And what happens then? Solitary confinement, tasered. Then when they are discharged, they repeat the cycle in the revolving door.

What we need to make sure we are doing is to deal with public safety, make sure there is restitution to the community for what has happened, but the key is to provide help for those with serious mental illness.

It is not right for our country to continue to say things like, It is not illegal to be crazy. Our courts and systems that do not understand mental illness continue to say that, but to them I say it isn't just an issue of someone has a right to be mentally ill; they have a right to be well.

□ 1745

What we need to do is to stop this revolving door of having someone who is hallucinating and delusional and waiting until he commits a crime or is a threat to public safety, instead of intervening earlier.

We need mental health courts; we need ways a policeman can intervene early to help persons, and we need evidence-based initiatives to fix our broken mental health system in America. I know that, in our own court in Allegheny County, they saw a nearly 38 percent reduction in recidivism when they used mental health courts.

This is compassion, and this is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her leadership on this, and I appreciate my good friend from Pennsylvania in his eloquence and his tireless championship in this area.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we have a broken system that does not meet the needs of people with mental illness, and it places an undue burden on law enforcement. His words about people having a right to be well really resonates with me because we have seen in all of our communities situations that escalate because they don't have the proper response—we don't have the proper training; we don't have the proper resources—where people get worse.

It is not just that it costs more money; it is the pain to the individuals, to their families, and, ultimately, since virtually all of these people are released but are released in a more damaged situation, they are worse. They are a greater risk to themselves and society, and the cycle continues.

There is no doubt in my mind that, if we were able to properly account for the costs and consequences of the current nonsystem that there would be far more resources saved in treating them humanely and effectively, giving the police and the community the re-

sources they need that will more than pay for itself. This is an important step for the Federal Government to be a better partner.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's leadership. I appreciate my friend Mr. MURPHY from Pennsylvania, and I am looking forward to working with him on other items.

I respectfully request that our colleagues not just support this, but take it to heart because we can make a difference on so many different levels.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I would encourage Members to support it if you would be willing to request a recorded vote on this.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. On behalf of our country, I attended the Healthy brain: healthy Europe conference in Ireland. The estimate in these 28 EU countries was that some 36 percent of the population had some type of mental health challenge, and they deal with it much more openly and without the stigma that sometimes we attach here in our country to mental health challenges.

I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his extraordinary leadership on this issue, and I thank the gentlewoman for offering this.

We will support this amendment and ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for working so diligently on this very important improvement to public safety and police training, and I encourage all Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the

production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$2,209,500)".

Page 24, line 14, insert after the first dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$1,709,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to bolster funds for the Department of Justice inspector general in order to meet the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

As a member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I am a firm believer in the proper oversight of the Federal Government. The more sunlight on Federal activity, the more honest and efficient it will be.

I am also a strong proponent of our inspector general community. Since the Inspector General Act was passed into law, the IG community has saved taxpayers billions of dollars and has uncovered countless examples of wrongdoing in the Federal Government.

It seems only fitting that the inspector general's office receive the budget requested resources, particularly at the expense of the office it will likely need to investigate first.

In the committee report, the committee noted, "The DOJ OIG has had significant investigative and audit workload." In fact, we have seen numerous scandals and coverups from within this agency and at the recommendation of the previous Attorney General.

I applaud the committee for including language in this bill to permanently prohibit funds for Fast and Furious-like programs and for the many other reforms contained in this legislation, but I do believe more needs to be done to ensure additional transparency and accountability within the DOJ.

Let's give the DOJ OIG the resources it needs to investigate this agency and to ensure the Justice Department adheres to the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree very strongly with the gentleman in that the inspector general's office does superb work. It is an independent agency whose oversight is crucial.

The amendment will certainly improve oversight and ensure that our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars are well spent. I would urge Members to support the gentleman from Arizona's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 46, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2578, which would increase funding in Veterans Treatment Courts.

Our Nation's heroes are returning home from over a decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan with the invisible wounds that come with multiple deployments in military service to our Nation.

The signature wounds of these wars, post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, have led to a rise in mental health issues among our veterans. According to the National Center for PTSD, about 11 to 20 percent of veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have PTSD in a given year. Since 2005, the number of veterans diagnosed with post-traumatic stress has doubled.

Too often, these mental health issues can severely impact a veteran's life—from being able to keep a job, to drug abuse, to criminal activity in some circumstances. Instead of receiving the mental health services and support that they need, a growing number of veterans ends up being incarcerated in our justice system.

My simple amendment would increase funds for Veterans Treatment Courts by \$2.5 million. Veterans Treatment Courts are designed to give veterans with mental health and substance abuse issues and who find themselves in trouble with the law an opportunity to get the help they need while avoiding jail time.

In my district, the Ventura County Veterans Treatment Court, which started as a pilot program in 2010, has helped dozens of veterans. Judge Colleen Toy White, one of the program's many champions in Ventura County, knows that the treatment courts reunite families and save lives.

Rather than arresting and jailing veterans for a few days or weeks and then putting them back on the streets with nothing changed in their lives, the Ventura County collaborative court connects veterans to needed treatment and services, which may include mental health care, drug and alcohol treatment, vocational rehabilitation, or other life skill services and programs.

The process begins with a guilty plea, an in-court meeting involving the veteran, his or her attorney, and a VA representative.

I was very impressed with the care that the court officers and volunteers extended to our veterans who found themselves before the court. A recent success for the Ventura County Veterans Treatment Court is a young man who was an Active Duty marine.

Before leaving the service in 2014, he had completed three combat tours in 12 years. He was arrested for two DUIs within 3 weeks. After 5 months of treatment, he still stands with his back against the wall rather than taking a seat in court. It is a common sign in combat veterans, but he is now getting evaluated by VA, is going to treatment, and has hope once again.

Since the Veterans Treatment Court program began in 2008 in Buffalo, New York, over 220 Veterans Treatment Courts have been established across the United States, and many more are being planned.

I believe we need to increase Federal resources to these critical programs nationwide, which is what my amendment seeks to accomplish. It is our obligation to ensure our veterans receive the appropriate attention to their needs and that we do whatever we can to help them transition to an independent civilian life.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment to provide veterans who are in trouble with the resources they need to help them secure a strong future.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA AMENDMENT

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we modify the amendment and, rather than strike line 12 on page 46, strike line 7.

The Acting CHAIR. Would the gentlewoman from California send the modification to the desk.

The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to Brownley of California amendment:

Page 46, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I have visited the Intrepid Center over in Bethesda. We have been working with our veterans on post-traumatic stress. I know, in Houston, some of the best work in the Nation is being done at the University of Texas, at the Center for BrainHealth in Dallas, and your work in Houston.

I had my own experience with this. I had a young man, Bill Cooper, who on his last day in Iraq went out on patrol, and he was the victim of an IED. Some 59 operations later, he ended up working for me in my district offices.

□ 1800

He is just doing a wonderful job helping other veterans in the Philadelphia area, but post-traumatic stress is a circumstance that far too many of our veterans have faced.

I want to thank my colleague from the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, area, Congressman PAT MEEHAN, who has helped to lead this effort on veterans courts, and the chairman and I support it. I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time because, again, I am not in opposition. I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would join in supporting the gentlewoman's amendment. The veterans courts do great work. I support the gentlewoman's amendment and urge Members to support it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I should report to the House that Bill Cooper got married, just had a new son, and got his graduate degree on the GI bill that we passed. He is just another example of what can happen for our veterans when we take care of them.

I thank the gentlewoman from California, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very, very much the chairman accepting my amendment. I appreciate his support,

and I know veterans across the country will as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$750,000)”.

Page 38, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$750,000)”.

Page 40, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$750,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MACARTHUR. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 2578 along with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who unfortunately was called away on an emergency and can't be here to speak with me.

The Violence Against Women Act has been an important step—a critical step, really—in ending the scourge of violence against women, and the elderly abuse grant program has been an important part of that. It funds training and services to end abuse of women in later life. The question is how much funding is necessary for this.

The National Network to End Domestic Violence suggests that that number is \$9 million for the program, and this Congress previously authorized \$9 million. Unfortunately, we can't afford that right now, and so we have to settle for something less. The President's budget, however, sets the amount at less than half, and that is simply not enough.

My amendment would increase that amount to \$5.2 million, which is \$1 million over the President's request and \$750,000 over the current mark. We would pay for that by moving \$750,000 from the Department of Justice administration account.

Mr. Chairman, the elderly abuse grant program has successfully helped many older women escape neglect, abuse, and exploitation taking many forms. Our elderly population is growing, and we simply believe we need a little more funding to make this program handle the growing population. ALMA ADAMS from North Carolina and I have cosponsored the amendment because this is not a Republican or Democratic issue; this is a very human issue. I ask my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition but do not oppose the amendment and would, in fact, encourage Members to support it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the chairman and his wisdom, and I would also ask my colleagues to support it. I have no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. I urge Members to support it. It is a good program and appreciate very much the gentleman bringing this to the floor today and urge Members to vote “yes.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING TECHNOLOGY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for information sharing technology, including planning, development, deployment and departmental direction, \$25,842,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer up to \$35,400,000 to this account, from funds available to the Department of Justice for information technology, to remain available until expended, for enterprise-wide information technology initiatives: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in the preceding proviso is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration-related activities, \$426,791,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Executive Office for Immigration Review fees deposited in the “Immigration Examinations Fee” account: *Provided*, That under this heading of the amount available for the Executive Office for Immigration Review, not to exceed \$15,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, \$92,000,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized, \$13,308,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL
ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not other-

wise provided for, including not to exceed \$20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, \$885,000,000, of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount provided for INTERPOL Washington dues payments, not to exceed \$685,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$9,000 shall be available to INTERPOL Washington for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, such sums as may be necessary shall be available to the Civil Rights Division for salaries and expenses associated with the election monitoring program under section 8 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10305) and to reimburse the Office of Personnel Management for such salaries and expenses: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided under this heading for the election monitoring program, \$3,390,000 shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 98, line 20, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a simple good governance to the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 2016. The amendment seeks to hold the Department of Justice accountable for its failure to enforce the rule of law. Specifically, my amendment decreases available funding for the salaries of individuals who concoct ways to undermine Federal criminal immigration laws.

This amendment is very similar to an amendment that passed this body last year in relation to the DOJ's lack of enforcement of Federal marijuana laws and was offered by my friend and colleague Congressman FLEMING. My amendment reduces Department of Justice's general legal account by \$1 million, specifically targeting the Deputy Attorney General's Office. I will continue to seek similar amendments until the Attorney General decides to enforce the Federal criminal immigration laws on the books.

In 2014, the Department of Justice instructed the U.S. Attorney's Office in some States to no longer prosecute persons that violate certain criminal immigration laws. I have heard firsthand from law enforcement in my district that such actions have placed unnecessary burdens on these officers, increased costs, put local communities at

risk, and encouraged more illegal immigration.

The committee raised similar concerns about the selective enforcement of these laws in the committee report stating: “The committee is concerned with the inconsistent enforcement of Federal criminal immigration laws and supports programs like Operation Streamline. The Attorney General is directed to submit a report to the committee . . . The report shall describe steps the Department is taking to ensure that the Federal criminal immigration law is enforced vigorously and consistently across the country to include prosecution guidelines and policies by district.”

My amendment is consistent with the concerns expressed by the committee and echo this message without harming the overall operation of the Department.

I thank the chair and ranking member for their leadership on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise reluctantly in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, if the proposal would have been to put this money in the veterans courts or drug courts or youth mentoring, I probably wouldn't be standing; but the idea of putting it into savings when we know that the allocation is already shy of what we needed and that many programs that we have had to give shorter appropriations to than we would have otherwise makes me reluctant to support this amendment, and I would ask the House to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the gentleman's amendment. I think he is exactly right. We need to send a very strong message to the administration that they must enforce the law as enacted by Congress. That has been the central theme I have tried to pursue as the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies. It is the foundation of all our liberty.

There is no liberty without law enforcement, and the Chief Executive has a duty under the Constitution to enforce the law as written by Congress and to faithfully execute that law. If any of the Federal agencies under the President's jurisdiction want access to our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, they need to enforce the law as written by Congress.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment; and, frankly, putting it in the savings account is a good thing because that goes back to the taxpayers. I support the gentleman's amendment and would urge Members to vote “yes” to send a message to the White House.

If the White House doesn't get it, they will learn it throughout the year under the new chairman of the CJS Subcommittee.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman for his support, and I ask all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

An amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

An amendment by Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) 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 154, noes 263, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

AYES—154

- | | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Allen | Buchson | Farenthold |
| Amash | Burgess | Fincher |
| Babin | Byrne | Fleischmann |
| Barr | Carter (GA) | Fleming |
| Barton | Chabot | Flores |
| Benishek | Chaffetz | Foxx |
| Bilirakis | Clawson (FL) | Franks (AZ) |
| Bishop (MI) | Coffman | Garrett |
| Bishop (UT) | Collins (GA) | Gohmert |
| Black | Conaway | Goodlatte |
| Blackburn | Cook | Gosar |
| Blum | Cramer | Gowdy |
| Brat | DeSantis | Granger |
| Bridenstine | DesJarlais | Graves (GA) |
| Brooks (AL) | Duffy | Graves (MO) |
| Brooks (IN) | Duncan (SC) | Griffith |
| Buchanan | Duncan (TN) | Grothman |
| Buck | Ellmers (NC) | Hardy |

- | | | |
|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| Harris | Messer | Sanford |
| Hartzler | Miller (FL) | Scalise |
| Hensarling | Miller (MI) | Schweikert |
| Hice, Jody B. | Moolenaar | Scott, Austin |
| Hill | Mooney (WV) | Sensenbrenner |
| Holding | Mullin | Sessions |
| Huelskamp | Mulvaney | Smith (MO) |
| Huizenga (MI) | Neugebauer | Smith (NE) |
| Hultgren | Nugent | Stewart |
| Hunter | Olson | Stutzman |
| Hurt (VA) | Palmer | Tiberi |
| Issa | Pearce | Tipton |
| Jenkins (KS) | Perry | Upton |
| Johnson (OH) | Pittenger | Wagner |
| Johnson, Sam | Pitts | Walberg |
| Jones | Poe (TX) | Walker |
| Jordan | Pompeo | Walorski |
| King (IA) | Posey | Walters, Mimi |
| Knight | Price, Tom | Weber (TX) |
| Labrador | Ratchliffe | Webster (FL) |
| LaMalfa | Ribble | Wenstrup |
| Lamborn | Rice (SC) | Westerman |
| Latta | Roby | Westmoreland |
| LoBiondo | Rohrabacher | Williams |
| Long | Rokita | Wilson (SC) |
| Loudermilk | Rooney (FL) | Wittman |
| Love | Roskam | Woodall |
| Lummis | Ross | Yoder |
| Marchant | Rothfus | Yoho |
| Massie | Rouzer | Young (IN) |
| McCarthy | Royce | Zeldin |
| McClintock | Russell | Zinke |
| Meadows | Ryan (WI) | |
| Meehan | Salmon | |

NOES—263

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Abraham | DelBene | Kelly (PA) |
| Aderholt | Denham | Kennedy |
| Aguilar | Dent | Kildee |
| Amodel | DeSaulnier | Kilmer |
| Ashford | Deuch | Kind |
| Barletta | Diaz-Balart | King (NY) |
| Bass | Dingell | Kinzinger (IL) |
| Beatty | Doggett | Kirkpatrick |
| Becerra | Dold | Kline |
| Bera | Donovan | Kuster |
| Beyer | Doyle, Michael F. | Lance |
| Bishop (GA) | Duckworth | Langevin |
| Blumenauer | Edwards | Larsen (WA) |
| Bonamici | Ellison | Larson (CT) |
| Bost | Emmer (MN) | Lawrence |
| Boustany | Engel | Lee |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Eshoo | Levin |
| Brady (PA) | Esty | Lewis |
| Brady (TX) | Farr | Lieu, Ted |
| Brown (FL) | Fattah | Lipinski |
| Brownley (CA) | Fitzpatrick | Loeb sack |
| Bustos | Forbes | Lowenthal |
| Butterfield | Fortenberry | Lowey |
| Calvert | Foster | Lucas |
| Capps | Frankel (FL) | Luetkemeyer |
| Capuano | Frelinghuysen | Lujan Grisham (NM) |
| Carney | Fudge | Lujan, Ben Ray (NM) |
| Carson (IN) | Gabbard | Lynch |
| Carter (TX) | Garamendi | MacArthur |
| Cartwright | Gibbs | Maloney, Carolyn |
| Castor (FL) | Gibson | Maloney, Sean |
| Castro (TX) | Graham | Marino |
| Chu, Judy | Graves (LA) | Matsui |
| Ciçilline | Grayson | McCaul |
| Clark (MA) | Green, Al | McCollum |
| Clarke (NY) | Green, Gene | McDermott |
| Clay | Guinta | McGovern |
| Cleaver | Guthrie | McHenry |
| Cohen | Gutiérrez | McKinley |
| Cole | Hahn | McNerney |
| Collins (NY) | Hanna | McSally |
| Comstock | Harper | Meeks |
| Connolly | Hastings | Meng |
| Conyers | Heck (NV) | Mica |
| Cooper | Heck (WA) | Moore |
| Costa | Herrera Beutler | Moulton |
| Costello (PA) | Higgins | Murphy (FL) |
| Courtney | Hinojosa | Murphy (PA) |
| Crawford | Honda | Nadler |
| Crenshaw | Hoyer | Napolitano |
| Crowley | Huffman | Neal |
| Cuellar | Hurd (TX) | Newhouse |
| Culberson | Israel | Noem |
| Cummings | Jeffries | Nolan |
| Curbelo (FL) | Jenkins (WV) | Norcross |
| Davis (CA) | Johnson, E. B. | Nunes |
| Davis, Danny | Jolly | O'Rourke |
| Davis, Rodney | Kaptur | Palazzo |
| DeFazio | Katko | Pallone |
| DeGette | Keating | Pascrell |
| Delaney | Kelly (IL) | |
| DeLauro | | |

Paulsen	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (PA)	DeLauro	King (NY)	Price (NC)	McHenry	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
Payne	Sarbanes	Thornberry	DeBene	Kirkpatrick	Quigley	McKinley	Rigell	Thornberry
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Titus	Dent	Kuster	Rangel	McMorris	Roby	Tiberi
Perlmutter	Schiff	Tonko	DeSaulnier	Labrador	Reed	Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Peters	Schrader	Torres	Langevin	Ribble	Ribble	Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Trott
Peterson	Scott (VA)	Trott	Larsen (WA)	Meehan	Rice (NY)	Meehan	Rohrabacher	Upton
Pingree	Scott, David	Tsongas	Larson (CT)	Messer	Rice (SC)	Rokita	Rohrabacher	Upton
Pocan	Serrano	Turner	Lawrence	Miller (FL)	Richmond	Rooney (FL)	Wagner	Valadao
Poliquin	Sewell (AL)	Valadao	Lee	Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Ros-Lehtinen	Wagner	Walberg
Polis	Sherman	Vargas	Levin	Moolenaar	Ruiz	Roskam	Walberg	Walden
Price (NC)	Shimkus	Veasey	Lewis	Mooney (WV)	Ruppertsberger	Ross	Walker	Walker
Quigley	Shuster	Vela	Lieu, Ted	Mullin	Rush	Rothfus	Walorski	Walorski
Rangel	Simpson	Velázquez	Lipinski	Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi	Walters, Mimi
Reed	Sinema	Visclosky	LoBiondo	Newhouse	Sánchez, Linda	Royce	Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)
Reichert	Sires	Walden	Ellison	Noem	T.	Russell	Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
Renacci	Slaughter	Walz	Emmer (MN)	Nugent	Sanchez, Loretta	Ryan (WI)	Wenstrup	Wenstrup
Rice (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman	Engel	Nunes	Sarbanes	Salmon	Westerman	Westerman
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Schultz	Eshoo	Olson	Schakowsky	Sanford	Westmoreland	Westmoreland
Rogers (AL)	Smith (WA)	Waters, Maxine	Esty	Palazzo	Schiff	Scalise	Whitfield	Whitfield
Rogers (KY)	Speier	Watson Coleman	Farr	Palmer	Schrader	Schweikert	Williams	Williams
Ros-Lehtinen	Stefanik	Welch	Fattah	Paulsen	Scott (VA)	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Roybal-Allard	Stivers	Whitfield	Foster	Pearce	Scott, David	Sensenbrenner	Wittman	Wittman
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Perry	Serrano	Sessions	Womack	Womack
Ruppertsberger	Takai	Womack	Fudge	Peterson	Sewell (AL)	Shimkus	Woodall	Woodall
Rush	Takano	Yarmuth	Gabbard	Pittenger	Sherman	Shuster	Yoder	Yoder
Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)	Young (AK)	Galleo	Pitts	Sinema	Simpson	Yoho	Yoho
T.	Thompson (MS)	Young (IA)	Garamendi	Poe (TX)	Sires	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)	Young (AK)
			Gibson	Pompeo	Slaughter	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)	Young (IA)
			Graham	Price, Tom	Smith (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)	Young (IN)
			Grayson	Ratcliffe	Smith (WA)	Stewart	Zeldin	Zeldin
			Green, Al	Reichert	Speier	Stutzman	Zinke	Zinke
			Green, Gene		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
			McSally		Stefanik			
			McCollum		Stefanik			
			McDermott		Stefanik			
			McGovern		Stefanik			
			McNerney		Stefanik			
	</							

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

NOES—10

NOT VOTING—5

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1852

Mr. WALKER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WESTMORELAND and JOYCE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 198, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—228

NOES—198

Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Duckworth
Ashford	Clarke (NY)	Edwards
Bass	Clay	Ellison
Beatty	Cleaver	Engel
Becerra	Cohen	Eshoo
Bera	Connolly	Esty
Beyer	Conyers	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Fattah
Blumenauer	Costa	Foster
Bonamici	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Crowley	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gabbard
Brooks (IN)	Cummings	Gallego
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Garamendi
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Gibson
Bustos	DeFazio	Graham
Butterfield	DeGette	Grayson
Capps	Delaney	Green, Al
Capuano	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Cárdenas	DelBene	Grijalva
Carney	Denham	Gutiérrez
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Hahn
Cartwright	Deutch	Hanna
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Hastings
Castro (TX)	Doggett	Heck (WA)
Chu, Judy	Dold	Higgins
Cicilline	Doyle, Michael F.	Himes
		Hinojosa

Honda	McCollum	Sarbanes
Hoyer	McDermott	Scalise
Huffman	McGovern	Schakowsky
Israel	McNerney	Schiff
Jeffries	McSally	Schrader
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Scott, David
Joyce	Moore	Serrano
Kaptur	Moulton	Sewell (AL)
Katko	Murphy (FL)	Sherman
Keating	Nadler	Simpson
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Sinema
Kennedy	Neal	Sires
Kildee	Nolan	Slaughter
Kilmer	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Kind	Nunes	Speier
Kirkpatrick	O'Rourke	Stefanik
Kuster	Pallone	Swallow (CA)
Langevin	Pascarell	Takai
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Takano
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lawrence	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Peters	Titus
Levin	Peterson	Tonko
Lewis	Pingree	Torres
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Torres
Lipinski	Polis	Tsongas
Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lofgren	Quigley	Veasey
Lowenthal	Rangel	Vela
Lowey	Reed	Velázquez
Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)	Vislosky
(NM)	Richmond	Walz
Luján, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
(NM)	Ruiz	Schultz
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine
Maloney,	Rush	Watson Coleman
Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	T.	Yarmuth
McCaul	Sanchez, Loretta	

NOT VOTING—6

Adams	Griffith	Roe (TN)
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1856

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, on June 2, 2015, I was unavoidably detained and missed four votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 270, "yea" on rollcall No. 271, "yea" on rollcall No. 272, and "no" on rollcall No. 273.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, 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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2289, COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-136) on the resolution (H. Res. 288) providing for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2578.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1900

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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (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, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 25, line 20.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed \$8,000,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$162,246,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection (and estimated to be \$124,000,000 in fiscal year 2016), shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2016, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at \$38,246,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental and cooperative agreements, \$1,995,000,000: *Provided*, That of the total

amount appropriated, not to exceed \$7,200 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That each United States Attorney shall establish or participate in a task force on human trafficking.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized, \$225,908,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$162,000,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2016, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the Fund estimated at \$63,908,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$2,326,000.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For fees and expenses of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, including advances, and for expenses of foreign counsel, \$270,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$16,000,000 is for construction of buildings for protected witness safesites; not to exceed \$3,000,000 is for the purchase and maintenance of armored and other vehicles for witness security caravans; and not to exceed \$13,000,000 is for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this heading may not be transferred pursuant to section 205 of this Act.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, \$13,000,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict resolution and violence prevention activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the preceding proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service, \$1,220,000,000, of which not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available

for official reception and representation expenses, and not to exceed \$15,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction in space controlled, occupied or utilized by the United States Marshals Service for prisoner holding and related support, \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized by section 4013 of title 18, United States Code, \$1,058,081,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be considered “funds appropriated for State and local law enforcement assistance” pursuant to section 4013(b) of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the United States Marshals Service shall be responsible for managing the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances available from funds appropriated under the heading “General Administration, Detention Trustee” shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation under this heading.

NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the National Security Division, \$95,000,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 for information technology systems shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for the activities of the National Security Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to this heading from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the preceding proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of individuals associated with the most significant drug trafficking and affiliated money laundering organizations not otherwise provided for, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, \$510,000,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States, \$8,489,786,000, of which not to exceed \$216,900,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$184,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PITTINGER

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 72, line 7, after each of the dollar amounts, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership and hard work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple, it is fair, it is fiscally responsible, and it strengthens our national security. My amendment reduces Federal spending for the Legal Services Corporation by \$25 million while leaving the program substantially intact. That money is then used to increase funds for the FBI in their critical counterterrorism efforts.

The underlying bill appropriates \$300 million for the LSC, but Congress has not authorized the LSC since 1980. Mr. Chairman, 35 years is much too long to leave a Federal program on autopilot. Even the nonpartisan CBO has recognized defunding the LSC is a way to rein in our out-of-control spending, noting that programs receiving LSC grants already receive funding from States, localities, and private entities, as well as from private attorneys involved in pro bono work. Community problems are best solved at the community level, not through the Federal bureaucracy.

This amendment, however, does not suddenly end LSC and its programs. It simply reduces funding in a responsible and modest way and applies that money toward critical national security efforts. This amendment prioritizes the spending of taxpayer money on our current needs.

Earlier this year, FBI Director James Comey said he has “homegrown violent extremist investigations in every single State.” Just last month, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary, Secretary Johnson, said: “We’re very definitely in a new environment because of ISIL’s effective use of social media, the Internet, which has the ability to reach into the homeland and possibly inspire others.” He continued, saying, “Because of the use of the Internet, we could have little or no notice in advance of an independent actor attempting to strike.” But in a congressionally mandated report released in March of this year, the FBI Commissioner said, budget cuts “severely hindered the FBI’s intelligence and national security programs.”

Mr. Chairman, given the constant, evolving, and new threats we face today from terrorism, it is common sense to reduce spending for a program

which has other proven avenues of funding and prioritize the funding we do have for those seeking to protect us from terrorism.

I encourage all my colleagues to support the amendment, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HUDSON). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the committee, over the time that I have been on the committee, each and every year has increased its appropriations to the FBI, and this year is no exception. The chairman, in his wisdom, working with a very tough allocation, has provided \$8.5 billion—to be exact, \$8.489 billion, which is a \$111 million increase.

I think that the gentleman, if his concern is about us providing adequate funding for the Bureau, can rest assured that the committee has taken every—they have taken that responsibility very seriously.

If his concern or effort is to suggest that somehow pro bono lawyers are going to make up the difference for a cut at Legal Services, in a big city like Philadelphia, it may be so that we have law firms who can have pro bono partners who can spend their time helping people who are not going to be able to pay them, but in large swaths of our country, that is not the case.

Legal Services was created and it helps people, many of whom are veterans, for instance, who are stationed far away from home, who have to fight off efforts by people who are trying to repossess a car or do something else nefarious. They need access to the courts. And so it was President Nixon who created Legal Services, understanding that one of the things about our country, it is a country of laws. People have to have access to the courts, and they need representation.

So I think there is already a justice gap, that is the percentage of people eligible to the numbers who are actually able to be helped, and I think this would be unwise. I hope and I believe that this House will not support this amendment because it would be taking from people who need it the most when there is no definitive need for it in terms of where it is being allocated.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COHEN, my colleague who represents the city of Memphis.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. FATTAH. I join with him in opposing this amendment.

Legal Services is funded at \$375 million this year. This budget cuts it \$75 million to \$300 million. That is a large cut. That is over 20 percent. It has been cut and cut and cut over the years.

Nationally, 50 percent of all eligible potential clients are turned away from Legal Services because of a lack of funding. In my district in Memphis,

they have lost \$300,000, and the staff has been reduced from 50 to 38.

Mr. Chairman, when we travel overseas, one of the things that almost every individual you meet up with tells us about America is, We envy your justice system. They envy our justice system because people have access to the courts to settle our differences.

But if you are poor and/or uneducated and you don't have a lawyer, you don't have access, really, to the legal system; the other side will. If you are a domestic violence victim and you need an attorney and you don't have one, you are subject to further domestic violence. If you are a tenant in an apartment building and you are being run out, the apartment people are going to have attorneys and you won't, and you will be on the street.

So we are talking about victims, domestic victims. We are talking about people being homeless. We are talking about individuals, American citizens, who won't have access to the courts, the envy of people around the world when they look at America, and we will be taking it away from them.

I would ask the gentleman to find moneys for the FBI from somewhere else. The FBI helps bring about justice. But to take it away from an area that gives poor people of America justice—even though it does give money to the FBI to find criminals and hopefully bring justice to them on the criminal side, which is important—this is not the right place to take the money.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the time of both my colleagues. I want to recognize the extraordinary commitment that my colleague, Mr. PITTENGER, has made to counterterrorism and trying to protect the safety and security of the United States.

I will say, though, Mr. Chairman, I did work as a legal aid attorney, a legal aid volunteer many years ago when I was a law student. We spent countless hours trying to keep a roof over the head of tenants who were being kicked out of their home through no fault of their own because a landlord wasn't paying a mortgage. Now, you had people who were going homeless because they did nothing wrong but couldn't avail themselves of an attorney.

To try to find, now, ways to gut that funding when, with low interest rates—one of the key methods of funding for Legal Services across this country is from interest on lawyer's trust accounts. Because of low interest rates, that funding has been basically nonexistent. In Massachusetts, that went from about \$34 million a year down to \$4 million a year.

We are gutting a very basic tenet of what this country is all about. We spend so much time in these Chambers,

Mr. Chairman, talking about how these laws are shaped to touch people's lives and very little time speaking about the enforcement and protections that they provide. Mr. Chairman, this is that moment, and I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

MR. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the wonderful work of Mr. KENNEDY and what he has done with Legal Services. I would say that Legal Services, frankly, has had a long and troubled history of using taxpayer money for political purposes.

An LSC-affiliated agency once used Federal tax dollars to produce pamphlets and political cartoons for political advocacy purposes. Tax dollars were also used to train activists on how to lobby Congress for additional funding. The LSC is marked by misuse of taxpayer money and redundancy, as many of these programs are offered, as well, by the States.

So I don't question that there is good work that is being done, but at the same time, I think it is prudent and logical that we look and see how this money is not being used wisely and, frankly, been inappropriately used.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very modest cut in this agency. I commend this amendment to the House and ask for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses, to include the cost of equipment, furniture, and information technology requirements, related to construction or acquisition of buildings, facilities and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law; conversion, modification and extension of Federally-owned buildings; preliminary planning and design of projects; and operation and maintenance of secure work environment facilities and secure networking capabilities; \$57,982,000, to remain available until expended.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to section 530C of title 28, United States Code; and expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants

in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs, \$2,073,945,000; of which not to exceed \$75,000,000 shall remain available until expended and not to exceed \$90,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk concerning rape kits.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 49, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

□ 1915

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would increase by \$4 million the bill's funding for grants to address the backlog of sexual assault kits at law enforcement agencies.

DNA analysis has been revolutionary in helping to catch criminals and prevent crimes from occurring because of DNA evidence. This evidence does us no good if it remains untested and sitting on a shelf in a lab somewhere.

Despite progress over the last few years, and much progress most recently, there are still thousands of rape kits that remain untested—potentially hundreds of thousands. That is potentially hundreds of thousands of victims whose assailants are never brought to justice left to prey on yet more women.

Last year, my hometown paper, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, highlighted the tragic need to end this backlog once and for all. It described a serial rapist who was finally caught by police in 2012. He could have been stopped nearly a decade earlier if only his first victim's rape kit had been tested, but that kit wasn't, and, instead, he was able to attack five more women over the next 8 years.

Missed opportunities like this happen all across our country every day. The trauma inflicted on victims of rape can be compounded when they know that their assailants run free while critical evidence goes untested.

Fortunately, efforts are underway to reduce the backlog, and they are making a difference. In Memphis, our backlog reached more than 12,000, but police have now opened 488 investigations and issued 90 requests for indictment.

But testing rape kits cost money, more than local law enforcement can afford. I appreciate the chairman's and the ranking member's commitment to eliminating the backlog and the funding that the committee has provided in the bill, but we need more.

This amendment would increase by not quite 10 percent, an additional \$4 million, and would take it from the

Drug Enforcement Administration, a \$2 billion agency that receives a \$40 million increase in this bill. DEA would barely notice the difference.

Moreover, DEA has been alarmingly irresponsible with money Congress has given it previously. An inspector general report recently found that DEA agents had “sex parties” with prostitutes funded by drug cartels in government-leased living quarters. And this followed an inspector general report that found the DEA paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for information from Amtrak that they could have obtained for free.

I think the choice is clear: we should stand with victims of sexual assault.

I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment. It is so important that these kits are tested, that the assailants are brought to justice, and that additional women are not attacked by what are known to be serial rapists who are out on the streets.

I would like to say a thank you to my partner on this amendment, Representative CAROLYN MALONEY, who has been a tireless advocate on this issue as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman is exactly right. We, in the bill, have increased funding to reduce the rape kit backlog. This is a vitally important tool that local police departments are using to get these people off the streets as quickly as possible.

I accept the gentleman's amendment. There is no punishment severe enough nor swift enough for these people. I think it is very, very important that we get these rape kits handled as quickly as possible, so I urge Members to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, we made some significant progress, but more needs to be done. I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. The committee has made this a very high priority. I thank the chairman for his leadership in this regard. We are all in concurrence here.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the chairman, particularly, and the ranking member as well, for their help and their hard work on getting the moneys passed and for helping on this amendment.

These rapists don't know State lines, and they cross State lines, so it is most appropriate that the Federal Government help the locals in finding people

that perform these dastardly acts all over our country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,000,000)”.

Page 38, line 9, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 38, line 24, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 47, line 8, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment takes \$9 million out of the DEA's \$2 billion salaries and expense budget and redirects it toward deficit reduction, as well as underfunded State and local programs to help children who suffer through child abuse, domestic abuse, and sexual assault.

This amendment has been scored by the CBO as reducing budget authority by \$2 million and reducing outlays by \$6 million in fiscal year 2016.

In the face of overwhelming support for lessening restrictions on marijuana, the DEA still spends over \$18 million a year on domestic marijuana eradication programs. This simply takes some of that money away because some States have legalized it, making some of these eradication programs no longer necessary, and it redirects the money—\$2 million to lowering the deficit, \$3 million to the Victims of Child Abuse Act, which supports justice and support for victims of child abuse, and \$4 million to the Consolidated Youth Oriented program, which helps victims and the services they need to pursue safe and healthy lives.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has a good amendment, and I would encourage Members to support it.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I concur.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS
Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 5, after the 1st dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 49, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill.

My amendment would add \$10 million to the Community Trust Initiative account for police body-worn cameras, and would take those \$10 million from the DEA account for salaries and expenses.

Over the last several months, we have seen more and more encounters between members of our communities and law enforcement that have been too powerful to ignore. We have seen in those recordings instances of police abuse. We have seen instances where police were justified in the use of force. We have even seen instances where police went above and beyond doing their job.

Mr. Chairman, over the last two decades or so, something changed—two things, in fact.

First, we developed a technology so that basically each of us who walks around with a cell phone camera is a social documentarian of the things going on around us.

The second thing that changed is the advent of social media, which allowed people not only to document their experiences, but also to widely distribute what they have documented to this country and to the world. Because of that, we have gotten a better indication of the interaction between law enforcement and members of our community.

In this digital age, we have a responsibility to seek and to know the truth about those encounters. Local police departments, many of them—in fact, 25 percent of the 17,000 police agencies in this country—are already using body cameras. Many more in States all over our Nation are seeking the funds to do this.

The President of the United States asked for \$50 million to allow local grants and moneys for local agencies to afford these body cameras and for the storage to make sure that they can keep that evidence.

As you all know, this is a very expensive thing, and many departments have struggled with the funds to afford these things. So in the budget that has been proposed, the amount proposed is not \$50 million, but \$15 million. This \$10 million would simply bring us back up to half of what the President has requested at \$25 million.

I will also add that this is very popular among the American people: 86 percent of Americans—Republicans and Democrats, people of every race and ethnicity, in every community across the country—support increased use of body cameras for officers. Even the association of police chiefs in our country supports this also.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage Members to support it. The gentleman has a good amendment. I think the Community Trust Initiative program that we have created in the bill will rebuild that bond of trust between police officers and their community by making sure that these body cameras are available. My good friend from Texas—Texas was the first State in the Union to pass a State law that says when, where, and how this data from the body cameras can be used. State Senator Royce West from Dallas passed that legislation. I had a chance to talk to him during the legislative session about a month and a half ago, talk to him about this, and I said: If you will pass this law in Texas and other States will pass it, my good friend, Mr. FATTAH, and I, we made sure that the language in our bill follows State law. The State law in Georgia, the State law in Pennsylvania, in Texas, et cetera, will decide when, where, and how this data can be accessed by attorneys, by victims, and make sure it is not given to the media. State law will control that. It is a good program and a good amendment, and I encourage Members to support it.

I am happy to yield to my good friend from Philadelphia.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and I thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this amendment. I also support it. We have already put some dollars available for this purpose, but adding another additional \$10 million gets us closer to the goal that we want to seek in this effort, so I thank the gentleman.

We have got a circumstance here where we are in total agreement and on one accord.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his foresight and thank him for his work on this. I also want to thank a few folks: Congressmen CLEAVER, CLAY; DANA ROHR-ABACHER, who was with me on this;

Congressmen SCHWEIKERT, JOHN LEWIS, and DONALD NORCROSS. Congressman NORCROSS did a lot of work on this in New Jersey. So thank you very much.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 5, after the first dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 72, line 7, after the first dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We just had an amendment on the floor and the amendment took \$25 million from Legal Services. I had several amendments to file, and they went from \$5 million for legal services up to \$35 million. So what I thought might be the equitable thing to do would be, instead of going with the \$35 million, which would have just been half of the cut, take the \$25 million that Mr. PITTENGER wanted to take away from them, take it away from the amendment that would have been best, the \$35 million increase, and go for a \$10 million increase, which would, in essence, be Mr. PITTENGER’s amendment against the amendment which would be a best practices that I would have recommended increasing \$35 million.

□ 1930

This amendment would restore \$10 million to the devastating cuts to Legal Services. Legal Services in 1995 was funded at \$400 million. Just on inflationary dollars, today, that \$400 million would be \$600 million; yet, in this budget, Legal Services would be funded at \$300 million, half of what it would be based on 1995 figures adjusted for inflation.

We are proud of our legal system, and we are known for it all around the globe, but it can be complex. With all of the problems we have with the legal language, let alone just languages that we have in this Nation, it is too difficult for people to represent themselves in court.

There is a saying: “He who represents himself as a lawyer has a fool for a client.” People need professional legal aid to get through the maze of the justice system. If you are poor in this country—and most people are—if you are uneducated—and many are—and scared when you go to court, you are not going to be able to successfully work against a private attorney on the other

side. It just takes away from the whole idea of equal justice under the law.

I talked earlier about domestic violence. There are ladies—and sometimes men—who need protective orders from abusive partners or seniors who have been victimized by fraudulent lenders as well. Legal assistance is vital to ensuring that these parties are treated fairly and are aware of their rights. That is why I am a champion of the Legal Services Corporation, which helps fund legal aid programs throughout the country.

This bill, as I say, cuts \$75 million, which would make many people in the Nation not have representation and unable to pursue justice. Nearly 50 percent of all eligible potential clients are turned away from legal services nationally, and it has hurt people all over this country.

The attorneys do heroic work, and there are serious consequences for reducing the funding to these folks. Unless we ensure legal assistance, we effectively shut the courthouse doors to many who won’t be able to protect their rights.

The decrease would come from the DEA. Again, the DEA has had numerous, numerous problems with agents who have gone rogue and have done things that you shouldn’t do anywhere, least of all when you are a DEA agent representing our country. The funding in the hands of Legal Services could change the lives of thousands of people who need legal representation.

This amendment is \$25 million less than what I would have like to have gotten with the \$35 million amendment, but I will take that. If we can get the 10, hopefully, Mr. PITTENGER will be happy with the 25 cut from the 35 that we should have gotten, in my opinion, on top to restore the 75 that we have lost.

Representatives QUIGLEY, CASTOR, SCHRADER, and JOE KENNEDY have all helped on this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, once again, I rise in support of the Legal Services Corporation.

This is an organization that is the major source of funding for legal aid offices all across this country. The funding, as my colleague indicated, has not kept pace with need, inflation, or reality.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman—and I have seen as a legal aid volunteer in the courtrooms and then again as a prosecutor the impact of adequate legal representation. I spent hours and hours, along with other volunteers, trying to ensure that citizens of this country who, through no fault of their own, are being victimized by large interests or by folks who did know how to navigate the legal system could have adequate representation in the courts.

Mr. Chairman, inside these halls, we debate with great vigor and great detail the nuances to every single piece

of legislation, yet spend far too little time discussing the impact of how that is going to be enforced after it becomes law. That is what the Legal Services Corporation does.

The fact is, in many ways, another source of funding for Legal Services is through the interest on lawyers' trusts accounts, IOLTA funding. With low interest rates over the course of past several years, that funding has been devastated.

In Massachusetts alone, that used to be about \$34 million a year through a separate fund that has been reduced to \$4 million. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that Legal Services has already been decimated at a time when more and more people need to understand that they have access to a fair and just legal system. That is what this amendment seeks to do.

That is why I am proud to support it, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the Drug Enforcement Agency does extraordinarily important work in targeting high-level drug trafficking organizations—disrupting and dismantling them, attacking the economic basis of the drug trade, and contributing to counterterrorism activities that are tied to and financed by drugs.

We have seen the absolute anarchy in northern Mexico. Mexico is a failed state. The northern part of the state is a complete disaster. We have got utter lawlessness along the Texas border, the southwest border, so it is so important that the DEA be given the resources that they need to do their job.

I understand the concern about the Legal Services Corporation. I will be filing legislation to give attorneys a dollar-for-dollar deduction in their taxes for services that they donate to the poor. I think it is a far better way to get at the concern that we all have that legal services be provided to the poor by doing that through the Tax Code rather than by appropriating our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars. The DEA has a very, very important job to do.

As for the concerns that the gentleman has raised and that I have heard other people raise about some of the activities of some senior level folks at the DEA, we have withheld money from the Department of Justice in our bill specifically to encourage the new Attorney General to discipline those high-level DEA officials who were involved in that embarrassing and disgraceful episode that we saw take place in Colombia that the inspector general uncovered.

That kind of behavior is not acceptable, and they should all be fired, and we have encouraged the new Attorney General to do so immediately. However, I think the taking of additional money from the DEA is a bad idea, and

I do encourage my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I will also point out that we have an initial \$43 million in this bill for violence against women programs, specifically for legal assistance for domestic violence victims.

I do urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment in order to protect the vital role that the DEA plays in the war on drugs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear. This does not cut the DEA. It only reduces the amount of money it was increased by in the budget, and it was increased by something like \$40 million in a \$2 billion budget. It would take \$10 million, which would make a big difference to Legal Services.

Once the Rohrabacher-Cohen-Farr amendment passes, they won't be messing with States that have legalized medical marijuana, and it will give the DEA a lot more time to do the right things they need to do in northern Mexico and in other failed states; and as for the states that haven't failed, stay out of them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) for any comments he may have.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want anyone to be confused here. On the floor, the chairman from the subcommittee and from the full committee has said—and I have said it—that we realize that the Legal Services Corporation and the shortfall needs to be addressed.

I believe, before we pass a final bill, it will be addressed. There is no possibility that I am going to support a bill that has got \$300 million funding for Legal Services Corporation.

There is this notion of a \$10 million increase on top of a \$25 million cut. I don't want these votes to be viewed as some kind of ceiling for Legal Services, and I think we ought to be careful here to make sure, as the House is working through this, that we understand that the amount that the bill is at now is unacceptable. It has already been cut. Taking that cut and adding \$10 million back to it is not a satisfactory response, notwithstanding the intentions of our colleague here.

We want to address the bigger issue, which is the full funding for Legal Services. As we go forward in this effort, I want to make my intentions clear that I intend to fight to make sure that we live up to our commitment and our responsibilities in terms of fully funding Legal Services.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to assure my friend from Philadelphia, as we get down further into conference, that we have got priorities in the bill that we did not have enough money for, and we will work hard with you to try to find resources, but let's not take it from the DEA.

I would urge Members to vote against this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and for provision of laboratory assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$1,250,000,000, of which not to exceed \$36,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses, not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by section 924(d)(2) of title 18, United States Code, and not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to other agencies or Departments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 19, insert after the dollar amount "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 42, line 24, insert after the dollar amount "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 46, line 7, insert after the dollar amount "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stand with the veterans throughout the country by offering a simple amendment to bolster funds in this act for Veterans Treatment Courts.

Veterans Treatment Courts promote sobriety and recovery through coordinated local partnerships among community corrections agencies, drug treatment providers, the judiciary, and other community support groups. Veterans Treatment Courts have been extremely successful since they were first

created in 2008 by a Buffalo judge to combat the growing numbers of veterans appearing before the court that were addicted to drugs and alcohol, as well as suffering from mental illness.

Many of our Nation's heroes returning from combat are traumatized due to the associated violence and pressure of war and often cope with such feelings with substance abuse. They need focused treatment and a helping hand, and these courts provide such an avenue.

The alternative to Veterans Treatment Courts is often jail time. I think we can all agree that providing treatment for our veterans through community partnerships at the local level is a far better option than locking them up.

My amendment pays for this modest increase for this critical initiative by reducing funds for the salaries and expenses for the overreaching Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives by \$5 million. I offered a very similar amendment last year, which was adopted by voice vote.

The ATF's salaries and expenses are slated to receive an increase of \$49 million from fiscal year 2015 enacted levels, which would bring the total appropriation level to \$1.25 billion. My amendment redirects funds from bureaucrats in the mismanaged and overzealous ATF to a worthy treatment program for our Nation's veterans.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to, once again, show their support for the worthwhile program by passing my commonsense amendment.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this bill.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a good amendment, and I encourage the House to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 46, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer another amendment to this bill, along with my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), that seeks to bolster another important program.

First, I reiterate my thanks to the committee for the long hours they have dedicated to prioritizing limited resources in order to produce this bill, but I simply believe the House should not reward bad behavior for that type that the ATF has shown recently. My amendment is simple, and it is nearly identical to an amendment I offered last year, which was adopted by voice vote.

The amendment shifts \$5 million from the overreaching ATF bureaucrats to a worthy and effective program known as the Harold Rogers Prescription Drug Monitoring Program.

□ 1945

You ask why \$5 million. Because that amount would bring the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program appropriations back to the level originally approved by the House last year. The gentleman, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, is the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and he has been unrelenting on the issue of combating prescription drug abuse.

This problem is truly plaguing our streets, our youth, and our communities. Prescription drug abuse is contributing to addiction, health deterioration, and even untimely death for too many across our country. Prescription drug abuse also fuels the demand for other illicit drugs, such as cocaine, methamphetamine, ecstasy, and heroin, along with human trafficking, gunrunning, and murder. Much of the solicitation activity flows over our southwestern border and into my home State of Arizona.

The primary purpose of the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program is to enhance the capacity of regulatory and law enforcement agencies to collect and analyze controlled substance prescription data through a centralized database administered by an authorized State agency. States that have implemented the PDMP can collect and analyze this data much more effectively than States in which collection of this data requires manual review of pharmacy files.

It is this body's duty, through the annual appropriations process, to evaluate which programs are worthwhile and which ones are not. The Prescription Drug Monitoring Program has shown promising results, but we must not give up. We must continue to think of our families, our friends, and our future generations.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. I thank Chairman CULBERSON and Ranking Member FATTAH.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I support the effort here to increase funding for a very important program that is addressing a major problem in our country. I divorce myself from the offset, not in terms of the actual offset, but in any criticism of the ATF. I think that they have some very brave, courageous Americans who are trying to make our country safer. I think in lieu of the balancing act here, I support the amendment, and I agree with it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I could also point out, actually, the ATF did the right thing here. I strenuously disagreed with the ammo ban and had a chance to meet with the head of the ATF, as I was the new chairman of the CJS Subcommittee, and walked him through the problems he was going to face on this House floor with amendments and problems with their budget and their spending plan this year.

He is a patriot, former marine, and a lifelong law enforcement officer. He understood they had kind of gone beyond the bounds of the statute, so he agreed to drop the ban on .223 ammunition after I had a very good heart-to-heart meeting with him, and so ATF did the right thing. I think we should encourage good behavior.

I want to recognize and I want to thank the new head of the ATF for doing the right thing and not going after law-abiding Americans' constitutional right to possess and use perfectly lawful .223 ammunition and focus on enforcing the statute, which is designed to protect police officers from armor-piercing bullets that can be fired from pistols.

ATF did the right thing here, but I think the gentleman has a good amendment. That money is going to a good cause. The Prescription Drug Monitoring Program is a good one. I share my colleague's support for the amendment. I want to encourage Members to vote for it, but I want to be sure the RECORD reflects that the ATF did the right thing in dropping the ammo ban, and I don't expect we are going to see another attempt by the ATF to attempt to ban .223 ammunition because the new chairman of the CJS Subcommittee will be on them immediately.

Mr. FATTAH. We are in agreement again, maybe coming to it from different angles, but the important thing is we are at a "yes" on this amendment. The way we all get to these points may be different.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding me time to speak on this very

important amendment. I want to thank him for his leadership.

Prescription drug abuse has become an epidemic in my home State of Arkansas and throughout our country. I am so grateful for people like Chief Kirk Lane of Benton, Arkansas, who leads on this issue throughout my district.

Tonight I speak from the well of our beloved House first as a dad, and a Congressman second. I have had personal experiences with the tragic loss of life that come as a result of prescription drug abuse, and many times our children and our loved ones are the ones who are so closely affected and impacted.

My daughter is 18 years old, and she already knows four people in her age group who have lost their lives due to the influence of prescription drugs and the related impacts. That is tragic.

I am proud that Arkansas recently passed legislation that gives law enforcement investigators access to our State's Prescription Drug Monitoring Program. This law in my State will enhance investigative capabilities and will give law enforcement investigators better ability to bring criminals to justice who are abusing prescription drug practices and trying to dump those drugs back on the street.

This is a serious problem that deserves more of our attention, first at our dinner tables, in our schools, and in our capitol buildings. I am so proud to support Mr. GOSAR's amendment that cuts money from the overhead at the ATF and will strengthen these prescription drug monitoring activities.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his kind words in support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and enter into a colloquy.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM).

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, as a small-business man and a supporter of the private sector, I wish to commend the committee for the inclusion of report language which states: "The committee encourages NOAA to purchase services from the private sector when such services are available, cost effective, and practicable."

As my friend from Texas knows, NOAA operates a fleet of survey ships for nautical charting as well as a fleet of survey aircraft for aerial photography and LIDAR for mapping. However, the inspector general of the Department of Commerce has long recommended that the aircraft fleet be privatized, as aerial survey operations are better, faster, and less expensive

when purchased from the private sector. In fact, the inspector general found NOAA survey operations cost 42 percent more than the private sector, which was then confirmed by a second NOAA-commissioned study.

Rather than accept these cost savings and productivity improvement requirements, NOAA has continually acquired new planes, new aerial sensors, and new ships. This is not only poor stewardship of taxpayer money and inefficient use of resources, but results in the government duplicating and directly competing with private enterprise. There are numerous companies, including small businesses, ready and able to perform these services for NOAA at a reduced cost and increased quality.

I have visited one such private sector mapping firm in my district and heard firsthand about how government agencies are engaged in this behavior, which hinders private economic growth and job creation.

My question for the gentleman from Texas is: Regarding the language I quoted earlier, is it the intent of the committee to include contracting for such surveying and mapping services when there is a qualified, capable, and cost-effective solution available in the private sector?

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to thank my colleague from Iowa for raising this important point, and the committee does expect NOAA to utilize the private sector for these services when they are available and cost effective and practicable. I deeply appreciate my friend's interest and look forward to continuing to work with him on these issues to ensure they are taken care of as we move through the process.

Mr. BLUM. I thank my friend from Texas and appreciate his hard work on this important legislation.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

Mr. BYRNE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$250,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward amendment would cut the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, by 20 percent. That would result in \$250 million worth of savings.

Let me make one thing clear. I know that the ATF has an important mission to play in keeping our Nation safe and regulating everything from firearms to alcohol. That said, in the last few years, we have seen an outrageous growth in operations and regulations coming out of the ATF.

How could we forget the Fast and Furious gun trafficking scheme that was allowed to go so far offtrack that 2,000 guns were allowed to flow to Mexican drug trafficking groups? Worst of all, a Federal law enforcement officer was killed with a gun from that operation.

There was Operation Fearless, where an undercover operation in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, went horribly wrong. Convicted felons were given access to weapons, the fake storefront was burglarized, and \$39,000 in merchandise was lost. The ATF even used someone with developmental disabilities in the operation and ultimately arrested him for his involvement.

From Wichita, Kansas, to Portland, Oregon, to Atlanta, Georgia, the stories of botched operations and inappropriate action just goes on and on.

Then there was the ATF's recent attempt to reclassify common M855 ammunition as armor piercing, despite its exemption from this classification since 1986 for sporting purposes. Thankfully, this proposal was dropped after pressure from Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the people I represent in southwest Alabama are tired of a Federal Government that doesn't live within its means. They want to see their elected officials in Washington get serious about making cuts to the Federal bureaucracy. My constituents also are tired of executive overreach and the Federal Government involving itself in areas where it simply doesn't belong.

I know that the committee and Chairman CULBERSON have made real efforts to rein in the ATF, and I appreciate those efforts. I also understand that ATF is now under new leadership, and I hope that the new leaders get serious about much-needed reforms.

I am all for safety and responsible gun ownership, and the ATF does have a role to play in that, but this amendment would simply require ATF to return to its core functions and responsibilities. It would cause ATF to look at itself in the mirror, find areas where they can cut back, and refocus on their true priorities.

Ultimately, this amendment is about protecting our Second Amendment rights while also pushing for real reforms to Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do understand the gentleman's concern. My constituents and all of us were upset with the ATF's attempt to ban .223 ammunition, but they did the right thing: they withdrew the ammo ban after I had a heart-to-heart with them. By doing the right thing, I think we should reward good behavior.

I am monitoring them very closely. We have spending plan language in our bill that allows the subcommittee to have ongoing oversight over not only

the ATF and Department of Justice, every agency under our jurisdiction has to submit a spending plan to us that is then subjected to careful ongoing oversight throughout the year; and if we cut ATF by \$250 million, they are not able to do all the important work that they are now engaged in, and it would really devastate the agency.

□ 2000

There are a lot of dedicated law enforcement officers in that agency that are doing their very best to fight gangs and violent criminals.

We have visited with the folks at ATF. They are not concerned about law-abiding citizens or a gun dealer who is following the law. They are focused on the criminal element in the country.

So I would encourage Members, and I would be happy to work with you and share with you the ongoing oversight work that I am doing. I encourage you to visit with the new ATF Director. He is a very impressive man: a marine and a lifelong law enforcement officer who did the right thing here.

The agency is devoted to protecting Americans' Second Amendment rights. As the new chairman, if I ever detect any deviation from that, I assure you this son of the South is going to make sure our Second Amendment rights are protected.

I would encourage Members to oppose the amendment. I just don't want to see the ATF devastated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his superb work in this area. We are in great debt to you for all that you have done. And I am 100 percent confident you will continue to do that.

I don't know the new leadership over there. I pray that it is truly new leadership. Because what has happened at ATF is simply not acceptable. And it is particularly not acceptable when it interferes with the Second Amendment rights of the people of the United States of America.

So I thank the gentleman. I know that he will do everything he possibly can. I will take him up on his offer to meet the new leadership.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I visited at the ATF headquarters. In looking at their work particularly focused on explosives—and their new site in Alabama—looking at some of the work that they are doing around the country, it is so vitally important that I think at this time in our country's history for us to retreat from our commitment to this agency would be a very unfortunate and unwise decision.

So I would hope that the House would vote in opposition to this amendment

and make sure that as we go forward we can try to address whatever the concerns are. But cutting ATF by this amount of money would put so many Americans at risk, and I think it would be unwise.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, I join my colleague in urging a "no" vote on this amendment, and will, again, work with my colleague in making sure the ATF continues to protect the Second Amendment rights of Americans.

There is no greater power the Congress has than the power of the purse. I assure you as the new chairman that I am monitoring very, very closely to make sure that ATF, FBI, and the Department of Justice enforce the law and preserve our Second Amendment Rights.

Therefore, I urge Members to vote "no", and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 25, strike "none of the" and insert "such".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chair, I rise to strike language from this appropriations bill that denies hope, denies dignity, and denies Americans their Second Amendment right to bear arms.

When I was district attorney in northern Colorado, a gentleman visited my office. He told me a story that I have heard from many, many others. He told me that 40 years ago, when he was in college, he gave his landlord a bad check. He pled guilty to a felony.

The past 40 years, he has been a model citizen. He finished college. He worked hard and raised a family. Now he wants to go hunting with his grandchild. He can't because he is a convicted felon.

The law allows the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to restore this man's right to possess a firearm. The burden is on the applicant to prove that he is not a danger. ATF may investigate to make sure. This appropriations bill prohibits ATF from processing applications, from following the law established by Congress 30 years ago.

America is a compassionate country. We restore the right to vote in many States, and other rights. There is no good reason to prevent law-abiding citizens from, at the very least, petitioning ATF to have their rights restored.

The change I am seeking is fair and reasonable, and it is long overdue. Peo-

ple who are able to prove to ATF that their possession of a firearm would pose no danger to society would finally, after over two decades of unfair treatment, be permitted to make their case and have their rights restored.

Not everyone who petitions ATF will have their rights restored. In fact, this bill does not intend in any way, shape, or form to allow a violent criminal to possess a firearm—only those non-violent criminals that ATF deems are not a danger. Not everyone will have their rights restored, but Washington should not get in the way of Americans asking for a second chance.

For these reasons, I respectfully request support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Prison System for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments, \$6,951,500,000: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Department of Health and Human Services such amounts as may be necessary for direct expenditures by that Department for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System, where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent or fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the Federal Prison System, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the Federal Prison System: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,400 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall remain available for necessary operations until September 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That, of the amounts provided for contract confinement, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements, and other expenses: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System may accept donated property and services relating to the operation of the prison card program from a not-for-profit entity which has operated such program in the past, notwithstanding the fact that such not-for-profit entity furnishes services under contracts to the Federal Prison System relating to the operation of pre-release services, halfway houses, or other custodial facilities.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling, and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account,

\$230,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$145,000,000 shall be available only for costs related to construction of new facilities: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed \$2,700,000 of the funds of the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which such accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the gentlewoman offering the amendment at this point in the reading?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 44, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, my amendment transfers \$2 million into the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act for the purpose of expanding and improving police training to safely and appropriately respond to mentally ill individuals.

Now, Mr. Chair, we have heard a lot lately in the news about high profile police-involved shootings that have become a major subject here around the country and here in Congress. Not surprising to some of us, especially those of us who hail from large urban cities, this is a widespread problem that has been around for a while.

But today, I am offering this amendment to highlight one serious issue that I think should be a major part of

our current national dialogue: ensuring that police have adequate training to identify persons with mental illness and to safely, when it is possible, resolve encounters during a crisis.

Mr. Chair, indulge me for a moment while I tell you a story about a 31-year-old man in my home district of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, who, unfortunately, is no longer with us today. His name was Dontre Hamilton.

Dontre, like many people in this country, suffered from a mental illness. He was diagnosed with schizophrenia 1 year prior to the incident and had been off his medication due to an insurance issue.

On April 30 of last year, Dontre was taking a nap on a public park bench when employees of a nearby Starbucks called the police. Two police officers came and did a wellness check and left the scene, discerning that Mr. Hamilton was no threat to himself, nor to anyone in the park or the public.

Soon thereafter, yet another call came from the Starbucks employee because this gentleman was sleeping on the public park bench. Another police officer, Officer Manney of the Milwaukee Police Department, arrived and started to pat down Dontre. This pat-down turned into a struggle, and Officer Manney pulled out his baton to help him subdue Mr. Hamilton.

The struggle escalated, and Dontre got control of the baton and swung it at Officer Manney. This caused Officer Manney to draw his firearm and shoot 14 bullets into Dontre Hamilton.

Officer Manney was terminated for conducting a pat-down in contravention of his training on dealing with mentally ill individuals but faced no charges in the death of Dontre Hamilton.

Mr. Chair, perhaps this tragedy could have been prevented. Too often, our mental health infrastructure is woefully inadequate for many Americans. A lack of treatment can turn a treatable mental illness into a severe debilitating condition. Many can't hold a job or pay rent. Many end up homeless on the streets. In fact, more than 124,000 of the 610,000 homeless people in the United States suffer from a severe mental illness.

As a result of many failures in our system, our Nation's police officers have de facto become our country's first responders to crisis calls, including those individuals experiencing mental illness. Too often these calls, many intended to be out of concern for the individual in crisis, become a tragic fatality.

As we know, mentally ill persons are not generally dangerous, Mr. Chair. In fact, they are actually more likely to become victims themselves than actual perpetrators of violence. Many of these tragic encounters could be prevented if police officers are trained and follow proper procedures.

The Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act is an important Federal initiative and tool that

will help us bridge this gap. This law established a grant program called the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program which helps States and localities develop collaborative approaches to dealing with the intersection of criminal justice and mental health systems.

One of the authorized grant uses under the program is training to police officers for exactly these purposes: to safely respond to crisis calls and limit the chance of a tragic and often preventable consequence.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. The gentlewoman has a good amendment, and I want to encourage Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 46, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member and their staffs for their cooperation on this amendment.

The amendment increases the funding for Veterans Treatment Courts by \$1 million. I offered a similar amendment last year that the House also adopted on a voice vote.

With the additional funds provided by this amendment, a total of \$6 million would be available for such courts, which is still short of the \$8 million Congress has authorized under the bipartisan Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act.

Our Nation's heroes are returning home from more than a decade of war. Upon their return, they bear the visible and invisible wounds of deployment. Substance abuse, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, and various mental health disorders can lead our returning heroes down a difficult and often lonely path during their transition to civilian life.

Twenty percent of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans suffer from post-

traumatic stress disorder or major depression. One in six battle with substance abuse. Left undiagnosed or untreated, these illnesses can result in an encounter with the justice system. Worse yet, these illnesses can also lead to suicide, which veterans commit at twice the rate of our civilian population.

Fortunately, specialized Veterans Treatment Courts are being developed across the country, including in my home county of Fairfax in Virginia, to help veterans who do find themselves in the justice system and suffer from substance addiction or mental health disorders so that they can alter their course and find the assistance they deserve, Mr. Chairman.

The first such court was established in Buffalo, New York, in 2008; and since then, more than 200 have opened across the Nation. Hundreds more are currently going through the planning and training process.

Today, there are more than 11,000 vets enrolled in Veterans Treatment Courts. Virginia is home to the sixth largest veteran population in the country, with nearly 850,000 veterans, more than 10 percent of whom live in my district, the 11th Congressional District of Virginia.

The comprehensive treatment program provides eligible veterans with an alternative to jail and incarceration. Participating veterans must commit to an 18- to 24-month program, during which they receive group counseling, a dedicated veteran mentor, and enroll in vocational education and self-help programs.

By bringing veteran service organizations, State veterans service departments, and volunteer mentors into the courtrooms, Veterans Treatment Courts can promote community collaboration and connect veterans with the programs and benefits they have earned and that they may need.

Having a veteran-only court docket ensures that everyone, from the judge to the volunteers, specializes in veterans care, and the involvement of fellow veterans allows the defendant to experience a camaraderie to which he or she became accustomed in the military.

We know this model works, and it is our hope this amendment will provide these courts with the resources they need to help our veterans who fall into the justice system to get back on the right track and transition successfully back into the society they swore to defend.

In closing, again, I want to thank the distinguished chairman, the distinguished ranking member, and their respective staffs for their cooperation in this matter.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I support the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. I think the gentleman has a good amendment, and I would encourage the Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and enter into a colloquy with my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for a colloquy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

During the full committee consideration of this legislation, the chairman will recall that we discussed the accompanying report language that, for the first time, would allocate NSF research funding by directorate and, in particular, would disproportionately reduce funding for the Directorate for Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences and the Directorate for Geosciences. This has raised critical questions and concerns within the scientific community.

As the legislative process goes forward, I ask for the chairman's assurance that we can work together to preserve the National Science Foundation's traditional discretion and flexibility in allocating basic research funding among the Foundation's directorates.

Mr. CULBERSON. I look forward to working with you, Dr. PRICE, and other members of the subcommittee and the full committee, as well as the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, to ensure that we protect the independence of the National Science Foundation.

It is vitally important that America preserves its leadership role in the world, and scientific research and NSF and NASA have been a vital part of that.

A strong supporter of our investment in the sciences, my favorite Founding Father, Thomas Jefferson, liked to say that liberty was the firstborn of science.

It is vital that we work together, as I will with you, sir, as we move through conference, to continue to preserve the flexibility and independence of the National Science Foundation. We, in the committee report, are simply working to make sure NSF prioritizes their funding, but I will continue to work with you throughout this process as we move forward.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman. This is critically important. I appreciate the chance to work on this, as the legislation moves forward.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
ACTIVITIES

OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND
PROSECUTION PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance for the prevention and prosecution of violence against women, as authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) ("the 1968 Act"); the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322) ("the 1994 Act"); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-647) ("the 1990 Act"); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-21); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) ("the 1974 Act"); the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386) ("the 2000 Act"); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162) ("the 2005 Act"); and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4) ("the 2013 Act"); and for related victims services, \$479,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount provided—

(1) \$196,000,000 is for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act;

(2) \$28,000,000 is for transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault as authorized by section 40299 of the 1994 Act;

(3) \$8,000,000 is for the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women and related issues addressed by grant programs of the Office on Violence Against Women, which shall be transferred to and administered by the Office of Justice Programs;

(4) \$11,000,000 is for a grant program to provide services to advocate for and respond to youth victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; assistance to children and youth exposed to such violence; programs to engage men and youth in preventing such violence; and assistance to middle and high school students through education and other services related to such violence: *Provided*, That unobligated balances available for the programs authorized by sections 41201, 41204, 41303 and 41305 of the 1994 Act, prior to its amendment by the 2013 Act, shall be available for this program: *Provided further*, That 10 percent of the total amount available for this grant program shall be available for grants under the program authorized by section 2015 of the 1968 Act: *Provided further*, That the definitions and grant conditions in section 40002 of the 1994 Act shall apply to this program;

(5) \$51,000,000 is for grants to encourage arrest policies as authorized by part U of the 1968 Act, of which \$4,000,000 is for a homicide reduction initiative;

(6) \$35,000,000 is for sexual assault victims assistance, as authorized by section 41601 of the 1994 Act;

(7) \$33,000,000 is for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, including as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act;

(8) \$16,000,000 is for grants to reduce violent crimes against women on campus, as authorized by section 304 of the 2005 Act;

(9) \$42,500,000 is for legal assistance for victims, as authorized by section 1201 of the 2000 Act;

(10) \$4,500,000 is for enhanced training and services to end violence against and abuse of women in later life, as authorized by section 40802 of the 1994 Act;

(11) \$16,000,000 is for grants to support families in the justice system, as authorized by section 1301 of the 2000 Act: *Provided*, That unobligated balances available for the programs authorized by section 1301 of the 2000 Act and section 41002 of the 1994 Act, prior to their amendment by the 2013 Act, shall be available for this program;

(12) \$6,000,000 is for education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities, as authorized by section 1402 of the 2000 Act;

(13) \$500,000 is for the National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to assist victims of domestic violence, as authorized by section 41501 of the 1994 Act;

(14) \$1,000,000 is for analysis and research on violence against Indian women, including as authorized by section 904 of the 2005 Act: *Provided*, That such funds may be transferred to and administered by the Office of Justice Programs;

(15) \$500,000 is for a national clearinghouse that provides training and technical assistance on issues relating to sexual assault of American Indian and Alaska Native women;

(16) \$25,000,000 for victim services programs for victims of trafficking, as authorized by section 107(b)(2) of Public Law 106-386, for programs authorized under Public Law 109-164, or programs authorized under Public Law 113-4; and

(17) \$5,000,000 for the purposes authorized under the Rape Survivor Child Custody Act.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322) (“the 1994 Act”); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (“the 1968 Act”); the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-647) (“the 1990 Act”); the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-164); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162) (“the 2005 Act”); the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-248) (“the Adam Walsh Act”); the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386); the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-180); subtitle D of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296) (“the 2002 Act”); the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-199); the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-403); the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-473); the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-416); the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4) (“the 2013 Act”); and other programs, \$1,015,400,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) \$409,000,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program as authorized by subpart 1 of part E of title I of the 1968 Act (except that section 1001(c), and the special rules for Puerto Rico under section 505(g) of title I of the 1968 Act shall not apply for purposes of this Act), of which, notwithstanding such subpart 1, \$20,000,000 is for grants for law enforcement activities associated with the presidential nominating conventions, \$15,000,000 is for an Officer Robert Wilson III memorial initiative on Preventing

Violence Against Law Enforcement Officer Resilience and Survivability (VALOR), \$4,000,000 is for use by the National Institute of Justice for research targeted toward developing a better understanding of the domestic radicalization phenomenon, and advancing evidence-based strategies for effective intervention and prevention, \$22,500,000 is for the matching grant program for law enforcement armor vests, as authorized by section 2501 of title I of the 1968 Act, and \$2,500,000 is for a program to improve juvenile indigent defense;

(2) \$220,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 241(i)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)(5)): *Provided*, That no jurisdiction shall request compensation for any cost greater than the actual cost for Federal immigration and other detainees housed in State and local detention facilities;

(3) \$41,000,000 for Drug Courts, as authorized by section 1001(a)(25)(A) of title I of the 1968 Act;

(4) \$7,000,000 for mental health courts and adult and juvenile collaboration program grants, as authorized by parts V and HH of title I of the 1968 Act, and the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-416);

(5) \$2,000,000 for the Capital Litigation Improvement Grant Program, as authorized by section 426 of Public Law 108-405, and for grants for wrongful conviction review;

(6) \$5,000,000 for economic, high technology and Internet crime prevention grants, including as authorized by section 401 of Public Law 110-403;

(7) \$20,000,000 for sex offender management assistance, as authorized by the Adam Walsh Act, and related activities;

(8) \$1,000,000 for the National Sex Offender Public Website;

(9) \$73,000,000 for grants to States to upgrade criminal and mental health records for the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, including as authorized by the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-180);

(10) \$125,000,000 for DNA-related and forensic programs and activities, of which—

(A) \$117,000,000 is for a DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities, including the purposes authorized under section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-546) (the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program): *Provided*, That up to 4 percent of funds made available under this paragraph may be used for the purposes described in the DNA Training and Education for Law Enforcement, Correctional Personnel, and Court Officers program (Public Law 108-405, section 303);

(B) \$4,000,000 is for the purposes described in the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-Conviction DNA Testing Program (Public Law 108-405, section 412); and

(C) \$4,000,000 is for Sexual Assault Forensic Exam Program grants, including as authorized by section 304 of Public Law 108-405;

(11) \$6,000,000 for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 217 of the 1990 Act;

(12) \$5,000,000 for a veterans treatment courts program;

(13) \$11,000,000 for a program to monitor prescription drugs and scheduled listed chemical products;

(14) \$13,000,000 for prison rape prevention and prosecution grants to States and units of local government, and other programs, as authorized by the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-79);

(15) \$75,000,000 is for the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative; and

(16) \$2,400,000 for the operationalization, maintenance and expansion of the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System:

Provided, That, if a unit of local government uses any of the funds made available under this heading to increase the number of law enforcement officers, the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform non-administrative public sector safety service.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance, the following amounts are made available until expended—

(1) \$95,000,000 for youth mentoring grants;

(2) \$19,000,000 for programs authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990;

(3) \$68,000,000 for missing and exploited children programs, including as authorized by sections 404(b) and 405(a) of the 1974 Act (except that section 102(b)(4)(B) of the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-401) shall not apply for purposes of this Act); and

(4) \$1,500,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments and expenses authorized under section 1001(a)(4) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, such sums as are necessary (including amounts for administrative costs), to remain available until expended; and \$16,300,000 for payments authorized by section 1201(b) of such Act and for educational assistance authorized by section 1218 of such Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 205 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for such disability and education payments, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to “Public Safety Officer Benefits” from available appropriations for the Department of Justice as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the preceding proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance, the following amounts are made available until expended: *Provided*, That any balances made available through prior year deobligations shall only be available in accordance with section 505 of this Act—

(1) \$11,000,000 for anti-methamphetamine-related activities, which shall be transferred to the Drug Enforcement Administration upon enactment of this Act;

(2) \$30,000,000 for assistance to Indian tribes;

(3) \$52,500,000 for initiatives to improve police-community relations, as described in the report accompanying this Act;

(4) \$41,000,000 for a grant program for community-based sexual assault response reform;

(5) \$68,000,000 for offender reentry programs and research, as authorized by the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-199), without regard to the time limitations specified at section 6(1) of such Act; and

(6) \$35,000,000 is for regional information sharing activities, as authorized by part M of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed \$50,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 202. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape or incest: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 204. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 203 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 206. The Attorney General is authorized to extend through September 30, 2016, the Personnel Management Demonstration Project transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to section 1115 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 28 U.S.C. 599B) without limitation on the number of employees or the positions covered.

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available under this title may be used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons or the United States Marshals Service for the purpose of transporting an individual who is a prisoner pursuant to conviction for crime under State or Federal law and is classified as a maximum or high security prisoner, other than to a prison or other facility certified by the Federal Bureau of Prisons as appropriately secure for housing such a prisoner.

SEC. 208. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by Federal prisons to purchase cable television services, or to rent or purchase audiovisual or electronic media or equipment used primarily for recreational purposes.

(b) Subsection (a) does not preclude the rental, maintenance, or purchase of audiovisual or electronic media or equipment for inmate training, religious, or educational programs.

SEC. 209. None of the funds made available under this title shall be obligated or expended for any new or enhanced information technology program having total estimated development costs in excess of \$100,000,000, unless the Deputy Attorney General and the

investment review board certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the information technology program has appropriate program management controls and contractor oversight mechanisms in place, and that the program is compatible with the enterprise architecture of the Department of Justice.

SEC. 210. The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act shall apply to deviations from the amounts designated for specific activities in this Act and in the report accompanying this Act, and to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this title in previous years.

SEC. 211. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to plan for, begin, continue, finish, process, or approve a public-private competition under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 or any successor administrative regulation, directive, or policy for work performed by employees of Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated.

SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be available for the salary, benefits, or expenses of any United States Attorney assigned dual or additional responsibilities by the Attorney General or his designee that exempt that United States Attorney from the residency requirements of section 545 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 213. At the discretion of the Attorney General, and in addition to any amounts that otherwise may be available (or authorized to be made available) by law, with respect to funds appropriated by this title under the headings “Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs”, “State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance”, “Juvenile Justice Programs”, and “Community Oriented Policing Services Programs”—

(1) up to 3 percent of funds made available to the Office of Justice Programs for grant or reimbursement programs may be used by such Office to provide training and technical assistance; and

(2) funds made available for grant or reimbursement programs under such headings, except for amounts appropriated specifically for research, evaluation, or statistical programs administered by the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, may be transferred to and merged with funds provided to the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, to be used by them for research, evaluation, or statistical purposes, without regard to the authorizations for such grant or reimbursement programs: *Provided*, That the transfer authority in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to the notification procedures applicable to a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act.

SEC. 214. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 20109(a) of subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13709(a)) shall not apply to amounts made available by this or any other Act.

SEC. 215. None of the funds made available under this or any other Act, for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, other than for the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note), may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the indi-

vidual is an agent of a drug cartel, unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 216. (a) None of the income retained in the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund pursuant to title I of Public Law 102-140 (105 Stat. 784; 28 U.S.C. 527 note) shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2016, except up to \$40,000,000 may be obligated for implementation of a unified Department of Justice financial management system.

(b) Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the unobligated balances transferred to the capital account of the Department of Justice Working Capital Fund pursuant to title I of Public Law 102-140 (105 Stat. 784; 28 U.S.C. 527 note) shall be available for obligation in fiscal year 2016, and any use, obligation, transfer or allocation of such funds shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act.

(c) Any use, obligation, transfer or allocation of excess unobligated balances available under section 524(c)(8)(E) of title 28, United States Code, shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act.

(d) Of amounts available in the Assets Forfeiture Fund in fiscal year 2016, \$154,700,000 shall be for payments associated with joint law enforcement operations as authorized by section 524(c)(1)(I) of title 28, United States Code, and \$20,514,000 shall be for payments associated with subparagraphs (B), (F), and (G) of section 524(c)(1) of title 28, United States Code.

(e) The Attorney General shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act detailing the planned distribution of Assets Forfeiture Fund joint law enforcement operations funding during fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 217. (a) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under each of the headings “General Administration—Salaries and Expenses”, “United States Marshals Service—Salaries and Expenses”, “Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and Expenses”, “Drug Enforcement Administration—Salaries and Expenses”, and “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—Salaries and Expenses”, \$20,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Attorney General demonstrates to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that all recommendations included in the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Justice, Evaluation and Inspections Division Report 15-04 entitled “The Handling of Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Allegations by the Department’s Law Enforcement Components”, dated March, 2015, have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented.

(b) The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the status of the Department’s implementation of recommendations included in the report specified in subsection (a).

This title may be cited as the “Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2016”.

TITLE III
SCIENCE

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United

States Code, not to exceed \$2,250 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$5,555,000.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION
SCIENCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$5,237,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That the formulation and development costs (with development cost as defined under section 30104 of title 51, United States Code) for the James Webb Space Telescope shall not exceed \$8,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That should the individual identified under subsection (c)(2)(E) of section 30104 of title 51, United States Code, as responsible for the James Webb Space Telescope determine that the development cost of the program is likely to exceed that limitation, the individual shall immediately notify the Administrator and the increase shall be treated as if it meets the 30 percent threshold described in subsection (f) of section 30104: *Provided further*, That, \$140,000,000 shall be for a Jupiter Europa mission to assure progress on a mission which meets the Planetary Science decadal objectives, consisting of an orbiter and studies of both a surface element as well as sample analysis of plumes emanating from the surface: *Provided further*, That NASA shall use the Space Launch System as the launch vehicle for a Jupiter Europa mission, plan for a launch no later than 2022, and include in the fiscal year 2017 budget the five year funding profile necessary to achieve those goals.

AERONAUTICS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of aeronautics research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$600,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space technology research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative

aircraft, \$625,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which \$25,000,000 shall be for icy satellites surface technology and test beds.

EXPLORATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of exploration research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$4,759,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That not less than \$1,096,300,000 shall be for the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle: *Provided further*, That not less than \$2,313,000,000 shall be for the Space Launch System, including no less than \$1,850,000,000 for launch vehicle development, which shall have a lift capability not less than 130 metric tons and which shall have core elements and an enhanced upper stage developed simultaneously: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided for launch vehicle development, no less than \$50,000,000 shall be for enhanced upper stage development: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for the Space Launch System, \$410,000,000 shall be for exploration ground systems and \$53,000,000 shall be for program integration: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000,000 shall be for commercial spaceflight activities: *Provided further*, That \$350,000,000 shall be for exploration research and development.

SPACE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space operations research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities, including operations, production, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$3,957,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

EDUCATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of aerospace and aeronautical education research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$119,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which \$18,000,000 shall be for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research and \$40,000,000 shall be for the National Space Grant College program.

SAFETY, SECURITY AND MISSION SERVICES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics, space technology, ex-

ploration, space operations and education research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$63,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$2,768,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

CONSTRUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL
COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law, and environmental compliance and restoration, \$425,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021: *Provided*, That proceeds from leases deposited into this account shall be available for a period of 5 years to the extent and in amounts as provided in annual appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 20145(b)(2)(A) of title 51, United States Code, such proceeds referred to in the preceding proviso shall be available for obligation for fiscal year 2016 in an amount not to exceed \$9,470,300: *Provided further*, That each annual budget request shall include an annual estimate of gross receipts and collections and proposed use of all funds collected pursuant to section 20145 of title 51, United States Code.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$37,400,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds for any announced prize otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers. Balances so transferred shall be merged with and available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred. Any transfer pursuant to this provision shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

The spending plan required by this Act shall be provided by NASA at the theme, program, project and activity level. The spending plan, as well as any subsequent change of an amount established in that spending plan that meets the notification requirements of section 505 of this Act, shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

The unexpired balances of a previous account, for activities for which funds are provided in this Act, may be transferred to the

new account established in this Act that provides for such activities. Balances so transferred shall be merged with the funds in the newly established account, but shall be available under the same terms, conditions and period of time as previously appropriated.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), and Public Law 86-209 (42 U.S.C. 1880 et seq.); services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; and authorized travel; \$5,983,645,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which not to exceed \$520,000,000 shall remain available until expended for polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES
CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the acquisition, construction, commissioning, and upgrading of major research equipment, facilities, and other such capital assets pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), including authorized travel, \$200,030,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science, mathematics and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$866,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

AGENCY OPERATIONS AND AWARD MANAGEMENT

For agency operations and award management necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.); services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the Department of Homeland Security for security guard services; \$325,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,280 is for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That contracts may be entered into under this heading in fiscal year 2016 for maintenance and operation of facilities and for other services to be provided during the next fiscal year: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided for costs associated with the acquisition, occupancy, and related costs of new headquarters space, not more than \$27,370,000 shall remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United

States Code) involved in carrying out section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863) and Public Law 86-209 (42 U.S.C. 1880 et seq.), \$4,370,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$15,160,000, of which \$400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the National Science Foundation in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers. Any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

This title may be cited as the "Science Appropriations Act, 2016".

TITLE IV

RELATED AGENCIES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$9,200,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to employ in excess of four full-time individuals under Schedule C of the Excepted Service exclusive of one special assistant for each Commissioner: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to reimburse Commissioners for more than 75 billable days, with the exception of the chairperson, who is permitted 125 billable days: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for any activity or expense that is not explicitly authorized by section 3 of the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975a).

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as authorized by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Genetic Information Non-Discrimination Act (GINA) of 2008 (Public Law 110-233), the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-325), and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-2), including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by section 1343(b) of title 31, United States Code; nonmonetary awards to private citizens; and up to \$29,500,000 for payments to State and local enforcement agencies for authorized services to the Commission, \$364,500,000: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$2,250 from available funds: *Provided further*, That the Chair is authorized to accept and use any gift or donation to carry out the work of the Commission.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire

of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and not to exceed \$2,250 for official reception and representation expenses, \$84,500,000, to remain available until expended.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, \$300,000,000, of which \$266,900,000 is for basic field programs and required independent audits; \$5,100,000 is for the Office of Inspector General, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be used to conduct additional audits of recipients; \$19,000,000 is for management and grants oversight; \$4,000,000 is for client self-help and information technology; \$4,000,000 is for a Pro Bono Innovation Fund; and \$1,000,000 is for loan repayment assistance: *Provided*, That the Legal Services Corporation may continue to provide locality pay to officers and employees at a rate no greater than that provided by the Federal Government to Washington, DC-based employees as authorized by section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding section 1005(d) of the Legal Services Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 2996(d)): *Provided further*, That the authorities provided in section 205 of this Act shall be applicable to the Legal Services Corporation: *Provided further*, That, for the purposes of section 505 of this Act, the Legal Services Corporation shall be considered an agency of the United States Government.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION

None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by, or contrary to any of the provisions of, sections 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, and 506 of Public Law 105-119, and all funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in such sections, except that all references in sections 502 and 503 to 1997 and 1998 shall be deemed to refer instead to 2015 and 2016, respectively.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission as authorized by title II of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.), \$3,340,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE
REPRESENTATIVE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$54,250,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$124,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the State Justice Institute, as authorized by the State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10701 et seq.) \$5,121,000, of which \$500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That, for the purposes of section 505 of this Act, the State Justice Institute shall be considered an agency of the United States Government.

TITLE V
GENERAL PROVISIONS
(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 503. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 504. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of each provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 505. None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2016, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates or initiates a new program, project or activity; (2) eliminates a program, project or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes or renames offices, programs or activities; (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; (7) augments existing programs, projects or activities in excess of \$500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, or reduces by 10 percent funding for any program, project or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent; or (8) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel, which would result in a change in existing programs, projects or activities as approved by Congress; unless the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds by agencies (excluding agencies of the Department of Justice) funded by this Act and 45 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds by agencies of the Department of Justice funded by this Act.

SEC. 506. (a) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b)(1) To the extent practicable, with respect to authorized purchases of promotional items, funds made available by this Act shall be used to purchase items that are manufactured, produced, or assembled in the United States, its territories or possessions.

(2) The term "promotional items" has the meaning given the term in OMB Circular A-87, Attachment B, Item (1)(f)(3).

SEC. 507. (a) The Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Science Foundation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a quarterly report on the status of balances of appropriations at the account level. For unobligated, uncommitted balances and unobligated, committed balances the quarterly reports shall separately identify the amounts attributable to each source year of appropriation from which the balances were derived. For balances that are obligated, but unexpended, the quarterly reports shall separately identify amounts by the year of obligation.

(b) The report described in subsection (a) shall be submitted within 30 days of the end of each quarter.

(c) If a department or agency is unable to fulfill any aspect of a reporting requirement described in subsection (a) due to a limitation of a current accounting system, the department or agency shall fulfill such aspect to the maximum extent practicable under such accounting system and shall identify and describe in each quarterly report the extent to which such aspect is not fulfilled.

SEC. 508. Any costs incurred by a department or agency funded under this Act resulting from, or to prevent, personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such department or agency: *Provided*, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 505 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That for the Department of Commerce, this section shall also apply to actions taken for the care and protection of loan collateral or grant property.

SEC. 509. None of the funds provided by this Act shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, or to seek the reduction or removal by any foreign country of restrictions on the marketing of tobacco or tobacco products, except for restrictions which are not applied equally to all tobacco or tobacco products of the same type.

SEC. 510. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Justice to obligate more than \$2,705,164,000 during fiscal year 2016 from the fund established by section 1402 of Public Law 98-473 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used to discriminate against or denigrate the religious or moral beliefs of students who participate in programs for which financial assistance is provided from those funds, or of the parents or legal guardians of such students.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 513. Any funds provided in this Act used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 505 of this Act.

SEC. 514. (a) The Inspectors General of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Legal Services Corporation shall conduct audits, pursuant to the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App.), of grants or contracts for which funds are appropriated by this Act, and shall submit reports to Congress on the progress of such audits, which may include preliminary findings and a description of areas of particular interest, within 180 days after initiating such an audit and every 180 days thereafter until any such audit is completed.

(b) Within 60 days after the date on which an audit described in subsection (a) by an Inspector General is completed, the Secretary, Attorney General, Administrator, Director, or President, as appropriate, shall make the results of the audit available to the public on the Internet website maintained by the Department, Administration, Foundation, or Corporation, respectively. The results shall be made available in redacted form to exclude—

(1) any matter described in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) sensitive personal information for any individual, the public access to which could be used to commit identity theft or for other inappropriate or unlawful purposes.

(c) Any person awarded a grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act shall submit a statement to the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, the Administrator, Director, or President, as appropriate, certifying that no funds derived from the grant or contract will be made available through a subcontract or in any other manner to another person who has a financial interest in the person awarded the grant or contract.

(d) The provisions of the preceding subsections of this section shall take effect 30 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, determines that a uniform set of rules and requirements, substantially similar to the requirements in such subsections, consistently apply under the executive branch ethics program to all Federal departments, agencies, and entities.

SEC. 515. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used by the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the National Science Foundation to acquire or renew a high-impact or moderate-impact information system, as defined for security categorization in the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Federal Information Processing Standard Publication 199, "Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems" unless the agency has—

(1) reviewed the supply chain risk for the information systems against criteria developed by NIST and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to inform acquisition decisions for high-impact and moderate-impact information systems within the Federal Government;

(2) reviewed the supply chain risk from the presumptive awardee against available and relevant threat information provided by the FBI and other appropriate agencies; and

(3) in consultation with the FBI or other appropriate Federal entity, conducted an assessment of any risk of cyber-espionage or sabotage associated with the acquisition of such system, including any risk associated with such system being produced, manufactured, or assembled by one or more entities identified by the United States Government as posing a cyber threat, including but not limited to, those that may be owned, directed, or subsidized by the People's Republic of China.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to acquire a high-impact or moderate-impact information system reviewed and assessed under subsection (a) unless the head of the assessing entity described in subsection (a) has—

(1) developed, in consultation with NIST, the FBI and supply chain risk management experts, a mitigation strategy for any identified risks;

(2) determined, in consultation with NIST and the FBI, that the acquisition of such system is in the national interest of the United States; and

(3) reported that determination to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the agency Inspector General.

SEC. 516. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture by any official or contract employee of the United States Government.

SEC. 517. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or treaty, in fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended or obligated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to pay administrative expenses or to compensate an officer or employee of the United States in connection with requiring an export license for the export to Canada of components, parts, accessories or attachments for firearms listed in Category I, section 121.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations (International Trafficking in Arms Regulations (ITAR), part 121, as it existed on April 1, 2005) with a total value not exceeding \$500 wholesale in any transaction, provided that the conditions of subsection (b) of this section are met by the exporting party for such articles.

(b) The foregoing exemption from obtaining an export license—

(1) does not exempt an exporter from filing any Shipper's Export Declaration or notification letter required by law, or from being otherwise eligible under the laws of the United States to possess, ship, transport, or export the articles enumerated in subsection (a); and

(2) does not permit the export without a license of—

(A) fully automatic firearms and components and parts for such firearms, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada;

(B) barrels, cylinders, receivers (frames) or complete breech mechanisms for any firearm listed in Category I, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada; or

(C) articles for export from Canada to another foreign destination.

(c) In accordance with this section, the District Directors of Customs and postmasters shall permit the permanent or temporary export without a license of any unclassified articles specified in subsection (a) to Canada for end use in Canada or return to the United States, or temporary import of Canadian-origin items from Canada for end use in the United States or return to Canada for a Canadian citizen.

(d) The President may require export licenses under this section on a temporary basis if the President determines, upon publication first in the Federal Register, that the Government of Canada has implemented or maintained inadequate import controls for the articles specified in subsection (a), such that a significant diversion of such articles has and continues to take place for use in international terrorism or in the esca-

lation of a conflict in another nation. The President shall terminate the requirements of a license when reasons for the temporary requirements have ceased.

SEC. 518. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, no department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this Act or any other Act shall obligate or expend in any way such funds to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to deny any application submitted pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)(B) and qualified pursuant to 27 CFR section 478.112 or .113, for a permit to import United States origin "curios or relics" firearms, parts, or ammunition.

SEC. 519. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to include in any new bilateral or multilateral trade agreement the text of—

(1) paragraph 2 of article 16.7 of the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement;

(2) paragraph 4 of article 17.9 of the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement; or

(3) paragraph 4 of article 15.9 of the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement.

SEC. 520. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to authorize or issue a national security letter in contravention of any of the following laws authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to issue national security letters: The Right to Financial Privacy Act; The Electronic Communications Privacy Act; The Fair Credit Reporting Act; The National Security Act of 1947; USA PATRIOT Act; and the laws amended by these Acts.

SEC. 521. If at any time during any quarter, the program manager of a project within the jurisdiction of the Departments of Commerce or Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or the National Science Foundation totaling more than \$75,000,000 has reasonable cause to believe that the total program cost has increased by 10 percent or more, the program manager shall immediately inform the respective Secretary, Administrator, or Director. The Secretary, Administrator, or Director shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days in writing of such increase, and shall include in such notice: the date on which such determination was made; a statement of the reasons for such increases; the action taken and proposed to be taken to control future cost growth of the project; changes made in the performance or schedule milestones and the degree to which such changes have contributed to the increase in total program costs or procurement costs; new estimates of the total project or procurement costs; and a statement validating that the project's management structure is adequate to control total project or procurement costs.

SEC. 522. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence or intelligence related activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2016 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 523. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract in an amount greater than \$5,000,000 or to award a grant in excess of such amount unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, the contractor or grantee has filed all Federal tax returns required during the three years preceding the certification, has not been convicted of a criminal offense under

the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and has not, more than 90 days prior to certification, been notified of any unpaid Federal tax assessment for which the liability remains unsatisfied, unless the assessment is the subject of an installment agreement or offer in compromise that has been approved by the Internal Revenue Service and is not in default, or the assessment is the subject of a non-frivolous administrative or judicial proceeding.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 524. (a) Of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available to the Department of Commerce's National Technical Information Service, \$10,000,000 are rescinded.

(b) Of the unobligated balances available to the Department of Justice, the following funds are hereby rescinded, not later than September 30, 2016, from the following accounts in the specified amounts—

(1) "Working Capital Fund", \$100,000,000;

(2) "United States Marshals Service, Federal Prisoner Detention", \$69,500,000;

(3) "Federal Bureau of Investigation, Salaries and Expenses", \$120,000,000 from fines collected to defray expenses for the automation of fingerprint identification and criminal justice information services and associated costs;

(4) "State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office on Violence Against Women, Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs", \$15,000,000;

(5) "State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office of Justice Programs", \$40,000,000; and

(6) "State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Community Oriented Policing Services", \$20,000,000.

(c) The Department of Justice shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report no later than September 1, 2016, specifying the amount of each rescission made pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 525. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase first class or premium airline travel in contravention of sections 301-10.122 through 301-10.124 of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States unless such conference is a law enforcement training or operational conference for law enforcement personnel and the majority of Federal employees in attendance are law enforcement personnel stationed outside the United States.

SEC. 527. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 527.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman

from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments. The first strikes section 527; the second strikes section 528. I had to put them in as two separate amendments because only one amendment pends at a time, but they are really together.

Sections 527 and 528, which my amendment would strike, restricts the President's authority to move Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States for trial.

Mr. Chairman, simply put, it is time to punish Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks. In GTMO, he has not been tried, convicted, or punished. Meanwhile, Federal courts have tried, convicted, and punished more than 400 terrorists. None of them have ever escaped from a U.S. prison. No prison where they are located has ever been subjected to an attack.

The only thing my friends who are opposed to closing Guantanamo have on their side is fear. Fear, Mr. Chairman. As they argue against this amendment, they will try to tell us that these men are dangerous and scary, that these men can harm us, that these men are the worst of the worst—and some may be—but these men are already in our custody.

Like so many murderers and terrorists already in prison, they have no power over us. They have been shut off from the outside world for more than a decade.

If there are terrible people in Guantanamo—and I am not denying that there are—then it is time for them to face the consequences of their actions in a U.S. court. And that is the rub. The terrorists that have been prosecuted and sentenced had their day in court and were found guilty.

U.S. Federal courts have successfully tried and convicted criminals and terrorists during times of war and peace for hundreds of years, all while respecting the rights of due process that our Constitution demands.

This leads me to believe that some of my colleagues do not believe in the American system of justice. They do not trust our American courts to do justice. I do not understand why.

Through the centuries, our legal system has kept America safe by putting away dangerous individuals while protecting those who were innocent of the government's charges against them. That is the beauty of our system that has made it the envy of the world.

The principles underpinning the system, the right to due process and to a fair trial, are built into our Constitution and are part of our most basic values. But in order for the system to work, you actually need to get your day in court.

Without our amendment, this bill guarantees that we will continue holding people indefinitely at Guantanamo Bay.

Even though we suspect that we are holding people who are terrorists, some of whom probably are, in fact, terrorists, none of this has been proven in a court of law. Without this amendment, we will continue to hold them indefinitely without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for, contrary to any notion of due process.

The founding principles of the United States, that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law and certainly may not be deprived of liberty indefinitely without due process of law, demands that we close the detention facility at Guantanamo.

We must close this facility, try these people, condemn the guilty, place them in supermax facilities, release the innocent, if there are any; and restore our national honor. I urge the support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure everyone in the House understands that what the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is attempting to do is to give constitutional rights to foreign nationals captured on battlefields overseas who are being held in Guantanamo Bay. Never before in American history have we ever given foreign nationals—enemy combatants captured overseas on a battlefield—constitutional rights, the most precious rights we have, that were fought for, bled for, died for by our forefathers on so many battlefields all over the world to preserve these precious rights reserved for the people of the United States of America. Mr. NADLER wants to extend the protections of this Constitution to the killers and the psychopaths who have killed so many Americans overseas.

I could not disagree more strenuously. I know the House disagrees strenuously. We have voted on this repeatedly. And the House and the Congress have repeatedly affirmed this language, which says very clearly, “none of the funds appropriated”—this is the language Mr. NADLER seeks to strike:

“None of the funds appropriated . . . in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States . . . Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces . . . and is or was held on or after June 24, 2009 . . . at Guantanamo Bay.”

During World War II, a group of Nazi saboteurs who landed on beaches in Long Island and in Florida were captured fairly rapidly by local police officers and local militia and were handed over to the U.S. military. Franklin Roosevelt did the right thing, and they immediately held these Nazis as military detainees. They were accorded a

trial under the Code of Military Justice and executed, as they should have been, I think within about 60 days.

This is not really an issue with the American people, who I hope, Mr. Chairman, are not watching tonight because there could not be a more dramatic contrast between the majority in the House that is representing the will of the Nation in seeing that our laws are enforced and the enemies of the United States are hunted down wherever they may hide.

I had a constituent tell me Hamas stands for “hiding among mosques and schools.” Wherever these people may hide—they hide behind women and children. They will not face our soldiers on the battlefield. When we have met them on the battlefield, we have defeated them decisively.

Where the men and women of the United States military find these people and hunt them down and kill them or capture them—if we have captured them and they have information that could save American lives, we bring them to Guantanamo Bay, and we have saved countless lives by holding them there.

We, in this appropriations bill, make clear that we will not give these killers, these cowards, these terrorists, these foreign fighters on foreign battlefields the precious rights reserved for the people of the United States by this Constitution. And it is that simple.

If you want to give terrorists, foreign fighters on foreign battlefields constitutional rights, you should vote with the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Vote against Mr. NADLER's amendment if you believe that the rights guaranteed by this Constitution are reserved for the people of the United States and that if you are an enemy combatant, a foreign national fighting the United States, you are going to be dealt with severely and accorded the Code of Military Justice, as it should be.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 90 seconds remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, almost everything the gentleman just said is not apropos and is wrong.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the people at Guantanamo have exactly the same constitutional rights—no more and no less—than they would have if brought to the United States. So it has nothing to do with giving constitutional rights to foreign nationals.

Second of all, some of these people were, indeed, captured on foreign battlefields; some were not.

Third of all, maybe they should be tried by military tribunals. But they have been held for 11, 12, 14, 15 years. We can't manage to try them by foreign tribunals. Put them in a Federal court. Try them. Convict them.

□ 2045

Put them in a Federal court, try them, and convict them. If you want to put them in a military tribunal, you can do that, fine. We haven't managed to. But the fact is, by staying in Guantanamo, they don't have any less, fewer, or more constitutional rights than are here. Anyone within the jurisdiction of the United States, according to the Supreme Court, has constitutional rights. We must treat them with due process. All this amendment says is treat them the way the Supreme Court has said we should: try them, condemn them, or find them innocent, as the case may be. Some may be innocent. Many of them are not. Some may be. We should follow our traditions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment so that we can apply American concepts of justice as the Supreme Court has said we must.

We can try them by military tribunal in Guantanamo or in the United States. We can try them in Federal Court. Military tribunals haven't worked. We haven't been able to make them work. Federal courts have worked. We should condemn the guilty and release the innocent, if there are any.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. It was not long after 9/11 that we held a conversation here in Washington, and the former Speaker was on a panel over in Rayburn, I think. We were discussing this, and he said, well, this is the situation that we find ourselves in after these attacks. And I asked Speaker Gingrich at the time, former Speaker, this notion of us being a nation of laws, what did that mean now. Because under former President Bush, the original President Bush, he had complained about the Chinese holding people without trial. We had issued a formal complaint that the Chinese were holding people without trial, using secret evidence and so forth and so on, and what did this mean now in the context of our own country's conduct. Speaker Gingrich said that, well, he wasn't really sure because we are at a difficult moment.

So now we are here. We have had two Presidents who tried to close Guantanamo. President Bush who opened it, and his second administration wanted to end it, and then we had two Presidential elections in which the country voted for Barack Obama, who said he wanted to close this facility. We have a congressional majority that is not going to do it, that is going to put every impediment in the way of doing it.

We have our national security enterprise that says that this is used as a recruitment tool against our interests, that this is working against the security of the United States. And, more

important than perhaps even that is, I am sure, gnaws at our ideals as Americans that you would take someone, hold them, never try them, never produce any evidence in a tribunal of any type, military or civilian, and say that you are going to do it in perpetuity, that this is not the great Nation that our ideal speaks to. This is the act of something less than what we should be doing as a great country.

Mr. Chairman, I know that it is not popular and Mr. NADLER's amendment is not going to probably enjoy majority support, but at the end of the day, we can't just ask what is popular or what is politic. At some point, we have to ask ourselves what is the right thing. If we can complain about China holding people without charge, with secret evidence and no trial and no access to lawyers, then we have to think about looking in the mirror and think about what we have allowed other people's actions to turn our country into in this circumstance.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Nadler amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me, if I could, Mr. Chairman, point out that President Obama has already said he wants to close Guantanamo Bay and bring these people into the United States. The 19th terrorist was captured in the United States, and therefore he was entitled to constitutional protection because he was in the United States.

But the only thing standing between Barack Obama giving these terrorists and killers constitutional rights is this language in this appropriations bill which says none of the money in the United States can be used to transfer these killers into the United States. As soon as they touch our soil, they will be given constitutional rights. And that is exactly what Mr. NADLER wants to do with his amendment is give these precious constitutional rights to these killers and these cowards that have been captured on foreign battlefields, these foreign nationals who have never been afforded the protection of the United States Constitution, which is reserved for the people of the United States.

They deserve what they have got. They are lucky to be alive. They are lucky to be in Guantanamo Bay. And I urge Members to vote against this amendment to ensure that these people are given what they deserve, and that is, whether it be life in prison or whatever lies ahead of them, that they will never again threaten the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no," against Mr. NADLER's amendment, to ensure that constitutional protections are only afforded to the people of the United States or those persons who are actually within our boundaries when they are captured or they commit a crime.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 528. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to construct, acquire, or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual described in subsection (c) for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) An individual described in this subsection is any individual who, as of June 24, 2009, is located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to strike section 528.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 528.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this is really a continuation of our colloquy from the last amendment since they both seek to do the same thing. Let me just say a couple of things.

Again, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that people in Guantanamo Bay have the same constitutional rights as people in Florida, New York, or Washington, so I do not seek to give people in Guantanamo Bay constitutional rights they do not already have. They have the constitutional rights. That was the Supreme Court decision, I think, in 2009 I think the decision was. They have the constitutional rights. Anyone under the jurisdiction and effective control of the United States has the constitutional rights, so that is not really in question.

What is really in question is: Are we going to honor our obligations? Now, the gentleman says that some of these people are terrible people, that they are murderers. Some of them may be,

and some of them are, but some of them may not be. They have not been tried. They ought to be tried.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, we have criticized the Chinese communists, and we have criticized many other nations for holding people in jail indefinitely, for not trying them and for not giving them any kind of due process. These people, like any other human beings, deserve some due process.

Some of them, I am sure, have been terrorists. They ought to be condemned and put in jail forever. Some of them may not be. And some of them were captured on foreign battlefields and some were not. Some of them were simply victims of the Hatfields and the McCoy's feud between two tribes or clans in Afghanistan or wherever, and one clan said: Gee, the Americans are paying a \$5,000 bounty, so why don't we tip them off to our enemy and tell them that they are a terrorist. Some of them were victims of that.

The facts ought to come out. Some due process ought to be given. No one ought to be held in jail for life without a trial, without a hearing, and without some due process. That is what we stand for. And simply saying that Americans deserve due process but other people do not, A, it is wrong. Other people do not have constitutional rights, but if they are in the United States, they do. If they are in Guantanamo, they have constitutional rights. The Supreme Court has already said that.

So the question here is: Are we going to bring them to a facility in the United States, a supermax facility? No one has escaped from them. It is cheaper. It saves the taxpayers a lot of money. Give them a military tribunal or a Federal trial and do what is right. That is what is at stake here.

I will say one other thing. Our military has told us time and time again that the stain of Guantanamo, besides being a stain on our honor, is one of the greatest recruiting tools the terrorists have. They point to Guantanamo. They say: Look at those American hypocrites. They are persecuting Muslims. They are persecuting non-Americans.

Well, they have a point. And other people think they have a point, and they get angry. They get radicalized, and they become terrorists against us.

So why not, for the 120-odd people who are still at Guantanamo, the majority of whom have been judged not to pose a threat to this country by our own military authorities, do the right thing? Give them a trial. Throw them in jail for whatever lengthy period of time is indicated if they are guilty. And if they are not, then they ought to be released if they are not guilty of a crime, if they haven't been terrorists. We have to have some evidence. We can't simply point to someone and say, "He is guilty of a crime. He is a terrorist," without some evidence to that fact. That is our tradition. Mr. Chair-

man, that is what this amendment calls for.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, let me point out to all the Members of the House and those listening here this evening that the section Mr. NADLER attempts to strike is the only thing standing between President Barack Obama and his attempt to close Guantanamo Bay and transfer all these killers, these cowards, and these foreign nationals captured on the foreign battlefields either attempting to or having already killed American soldiers. This language that Mr. NADLER is attempting to strike prohibits, says:

None of the funds appropriated by this or any other act may be used to construct or acquire or modify any facility in the United States to house any individual transferred into the United States from Guantanamo Bay.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have got two provisions in this bill: no money to transfer anybody from Guantanamo into the United States—and that amendment, which will be a record vote, will be decisively defeated by the House in a minute—and then this amendment which Mr. NADLER is offering. We have put language in this bill for the last several years to make sure that President Obama cannot use Federal hard-earned taxpayer dollars to build a prison facility or modify it to house anybody transferred from Guantanamo.

Now, this is very clear-cut. This is very simple. Obviously anybody held, if you are in a military tribunal, you get due process. That is not the issue. What Mr. NADLER is attempting to do with this amendment, again, is to give constitutional rights to foreign nationals captured on foreign battlefields engaged, and we are still at war with these people. We are still at war. And Mr. NADLER is attempting to extend constitutional protections fought for and died for by our ancestors to enemy combatants captured on foreign battlefields—never been done, absolutely unprecedented, and, frankly, unbelievable. I cannot even imagine the cost, the sacrifice, the burden on American taxpayers, the threat to American safety, for what?

So these foreign nationals, these psychopathic killers in ISIL are going to respect us and like us because we give them a trial and gave them constitutional protection? Yeah, that is going to happen.

Mr. Chairman, we are at war with a medieval mindset that is determined to destroy our way of life and our liberty. They are hostile to everything that our Founding Fathers fought for. These people would destroy this Constitution that we have had for over 200 years, worked so hard to preserve and protect.

I cannot think of anything more destructive or damaging to the morale of our troops, to the morale of our Nation, and to all of those families who lost loved ones in the war on terror than to bring in these killers and cowards in the United States and grant them the protections guaranteed to American citizens in the United States Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, Mr. Chairman, even the Nazis who came ashore on Long Island that the gentleman referred to before were tried in the military tribunal. They weren't simply thrown in jail and held forever. They were tried in a military tribunal, condemned, and then sentenced to death.

All this amendment says is we should do the same thing, that people who are in the custody and the jurisdiction of the United States already have constitutional rights. We are not giving them constitutional rights. The Supreme Court already said they have them. We are saying they should get a military tribunal or a civilian trial, whichever is chosen. This amendment doesn't deal with that. And they should be condemned or not.

One more thing. The gentleman keeps saying that these people were enemies of the United States captured on the foreign battlefield. Some were and some were not.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. NADLER, because the section we are dealing with is a prohibition against building a prison facility in the United States to house these people. So that is what the debate needs to be about. What you are attempting to strike is a prohibition against using our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to build a prison to house these killers.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriations bill. I just want everybody to know it is \$2 million per inmate at Guantanamo. It is a premium facility, \$2 million per inmate.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

□ 2100

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is whether or not our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars are going to be used to build a prison facility in the United States to house the terrorists and killers and cowards held in Guantanamo Bay. That is the question before us.

Mr. NADLER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. NADLER. Does the gentleman not know what has been testified to repeatedly, that it will be a lot cheaper for the taxpayers' money to hold them in the United States than in Guantánamo?

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, that may be your opinion, sir, but we will not, and will not ever, afford constitutional rights or house foreign fighters captured on a foreign battlefield who have been killing the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States on a foreign battlefield, we are never going to house them in a prison in the United States. We are never going to give them constitutional rights. Those rights are reserved to the people of the United States and the people who commit crimes within the boundaries of the United States.

The 19th terrorist, who didn't quite make it that day, was captured in the United States, and he was given a trial, as he should be. The Constitution extends protections to persons within the United States. These people, again, whom we are at war with have never been afforded constitutional protections. And you are right, the Nazis captured in Long Island and in Florida were given due process in a military tribunal, as these individuals have been given due process in military tribunals at Guantánamo Bay. That is the way it always has been and always should be.

And certainly the Members of this House have voted repeatedly in the past, and I am confident they will vote again tonight to defeat this amendment to reaffirm that these precious rights in the United States Constitution are reserved for the people of the United States and will never be extended to enemy foreign fighters, particularly these cowards who have been waging war against women and children and won't come out and fight our men and women on the battlefield in open combat.

This language in this bill is the only thing standing between President Barack Obama in his attempt to close Guantánamo Bay and move these people into prison facilities in the United States. So I urge Members to vote against Mr. NADLER's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield initially to my friend, Mr. BABIN, and then will yield to Mr. POSEY.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I am seeking an increase of funding for the Commercial Crew Program in our Science budget.

For the past several years, the United States taxpayers have been pay-

ing over \$70 million a person to launch our astronauts to the International Space Station on Russian vehicles from Russian soil. We must end this reliance on the Russians as quickly as possible. We must set priorities within the NASA budget to make sure that the American astronauts are launched from American soil on American vehicles sooner rather than later.

When it comes to spending within our NASA budget, it is important that we set a precedent of what we think is the most important thing to do. NASA is the only U.S. Government agency that has human spaceflight as its mission. If NASA doesn't do it, then it simply is not going to be done.

This investment in Commercial Crew, which is managed out of Johnson Space Center in the 36th congressional District, would aid the development of U.S. human spaceflight capabilities and lay the foundation for future commercial transportation and end our dependence on the Russians.

I look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that we give this program the funding necessary to end our reliance on the Russians.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. BABIN. I want to assure you that as we work through this process in conference and the additional funding becomes available—and I do expect that as we move forward, if we have additional funding, we are going to make sure that any gaps or holes, whether it be in the Orion program or anywhere else, we are going to fill those holes and make sure that we are given as much support as we possibly can to Commercial Crew and to Orion.

We funded the Orion program at the level the President requested. And if we get additional funds, we will do our very best to hit that mark also for the Commercial Crew Program.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I am very supportive of the Commercial Crew Program, and I think that there is a shortfall in that particular program. I think that is what the gentleman is referring to in his hope that we can address that shortfall so that we don't have to spend what has now been about \$500 million with our Russian counterparts in order to transport astronauts to the International Space Station.

Mr. CULBERSON. We will work together. If we, as we say, find additional funds, we will do everything we can to help Orion.

Mr. BABIN. Thank you for your consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will be happy also to yield to my good friend, Mr. POSEY, for a colloquy as well.

Mr. POSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This bill adequately funds the Space Launch System, the rocket which will carry the Orion capsule into space, and I am grateful for that.

It adequately funds exploration ground systems, which are essential to getting Orion off the ground, and I am really grateful for that.

But without sufficiently funding the Orion capsule, we will be delaying the deep space exploration missions. Orion is a very unique and very special spacecraft, unlike any we have ever sent into space, possessing capabilities to carry astronauts deeper into space than humans have ever gone before. The technological and engineering challenges are enormous, and it requires proper funding to get the job done.

It is critical that Orion receives adequate funding to remain on schedule. My rough calculations indicate this funding level, so much less than authorized, can result in the delay of having Orion online by as much as 2 years. Imagine having our space launch systems ready to go, our exploration ground systems ready to go, and no space capsule ready to fly for 2 more years after that. That would be disastrous.

Unfortunately, when Congress assigns tasks to NASA and does not provide adequate funding, American's space program gets criticized and maligned for being behind schedule, when it is actually Congress that caused the problem.

I thank my colleagues for their work on this issue, and I am hopeful that we can work together to make certain Orion gets enough funding to stay on schedule to carry humans into space, deep space, by 2021.

I thank Chairman CULBERSON for his work on this and his assurance that we can work together to secure adequate funding to keep Orion on schedule.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to assure the gentleman that we will do so. I want to make sure to make the RECORD clear that we funded Orion at the level requested by NASA. We fully funded in exactly the number they asked for. If additional funds become available, and it looks like it is really going to help them speed up the program, we will certainly make those funds available to them, because we want to get Americans back into space as quickly as possible on an American built rocket. That is why you have seen us plus up the SLS heavy launch rocket program to accelerate that program, which will have so many uses. But, of course, you know I don't know there is any stronger advocate for NASA and America's space program than I am and you gentlemen are. I look forward to working with you.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I move to strike the last word with the gentleman from Texas.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the gentleman cannot strike the last word.

Mr. CULBERSON. Do I have the ability to strike the last word again to complete additional colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado?

The Acting CHAIR. Only the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Pennsylvania can move to strike the last word under the rule.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word and enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado, my friend.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I thank my friend from Florida for speaking up on behalf of Orion.

Orion is America's new spacecraft to take astronauts further into space than ever before and land our astronauts on Mars.

Orion had its maiden test flight this past December, and it was a resounding success. The Orion program, as Mr. POSEY stated, needs a full funding for this, and we believe it to be \$1.35 billion for fiscal year '16 to meet those needs.

I appreciate the committee including language in the committee report requiring NASA to provide an assessment of these challenges, but Congress needs to provide the resources necessary in fiscal year '16 to mitigate the entire risk and move this project forward.

So I thank the gentleman from Texas for his support of the Orion program. We need to make sure it has sufficient resources to get our men and women, our astronauts, to Mars as quickly as possible.

Mr. CULBERSON. I look forward to working with you and my colleague from Texas and our colleagues from Florida in ensuring everyone in this House supports NASA and the manned space program. And I will work closely with you and my colleagues to ensure that any additional funding that Orion needs that they receive as we move through this process and go into conference.

As you noted, the bill that we have before us tonight funds Orion at the level requested by NASA. We gave them exactly what they asked for. We also asked them to give us reports on making sure they can meet their deadlines for testing the spacecraft and meeting their milestones. As they prove that to us and as we get further along and additional funds get available and they show us they need that, of course, we will put them at the top of the list.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to staying on top of this so that as they move forward we have sufficient funding to really propel this project forward and get our astronauts to Mars.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman. America will never surrender the high ground—outer space is the high ground of the 21st century—and we are going to make sure to preserve America's leadership in space exploration, both manned and unmanned.

I yield back the balance of my time.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I am doing something I would rather not do. But the gentleman from Texas was so nice on my rape kit amendment, and we did save Texas and have Davy Crockett, a predecessor of mine, in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that my request for a recorded vote on the amendment I offered that the chair was against, that it be withdrawn, to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 529. To the extent practicable, funds made available in this Act should be used to purchase light bulbs that are "Energy Star" qualified or have the "Federal Energy Management Program" designation.

SEC. 530. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving funds appropriated under this Act to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts and include in its annual performance plan and performance and accountability reports the following:

(1) Details on future action the department, agency, or instrumentality will take to resolve undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(2) The method that the department, agency, or instrumentality uses to track undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts.

(3) Identification of undisbursed balances in expired grant accounts that may be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(4) In the preceding 3 fiscal years, details on the total number of expired grant accounts with undisbursed balances (on the first day of each fiscal year) for the department, agency, or instrumentality and the total finances that have not been obligated to a specific project remaining in the accounts.

SEC. 531. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) or the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to effectuate the hosting of official Chinese visitors at facilities belonging to or utilized by NASA.

(c) The limitations described in subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to activities which NASA or OSTP has certified—

(1) pose no risk of resulting in the transfer of technology, data, or other information with national security or economic security implications to China or a Chinese-owned company; and

(2) will not involve knowing interactions with officials who have been determined by the United States to have direct involvement with violations of human rights.

(d) Any certification made under subsection (c) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, no later than 30 days prior to the activity in question and shall include a description of the purpose of the activity, its agenda, its major participants, and its location and timing.

SEC. 532. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act, for fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to deny, or fail to act on, an application for the importation of any model of shotgun if—

(1) all other requirements of law with respect to the proposed importation are met; and

(2) no application for the importation of such model of shotgun, in the same configuration, had been denied by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 2011, on the basis that the shotgun was not particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 94, beginning on line 16, strike section 532.

Page 96, beginning on line 12, strike section 537.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 532 and 537, two harmful gun riders in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, appropriations bills are not the proper place to address significant policy provisions. Instead, such changes to gun policy must be seriously and properly considered by Congress through the regular order. The American people deserve an open and transparent process where a full range of options can be frankly discussed and debated by the proper congressional committee and the entire House of Representatives.

Over the past several years, various appropriations riders related to gun policy have had unintended consequences that could have been prevented had these issues been fully and thoroughly debated in Congress.

Today is National Gun Violence Awareness Day. Today of all days we can and must do better. We should not allow contentious policy provisions related to important Federal policies governing firearms to be attached to these appropriations bills.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Appropriations Committee and the House as a whole to stop inserting significant gun

policy provisions into must-pass spending bills.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

□ 2115

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 533. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, adjudication, or other law-enforcement related activity.

SEC. 534. The Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the International Trade Commission, the Legal Services Corporation, the Marine Mammal Commission, the Offices of Science and Technology Policy and the United States Trade Representative, and the State Justice Institute shall submit spending plans, signed by the respective department or agency head, to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 535. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate approves a resolution of ratification for the Treaty.

SEC. 536. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to relinquish the responsibility of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration with respect to Internet domain name system functions, including responsibility with respect to the authoritative root zone file and the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions.

SEC. 537. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a person licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to report information to the Department of Justice regarding the sale of multiple rifles or shotguns to the same person.

SEC. 538. No funds provided in this Act shall be used to deny the Inspectors General of the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation timely access to all records, documents, and other materials in the custody or possession of the respective department or agency or to prevent or impede the particular Inspector General's access to such records, documents, and other materials, unless in accordance with an express limitation of section 6(a) of the Inspector General Act, as amended, consistent with the plain language of the Inspector General Act, as amended. The Inspectors General of the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within five calendar days any failures to comply with this requirement.

SEC. 539. The Department of Commerce, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation,

and the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on any official travel to China by any employee of such Department or agency, including the purpose of such travel.

SEC. 540. (a) No funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate, permit, license, or promote exports to the Cuban military or intelligence service or to any officer of the Cuban military or intelligence service, or an immediate family member thereof.

(b) This section does not apply to exports of goods permitted under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.).

(c) In this section—

(1) the term “Cuban military or intelligence service” includes, but is not limited to, the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, and the Ministry of the Interior, of Cuba, and any subsidiary of either such Ministry; and

(2) the term “immediate family member” means a spouse, sibling, son, daughter, parent, grandparent, grandchild, aunt, uncle, niece, or nephew.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to strike section 540.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 540 (page 97, line 18 through page 98, line 10).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I am serving my 22nd year in the United States Congress, and I have never seen a provision in an appropriations bill like this.

This amendment in there could be labeled the “family feud.” There is only one Member of Congress who is related to anybody in the leadership and in the military in Cuba, and he is the person who put this amendment in.

What it does is it prohibits businesses from doing business in Cuba because it makes it almost impossible for any business to get a license. That is why the United States Chamber of Commerce; the National Foreign Trade Council; the Emergency Committee for American Trade; USA Engage, which is a trade group; and CubaNow, which is Florida's Cuban Americans, are all opposed to this provision of the bill and support my amendment to strike it.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD letters from CubaNow which are in support of my amendment.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARR: We urge that House Members vote to strip Section 540 from H.R. 2578, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

This provision would turn back the strategic effort to normalize relations between the U.S. and Cuba, harming advancements to increased commerce with Cuba.

Majorities of Americans, Cuban-Americans, and Cubans support normalizing relations and ending the unilateral trade embargo. Bipartisan support exists in both the House and Senate and throughout the business community and the majority of civil society groups focused on Cuba.

The question of Cuba policy should be approached deliberatively in the full context of hemispheric relations.

Please support the Farr amendment to strip Section 540 from H.R. 2578.

Sincerely,

CUBANOW;
EMERGENCY COMMITTEE
FOR AMERICAN TRADE;
ENGAGE CUBA;
MANCHESTER TRADE
LIMITED, INC.;
NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE
COUNCIL;
U.S. CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE;
USA*ENGAGE.

#CUBANOW STATEMENT ON ADMINISTRATION
VETO THREATS OVER CUBA POLICY

[From #CubaNow]

WASHINGTON.—#CubaNow Political Director David Gomez issued the following statement in support of the Obama Administration's veto threats and congressional efforts to eliminate attempts to limit or roll back the new Cuba policy:

“#CubaNow supports the recent veto threats issued by the Obama Administration in regards to the House's current *Transportation* and *Commerce* appropriations bills. As the Administration noted, these bills include policy riders that place unacceptable and regressive restrictions related to Cuba, including Americans' right to travel to the Island and the ability to do business with and support Cuba's growing private sector. #CubaNow also supports the floor amendment by Rep. Sam Farr to strike the restrictions from the Commerce appropriations bill and other similar efforts in Congress to keep spending bills free of *bad policy* that will do nothing to help the Cuban people.”

“Congress should work on advancing U.S.-Cuba policy in a constructive manner that recognizes there's no going back to the failed ideas of yesterday. Only a small minority in Congress continues to try to drag their feet. But the Cold War is over, and it's time that Congress heeds the will of an American public that *by and large* supports moving forward with greater engagement. Our new direction will do more to help Cuban civil society than riders that try to breathe life into an unsuccessful half-century-old policy.”

Mr. FARR. Almost every country in this hemisphere and almost every country in the world has normal trade relations with Cuba. We are trying to open those up so that businesses in America, particularly our agriculture and our other trading goods, can take advantage of the market in Cuba—not a big one, but an important one—because it is so close to shore.

What this amendment does is it stops all of that. It targets the Cuban military by saying that anything related to the Cuban military and what they own, which is a lot of businesses in Cuba, may not be used to facilitate, permit, license, or promote exports to the Cuban military or intelligence services or the immediate families thereof.

This is what is really so damaging. The term “immediate family,” as described in the bill, means a spouse, sibling, son, daughter, parent, grandparent, grandchild, aunt, uncle, niece, or nephew. Now, how does a businessperson in the United States know if

any of those people are working for any of the agencies that this bill restricts from?

It hurts American businesses, and it hurts Cubans. Let's stop living in the past. Let's strike this provision in the bill and support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I am glad this amendment is here.

President Obama said—and he said this a while ago—that his policies are to help promote the Cuban people's independence from Cuban authorities.

Now, no one can claim that the Cuban military and the Cuban intelligence community and their direct family members are not the Cuban authorities. Nothing is more authority than those two things. Let's unmask what this amendment does.

The language in the mark, in the bill, simply affirms that we should not send exports—I will make this very clear—to the Cuban military or the intelligence community or their immediate families. In unmasking this amendment, what this amendment is saying is no, no, no, that we do support and that we do want to do business with the Cuban military and the Cuban intelligence services and their immediate families.

By the way, it is the same military and intelligence services that brutalized the Cuban people, that beat prodemocracy demonstrators, that beat a number of American citizens in Panama recently, that illegally smuggles weapons, which has members of that Cuban military under indictment here in a U.S. Federal court for the murder of American citizens.

I am glad this amendment is here because this amendment unmasks the underlying issue, and the chairman's mark specifically deals with—again, as I mentioned—the Cuban military and the intelligence community and their immediate relatives.

If this amendment were to happen, what we would be saying is that we want to do business, not with Cuba and not with the Cuban people, but with the Cuban military and the intelligence services and their direct relatives. Frankly, I am glad this amendment is here because it does unmask the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Farr amendment.

Section 540 is critical in ensuring that exports to Cuba reach and benefit the Cuban people, not the regime's military and intelligence services, which actively and aggressively collaborate with our enemies throughout the world. Still today, Cuba has one of

the most robust spy networks in the United States. These are not the people we should be rewarding with American business.

The most recent State Department report on Cuba's human rights conditions says that harsh prison conditions, arbitrary arrests, selective prosecution, and the denial of fair trials continue in the country.

The iron fist of the Castro regime has cracked down on peaceful democratic activists with over 2,000 dissidents arrested since the President's December 17 announcement. Just this past Sunday, 59 members of the Ladies in White were arrested along with 25 other human rights activists—their crime? It was attending Sunday mass, Mr. Chairman.

The oppression is not limited to Cuba's borders. According to high-level military defectors from Venezuela's Government, there are between 2,700 and 3,000 Cuban military and intelligence agents aiding in the crackdown against Venezuelan protesters and opposing American interests in that country.

These are the thugs—the very individuals—who would most benefit from the Farr amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a diversity of views in this Chamber with regard to our broader Cuba policy. What I cannot understand is why anyone would want to reward the individuals responsible for the deaths of Americans, for the oppression of the Cuban people, for spying against our country.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to oppose the Farr amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, rhetoric is really cheap here, but I would urge Members to read the bill and to read the second term.

It reads:

The term “Cuban military intelligence service” includes but is not limited to the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces and the Ministry of Interior of Cuba and any subsidiary of such ministry.

The term “immediate family” means spouse, sibling, son, daughter, and so on.

The analysis by our own Library of Congress says that this would severely hurt the consumer communication devices that would be sent to families in Cuba as part of the negotiations that are going on right now between the United States and the administration.

It would also hurt materials, equipment, tools used by the private sector to construct or to renovate privately owned buildings, tools and equipment for private sector agriculture activity, tools and equipment and supplies and instruments used by the private sector.

This provision just kills the ability for the United States to open up trade that every other country has. This is just a “family feud” amendment. This is not good business, and that is why the business community is opposed.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. McCLINTOCK). The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Once again, the other side is really pushing the envelope in terms of characterizing what this amendment actually does.

This amendment would strike provisions included in this bill that would prohibit the Department of Commerce from issuing licenses for new types of exports that are permitted under the Obama administration's new policy of engagement with Cuba. This provision is not only an inappropriate policy rider in this appropriations bill, but, if included, it would put this House, once again, on the wrong side of history.

Supporters of this provision claim that it would only prohibit exporting to anyone who works with the Cuban military, intelligence services, and their immediate families. The reality is that the effects of this provision are much, much broader.

It would make it difficult for the Department of Commerce to issue licenses to companies that want to export to Cuba, U.S. companies that create jobs in the United States of America. This includes equipment and supplies for entrepreneurs that are related to running their own businesses here in America, and it includes the materials, equipment, and tools to construct or renovate privately owned businesses.

Simply put, this rider is wrong. It is wrong for business, and it certainly should not be part of a bill that funds our critical Commerce, Justice, and Science programs.

The majority of Americans and Cubans agree that U.S. policy toward Cuba has been an unpopular failure for more than 50 years. Instead of including misguided provisions that undermine the process of normalizing relations with Cuba, we should be moving toward increased exchanges, formal relations with our neighbors, and creating good-paying jobs in the United States by allowing the exporting of U.S. products to Cuba.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the language Mr. FARR is attempting to strike.

It reads:

No funds made available to do business with the Cuban military or the intelligence services.

The only thing standing between President Barack Obama's attempt to override the will of the people as expressed by Congress, which is we will not do business with Cuba, is the Federal law. President Obama is attempting to change that.

The only thing stopping President Obama from doing business with Cuba is this language, and the language says

you cannot do business with the Communist military in Cuba or with the Communist intelligence services.

It is very straightforward. If you want to do business with the private sector in Cuba, go ahead. All this says is that you can't do business with the Communist military or with the Communist intelligence services.

Therefore, we urge Members to vote "no" against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. FARR. It is very interesting that the capitalist society out there supports my amendment: the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Foreign Trade Council, Engage Cuba, the Emergency Committee for American Trade. They wrote a letter that they urge the House Members to strip section 540 from H.R. 2578, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

The provision would turn back the strategic effort to normalize relations between the U.S. and Cuba, harming advancements to increase commerce with Cuba. The majorities of Americans, Cuban Americans, and Cubans support the normalization of relations and any unilateral trade embargo.

Bipartisan support exists in both the House and the Senate and throughout the businesses community and with the majority of the civil society focused on Cuba. The question of Cuba policy should be approached deliberatively and in the full context of hemispheric relations.

I urge the support of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, we spend a lot of time making something simple complex. The problem here is that, in a small nation, an island like Cuba, trying to discern whether somebody is related—a cousin, a nephew, a so-and-so who might work for some entity—is very problematic.

What this restriction would basically mean is that you wouldn't be able to do any business. That is notwithstanding everything else, notwithstanding the failure of the last 50 years, notwithstanding the fact that everybody else in the world is doing business in Cuba, this language would prevent us from being able to do any business there because you would not be able to predetermine whether there was a blood connection between some person you were selling a cell phone to and someone who, at some point, was a grunt in the military.

□ 2130

That is the issue. That is why we should support the Farr amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available by this Act may be expended during fiscal year 2016 for the shutdown of the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy or for the preparation therefor.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 542. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the bill (before the short title), the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to transfer cell site simulators, or IMSI Catcher, or similar cell phone tower mimicking technology to state and local law enforcement that haven't adopted procedures for the use of such technology that protects the constitutional rights of citizens.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I will try to make this very quick because I know there is a point of order.

This was one of those moments where there was a concern about new adopted technology. We have all heard the stories of some of these, shall we call them, dummy cell sites that are basically used to capture the phone calls because they produce the largest, most powerful signal. Now, some of this technology that has been being used at the Federal Government level is being transferred to State and local law enforcement.

The amendment is meant to be very simple and just says for the Federal Government to design, for Justice to design, protocols that the constitutional rights are being protected, that if a local law enforcement is going to use this capture technology, that they better darn well be following the Constitution, and before that technology is transferred, that there is an understanding, mechanics of that being laid out.

We tried to make the amendment as simple and clear-cut as possible.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the amendment, reluctantly, because I agree with the gentleman's amendment because I share his concern about privacy matters; but because the amendment proposes to change existing law, and it constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, it, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I do share the gentleman's concern. I think it is very important that, as the House debates these matters, that we remember that our most important right as Americans is to be left alone and our right of privacy. I am deeply concerned about these cell phone towers that are spoofed, that are designed to spoof our phones, and the government intruding into our zone of privacy that is now compromised by these electronic devices in so many ways.

However, House rules state in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

This amendment does require a new determination by its express terms, and while I will certainly work with the gentleman as we move forward in conference to address this concern, make sure our privacy rights are protected, I do ask at this time for a ruling from the Chair on the substance of my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, with the chairman's friendship and commitment and where he is on understanding the importance of the issue, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum. I have submitted identical amendments to 16 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority, so I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay \$147 per barrel. But despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC. Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum. We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 633,000 vehicles. Nearly 50,000 of these vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill, being used by the Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, and the National Science Foundation.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol or some other mix. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important. I want this same choice for American consumers.

That is why I am proposing a bill this Congress, as I have in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of, or in addition to, gasoline. It doesn't cost much at all; and if they can do it in Brazil, we can do it here.

In conclusion, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign government-controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers. I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I do not oppose the gentleman's amendment and would urge its adoption.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), my friend from Philadelphia.

Mr. FATTAH. We had a big celebration at the Ben Franklin Institute in Philadelphia for electric cars, and there was such a variety of vehicles. Alternative fuels are important. I think that the gentleman's amendment is one that we have accepted in previous appropriation bills, and I concur with the chairman that we would accept it in this case.

Mr. CULBERSON. I urge Members to support the amendment and urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I conclude and say I thank my colleagues and look forward to continuing to work together with them in a bipartisan fashion for the good of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk regarding the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, with multiple cosponsors.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of Justice or the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 101(m) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(m)) alter the product or service of the person to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1801(f)) of any user of such product or service.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

Mr. POE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have a simple, straightforward amendment to protect the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This is a very similar amendment that passed DOD Appropriations last year.

I would like to thank Representatives LOFGREN, MASSIE, CONYERS, AMASH, NADLER, FARENTHOLD, POLIS, LABRADOR, and LIEU for working with me as cosponsors on this important amendment.

James Comey, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, re-

cently asked Congress to update the law to ensure that the Federal Government can access information from Americans' cell phones and personal electronic devices in the future.

Many U.S. technology companies have also been approached by the government agencies, urging them either through intimidation or just request to create back doors on their products' encryption system so the government can access it later down the road. We have all learned recently about the government's abuse of section 215 under the PATRIOT Act and abuse under section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act.

Basically what this amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is prohibit the government from going to Apple, for example, and telling Apple that they want an encryption in cell phones that they sell to Americans, an encryption that would allow the FBI to have access to this information, which would include not just conversations, not just include emails, but it would also include text messaging as well.

This is a straightforward amendment. This prohibits the Federal Government—specifically, the FBI—from going in and receiving this information. Privacy is important. It is under our Constitution. There should be no doubt that the Federal Government should have no access to our cell phones and the information that is in those cell phones. That is what this amendment does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, but I do not oppose the gentleman's amendment. I agree with his amendment and encourage the House to support it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized on her reservation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I had also sought to seek the time in opposition, although I also do not oppose the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Does the gentlewoman support the amendment?

Ms. LOFGREN. I support the amendment, as does the gentleman.

Mr. CULBERSON. That was my point. I think it is important. We are here in this Chamber looking at George Mason, who refused to sign the Constitution because he was so concerned that the power of the Federal Government would just absolutely obliterate—

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

Does the gentlewoman withdraw her reservation?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, further reserving, I was wondering if the Democratic side of the aisle might be able to split the time. That is why I was reserving the right to object.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to split the time with

the gentlewoman. I am claiming the time in opposition, although I do not oppose it. The gentleman still has some time remaining on his initial time. I will yield in just a moment, but I really think it is important in this age of electronic communication that we in the Congress debate and be keenly aware of the new boundaries.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

Ms. LOFGREN. I withdraw my reservation.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 2145

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, my neighbor and good friend, Judge TED POE, brings a very important point to the floor tonight.

In this new era of expanding technology that now intrudes on every aspect of our lives, it is very important to remember the admonition that Benjamin Franklin gave us—that those who would surrender a little freedom to gain a little safety are soon going to find themselves with neither.

I do find it instructive that we are here on this House floor looking at George Mason, who is on the right here, who refused to sign the Constitution because he was so concerned the Federal Government would become omnipotent and obliterate the rights of individuals and the rights of the States to control those issues that deal exclusively with the States.

My favorite Founding Father, Thomas Jefferson, was keenly aware of and concerned about the power of the Federal Government. We are entering into a whole new era now where the government has got the ability to intrude on every aspect of our life.

I share Judge POE's concern. I support his amendment, and I urge the House to support it. If the FBI has a court order, if the National Security Agency gets a court order, I believe they could get access to what they need to get access to. Just like cracking a safe.

In fact, I asked this question, if I could, of Director Comey in front of our subcommittee. He said these new iPhones—I dropped my iPhone 5 and had to get a 6—he said these can't be cracked. So, therefore, you would have to open them up like you would a safe, as you had to order safes, I bet, opened on occasion, Judge POE.

So I agree with the amendment, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As Mr. POE recognized, this is a very diverse group of authors who don't agree on everything, but this is very important for a reason.

First, it is fundamental that our privacy be protected; that the Fourth

Amendment be adhered to. Secondly, we all know—and if you ask any computer scientist, they will tell you—that once the vulnerability is introduced for a good reason, it is available for hacking for very bad reasons. Finally, for competitiveness. Think how competitive it is to sell an American product around the world when everyone knows that it is compromised. Not a really good marketing tool.

Last year, as Mr. POE mentioned, we had almost precisely this amendment on the floor as an amendment to the DOD appropriations. What was the vote on that amendment? It was 293–123; overwhelming.

So I am hoping that Members will not flip-flop, that they will, in fact, vote the way they did last year.

And I will just go a little trip down memory road. When I was first elected to the Congress, I took my oath of office January 4, 1995, and I met BOB GOODLATTE for the very first time. And he and I went all over this Congress to try and work on decontrol of encryption.

Although a lot of people we talked to in 1995 had no idea what we were talking about when we talked about encryption, ultimately that bipartisan effort was successful. We must not let that successful effort to protect privacy, to protect technology, be eroded at this point.

So I look forward to a very strong vote on this. I think it is important that we have a vote, even though there is agreement, just to send the message to the other body how serious that we are.

Mr. CULBERSON. Our most important right as Americans is to be left alone. If you are a law-abiding American, you are secure in your home and your possessions. Your home is your castle.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. We might not agree on everything, but I think we agree on the Fourth Amendment. So this is a great day for this body to come together across the aisle for that purpose. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CULBERSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I just wanted to indicate that on behalf of the minority, we support your amendment and are prepared to agree to it.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Thank you, Judge POE, for introducing this amendment. This was substantially the same amendment that we offered last summer that passed with a veto-proof majority 293–123.

Back doors are bad for three reasons. When the government forces companies to put back doors or weaken their encryption, it is bad for security because hackers are going to find these back doors and other foreign countries will find these back doors.

It is bad for privacy because the Fourth Amendment can be violated. And it is bad for business. As my colleague ZOE LOFGREN from California mentioned, it is bad for business because it makes us less competitive overseas. Who wants to buy a piece of defective software that was made defective by our government?

So I urge Members to vote for this amendment because it would prevent all of these bad things from occurring.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. In conclusion, I want to thank the minority, Ms. LOFGREN, and all the cosponsors on this, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, for their support.

On the issue of privacy, in this time where we have threats to this country, we can have security and we can certainly have privacy, and we can have the Constitution be followed as well.

The Fourth Amendment has always required that if the government wants to search, the government must follow certain rules. And those rules are that you must get a warrant from a judge based on probable cause. That is still the law of the land, even in 2015.

All this amendment does is ensure the fact that the government—the FBI—follows the Constitution. The idea that the Federal Government wants to have encryption in American cell phones so they can have access to the information is repulsive. So all this does is keep the Federal Government out of our business without appropriate constitutional protections.

I ask for support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reaffirm that, as Judge POE has written this amendment, there is an exception in here that if the government gets a court order, they can go in and put a back door on the phone when the judge says there is a compelling reason to do so.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. Certainly. The law—the Constitution—still applies that the government must go and get a warrant based upon probable cause under the Fourth Amendment. Of course, there are exceptions to warrantless search.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, the way the amendment is written, the government can't just force all phone companies to build a back door into all telephones. You have got to have a court order on that specific phone, on that specific person, before you can do it. That is absolutely reasonable. That is what Mr. Madison and Mr. Jefferson intended for us to do.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to execute a subpoena of tangible things pursuant to section 506 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 876) that does not include the following sentence: "This subpoena limits the collection of any tangible things (including phone numbers dialed, telephone numbers of incoming calls, and the duration of calls) to those tangible things identified by a term that specifically identifies an individual, account, address, or personal device, and that limits, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope of the tangible things sought."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, here in Congress we have just been spending a lot of time and energy discussing NSA surveillance. The American public—and now, Members of Congress in both Chambers—have spoken clearly that the kind of bulk data collection the NSA has engaged in needs to be stopped. However, there is a corresponding change that we need to make with regard to the Drug Enforcement Administration.

In a series of revelations from 2013 to 2015, it came to light that the DEA had for more than 20 years been gathering a vast database of information on America's personal communications. There was no congressional authority for this program and no oversight by Congress or any area of the Federal Government.

Legal experts who weighed in after the program was finally made public have said without hesitation that the program was illegal.

In 2013, the Department of Justice brought this program to an end, but there is nothing to stop the government or the DOJ from resuming it at will unless Congress acts by inserting this language in the appropriations bill. Without this language, the DEA could once again unilaterally sweep up the communications records of millions of Americans.

There is no reason that, as we work to end the unconstitutional surveillance that the NSA has engaged in, we should continue to allow the DOJ to have the very same abuses.

This is a corresponding piece of legislation to something that already passed the House with regard to the NSA by an overwhelming majority.

I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan amendment that we worked on with Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD to simply prohibit DOJ from using Federal funds to engage in bulk data collection of Americans' phone records or other data, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Just being given Mr. POLIS' amendment, I oppose the idea of bulk data collection. I would like to accept the gentleman's amendment because of my previous expressed concerns about how we want to make sure we are protecting the privacy of law-abiding Americans.

So I would accept the gentleman's amendment with the understanding that I would work with him. There may be unintended consequences here that I am not immediately aware of. Judiciary Committee staff is working with ours right now to make sure we have got our arms around this.

I want to make sure that if the DEA has a valid court order, a valid subpoena, that they can go after lawbreakers and complete their investigations. Again, we want to protect the privacy of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I think with the understanding that the chairman has laid out, your accepting this amendment would move us forward, and I agree. I think we have a clear understanding that you are accepting it, but we will work together to make sure it doesn't have any unintended consequences.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, with that understanding, I want to make sure we reserve the right of DEA to get a court order to do their work. With that understanding, I withdraw my opposition and will accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the coauthor of the amendment.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this amendment to prevent bulk collection of data at the Department of Justice.

Last month, this House spoke loud and clear that we oppose the National Security Agency's bulk collection of telephone metadata. Today, the Senate joined us in that judgment, and, together, we have reaffirmed our commitment to the Fourth Amendment and to protecting Americans from unconstitutional government surveillance.

We learned earlier this year that long before the NSA program ban, the Drug Enforcement Administration engaged in its own bulk collection program that provided a model for the NSA to use

nearly a decade later. This program included logs of virtually all telephone calls from the U.S. to as many as 116 countries, ostensibly linked to drug trafficking, all without a court order and without authorization from Congress.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. Although the DOJ has since shut down this program, there is nothing preventing the Department from renewing it in secret without authorization, as it did before. This amendment would ensure that it remains dormant and that Americans' privacy remains secure.

I thank Mr. POLIS and the other cosponsors of the amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for accepting this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and thank my colleague from Texas for agreeing to accept it.

This has been a great victory this week in our ability to work with the Senate to rein in what I believe to be the unconstitutional bulk data collection by the NSA.

Just because we stopped the NSA doesn't mean we shouldn't be ever vigilant. With the reports of the DEA engaging in similar activities, it is absolutely appropriate that we use the power of the purse to ensure that this type of spying on American citizens—this bulk data collection—is stopped.

This is no different from the general warrants that were complained about when the King of England would send troops to rifle through people's desks just looking for stuff. It is the exact same thing in the digital age. I encourage my colleagues to support it and look forward to working with my colleague, Mr. CULBERSON, in making sure it does become part of this bill.

□ 2200

Mr. POLIS. In conclusion, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON). It is, indeed, the intended language and we believe the actual language of the amendment that would not interfere with any valid court orders or warrants. We are happy to work with them in that regard.

The amendment is designed to pertain to bulk collection of data, which was never specifically authorized by Congress.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas accepting the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) Each amount made available by this Act, except those amounts made available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following accounts of the Department of Justice:

- (1) "Fees and Expenses of Witnesses".
- (2) "Public Safety Officer Benefits".
- (3) "United States Trustee System Fund".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to begin by thanking the committee and Chairman CULBERSON for their tremendous work that they have put into this bill, identifying ways to reduce spending and to be a good steward of the taxpayers' money.

This funding bill is \$51.4 billion, and I would like to point out that that is \$661 million below the President's request. Good work on behalf of our team.

Now, I am one of those that thinks more needs to be done, especially when we look at the discretionary spending. There is more we should do. My amendment calls for a 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction. That would reduce the budget authority by \$540 million and outlays by \$340 million in Fiscal Year 2016.

I am fully aware of the opposition that exists to across-the-board cuts by many of the appropriators, and I have many times stood on this floor and heard how they think this is just a little bit of a cut too much.

However, we are nearly \$18.3 trillion in debt. Indeed, Admiral Mullen, on July 6, 2010, said the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt.

Getting our spending under control is an important step for us to take. That is why we need to move forward and do what many of our States have done and institute across-the-board cuts to save one penny out of a dollar.

Engage the rank-and-file Federal employees. Have them bring to the table their best ideas. Our children are depending on us to do this in order to maintain the fiscal sovereignty of our Nation.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is important for the House to oppose this amendment because, as in our personal lives or our business lives, the Appropriations Committee has prioritized the very precious and scarce, hard-earned taxpayer dollars that we are entrusted to appropriate to make sure that they are spent on the most urgent priorities first.

We do not want to cut, as Mrs. BLACKBURN would, the FBI. We do not

want to cut our operations of our cybersecurity forces, as Mrs. BLACKBURN would. I do not want to cut the work that is being done by our law enforcement officials across the country, as Mrs. BLACKBURN would.

This amendment would also cut, for example, the good work that is being done by the U.S. Marshals Service. This would cut the 55 new immigration judges that we have included in the bill.

This would cut the amount of money we set aside for the operation of our prison system, of the ATF, all Federal law enforcement agencies that perform such a vital role. We prioritized them and made sure they are protected from cuts.

I would oppose this amendment on the basis that we do not want to cut Federal law enforcement.

We also don't want to cut our Nation's investment in the sciences and the National Science Foundation or our work to preserve America's leadership role in space exploration.

We want to make sure that we are doing all that we can to accelerate our work in bringing American astronauts back into space on an American-made rocket as quickly as possible. This amendment would cut NASA.

We have, in the bill, however, cut or eliminated dozens of programs that their authorization has expired—or their usefulness has expired. We went in and dramatically cut programs that were not effective anymore, completely eliminated programs.

We found all kinds of savings in this bill, and I am sure that our priorities are ones that the good people of Tennessee that Mrs. BLACKBURN represents would share. I know her constituents share, as we do, a commitment to law enforcement, to scientific research, to America's space program; and they would probably also agree with our cuts to the Department of Commerce, our unavoidable cuts really to the Census.

We did our best to protect the important work that our men and women in uniform who enforce the laws of the United States do. This amendment would be a blunt cut across the board to all of these worthwhile programs, and I urge the Members to oppose it.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I wanted to say that I concur completely with the chairman, and I am opposed to the amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I appreciate, as I said, the work that the committee has done, but I think it is imperative that we realize the burden that we are placing on future generations.

Quite frankly, I think it is rather selfish of this body to force future generations—our children and grandchildren—to pay for the out-of-control spending of today.

Have we done a good job? Yes. Could we do a superlative? Absolutely, we

could. Cutting one penny out of a dollar is a wise step. I don't know of anybody that thinks we are underspent. I know a lot of people that think we are overspent and that we are overtaxed.

What it is going to take in order to get our fiscal house in order and to secure this Nation for future generations is, yes, indeed, targeted cuts. It is going to take across-the-board cuts, and it is going to take everybody agreeing that we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem.

That is a component of our budget and appropriations process that the American people are demanding that we get under control. It is not necessarily a debate about worthiness. There are lots of good programs and essential programs.

What it is, is a debate about stewardship, making certain that we are focusing and that we are doing the extra work that is necessary to get the spending under control.

As I said, this is \$51.4 billion in discretionary funding that is in this appropriations bill. It is below the President's request. The committee is to be commended for that.

Taking the step of a 1 percent cut, you are talking about \$540 million in budget authority and \$340 million reduction in outlays. It is a goal that we should set for ourselves. It is doable. It is attainable.

We should take a playbook and a lesson from the States and the counties and the communities that we represent and make the effort to reduce the spending just a little bit more.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Texas has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I want to point out also that the amendment before us would cut 1 percent from eliminating the backlog of rape kits that are piling up in local police departments all over the country. We increased funding to eliminate that backlog of rape kits.

We increased funding to help forensic labs at the local level. We increased funding to make sure that programs to prevent violence against women are fully funded. This amendment would cut those funding increases for violence against women.

□ 2210

It is not the annual appropriations bill that is the biggest part of the problem. All of us need to recognize that we have got to look at the entire Federal budget.

The annual appropriations bill only represents one-third of the problem. The other two-thirds of the problem are the automatic mandatory problems: the looming bankruptcy of Medicare, the looming bankruptcy of Social Security and Medicaid, the incredible

burden that ObamaCare has placed on individual Americans—it threatens to bankrupt the entire healthcare system—the national debt, and the interest on the national debt.

The American taxpayers are, indeed, taxed too much, but the biggest part of the spending problem is on these automatic programs that are consuming two-thirds of the Nation's resources.

In fact, if you pay off all those existing—just paying for these existing programs, the mandatory programs, which you have to think of as America's mortgage and interest payments, once you pay Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans benefits, you are only left with \$689 billion to run the entire Federal Government, which is enough money to run the government through July 27. "National credit card day" is what I call it. July 27 is the day when we run out of existing revenue, and we are living on borrowed money to be paid off by our kids.

A far better way to deal with this problem is to deal with the looming bankruptcy of Medicare, Social Security, and to deal with the national debt and deficit, the two-thirds of the problem out there, and not look at some 1 percent cut on the one-third of the budget that we have already prioritized and cut everywhere we possibly can while protecting law enforcement. We are protecting our investment in the sciences and space exploration.

I urge the Members to reject this amendment, and I would urge the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) to work with us throughout the year as we develop these appropriations bills and help us find cuts in programs and prioritization of funding, rather than bringing the amendment to the floor at the last minute.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for Federal Prison Systems—Salaries and Expenses, and in-

creasing the amount made available for Office of Justice Programs—Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention, by \$69,515,000.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chair, this amendment that I am offering today would repurpose just 1 percent of the funding for the Federal prison system and restore funding for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Madam Chair, the underlying bill zeros out both title II formula grants and title V discretionary grants for prevention and early intervention programs, which were funded last year at approximately \$70 million. To ensure that our State juvenile justice systems are not irreparably damaged, this amendment would take just 1 percent away from our Federal prison systems, approximately \$70 million, to maintain our commitment to prevention and early intervention.

The prison system can take steps to deal with this reduction by limiting duplicate prosecutions or pursuing evidence-based alternatives to incarceration, particularly for first-time offenders. These practices not only will save money, but will also improve public safety.

We have a choice, Madam Chair. We can invest in prisons after the fact, or we can invest in prevention and early intervention before the fact and eliminate what the Children's Defense Fund calls the Cradle to Prison Pipeline.

Madam Chair, at this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to my colleague and friend Congressman SCOTT's amendment and to encourage this body to restore critical funding for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

This existing appropriations bill decimates funding for title II State formula grants and title V local delinquency prevention programs which are essential investments that are proven to reduce crime.

This amendment would provide \$69,515,000, the equivalent of less than 1 percent of the Federal prison budget, which is a small investment when you consider the cost of incarcerating a youth is an average of \$88,000 per year. That is hundreds of dollars a day to incarcerate a youth. Evidence-based alternatives to incarceration for youth costs as little as \$11 per day.

These proven juvenile crime prevention methods cost pennies compared to

the incarceration of our young people. Members from both parties have espoused the importance of investing in our children. Conservative organizations have been among the loudest advocates for reforming our criminal justice system—in particular, for our youth—to move from an incarceration-based system to one that funds proven research-based alternatives to putting behind bars America's children. There is a bipartisan consensus on this, ladies and gentlemen.

While this amendment will be withdrawn, I hope we can work together to fund these critical programs to give our children the opportunity to be productive members of our communities, reduce crime, and save billions of tax dollars going forward.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for raising this important issue. I assure him that it is my intention that we will be working between here and the final bill to improve upon this area in the bill.

I thank the chairman for all of his work in this regard.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman for allowing us to debate because I understand the point of order will be sustained.

There will be other opportunities during the legislative process, as the ranking member of the subcommittee has indicated, to deal with this issue.

The way the bill has been drafted, it was impossible to get an amendment in order, but there will be other possibilities later on in the process, and I would hope the chair and the ranking member will work effectively to make sure that we deal with the choice that we have, whether we are going to just put money away for young people to get in trouble and then deal with it or we can deal with it in advance with prevention and early intervention. This is what this amendment would do.

Madam Chair, if the gentleman is going to assert his point of order, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and deal with the issue later on in the process.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of title V of the bill, the following:

SEC. 5 _____. (a) For each fiscal year after the expiration of the period specified in subsection (b) in which a State receives funds for a program referred to in subsection (c)(2), the State shall require that all individuals enrolled in an academy of a law enforcement agency of the State and all law enforcement officers of the State fulfill a training session on sensitivity each fiscal year, including training on ethnic and racial bias, cultural diversity, and police interaction with the disabled, mentally ill, and new immigrants. In the case of individuals attending an academy, such training session shall be for 8 hours, and in the case of all other law enforcement officers, the training session shall be for 4 hours.

(b)(1) Each State shall have not more than 120 days, beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, to comply with subsection (a), except that—

(A) the Attorney General may grant an additional 120 days to a State that is making good faith efforts to comply with such subsection; and

(B) the Attorney General shall waive the requirements of subsection (a) if compliance with such subsection by a State would be unconstitutional under the constitution of such State.

(2) For any fiscal year after the expiration of the period specified in paragraph (1), a State that fails to comply with subsection (a), shall, at the discretion of the Attorney General, be subject to not more than a 20-percent reduction of the funds that would otherwise be allocated for that fiscal year to the State under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.), whether characterized as the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, or otherwise.

(c) Amounts not allocated under a program referred to in subsection (b)(2) to a State for failure to fully comply with subsection (a) shall be reallocated under that program to States that have not failed to comply with such subsection.

Ms. LEE (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 2220

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I want to thank the Chair and our ranking member for your leadership on this subcommittee for your interest and support on this amendment. I recognize

the point of order and plan to withdraw the amendment.

Recent events in Ferguson, Staten Island, Baltimore, and around the country really illustrate the need for significant reform in police interaction in communities that they are sworn to serve and protect. That is why this amendment would require the States receiving funding from the Department of Justice's Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Program put academy students and law enforcement officers through sensitivity training on ethnic and racial bias, cultural diversity, and police interaction with the disabled, mentally ill, and new immigrants.

As you know, DOJ's Byrne JAG Grant Program is the primary provider of Federal criminal justice funding to State and local jurisdictions supporting a wide range of law enforcement and court activities. Our law enforcement agencies and officers play a critical role in protecting the safety of our communities. We need them to work cooperatively and competently along with our community members if we want to protect the public safety and the integrity of our neighborhoods.

This is a major issue in many congressional districts where many officers live outside of the communities they serve and do not have the training to deal with a diverse constituency. Madam Chairman, I know that we all agree that the status quo is simply unacceptable.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), my colleague who has demonstrated incredible leadership on this issue and continues to work in a bipartisan fashion on this very common-sense policy.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment. FBI Director James Comey's February 12, 2015, speech, entitled, "Hard Truths: Law Enforcement and Race," addressed what he characterized as a "disconnect between police and minority communities." Director Comey challenged officers to "acknowledge the widespread existence of unconscious bias." We appreciate his candor and acknowledgment of issues we have long felt.

Experience in our communities indicates negative police interaction, and excessive force disproportionately affects communities of color, but there are other communities who would also benefit from better law enforcement relations.

As FBI Director, Mr. Comey requires all new agents and analysts to study the agency's interaction with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., followed by a visit to the King Memorial. The FBI's required study serves as recognition that in order to truly see each other as people, we must recognize our shortcomings and create and identify opportunities to understand, respect, and be decent to one another.

Police officer sensitivity training and annual retraining demonstrate a commitment to communities across this Nation. As Members of Congress, it is a practice we must encourage. In Ferguson, Staten Island, Cleveland, North Charleston and Baltimore, the need for reform is as clear as it is urgent.

Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), our ranking member.

Mr. FATTAH. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her steadfastness and her focus on this matter and pledge to her that I am going to work with the chairman as we go forward to see that we get this incorporated in the final product of our bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I continue to reserve the point of order pending the gentlewoman's withdrawal of the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I want to reassure my colleague that I will continue to work with her and my ranking member, to work on this as we move through conference, as we discussed in full committee.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's withdrawing the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chair, I want to thank our ranking member and our chairman for their commitment to continue to work on this very important issue, along with Congressman CLAY.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section 221 of title 13, United States Code, with respect to the survey, conducted by the Secretary of Commerce, commonly referred to as the "American Community Survey".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we are all familiar with the Census that takes place every 10 years where there is a counting of the people in America. The Census Bureau also has another project, not constitutionally required, but something

that they do called the American Community Survey, which is a partial sampling of about 3 million Americans a year.

A survey is sent out, and I will read from this 28-page survey. It is 48 questions long, and the questions have nothing to do with how many people live in your house. Some of the questions are like this:

When do you leave for work?

When does your spouse leave for work?

When do your kids leave for school?

Does anyone suffer from a mental illness in the residence?

Does your house have a sink with a faucet?

Does anyone have trouble walking?

Does anyone have trouble getting dressed or bathed?

So there are 48 questions like this, and failure to abide by and fill out this document and send it back to the Census Bureau could result in a fine.

Now, people in my district have called my office from all over the country about getting this thing in the mail and the harassment by the Census Bureau and subcontractors, including the fact that I have a single parent in my district that called and was complaining about the fact that the Census Bureau person would sit in the front of her house waiting for her to come home from work and then go to the door and peak through the windows trying to get her to fill out this page, or these 28 pages and send them back to the Census Bureau. So harassment takes place. And some people are threatened with a fine that is imposed for failure to abide by the survey.

Now, what this amendment does, it does not eliminate the American Community Survey. The ranking member and I had a discussion, I guess, about 5 hours ago on the House floor about whether it is a good idea or not. It doesn't even stop the survey from being conducted.

□ 2230

All it does is prohibit the Federal Government from imposing a penalty for failure to fill out the survey. That results in the fact that people then can voluntarily fill out this form and send it back if they want to. If they don't want to voluntarily have their privacy invaded by the government, then they don't have to fill it back out and don't have to worry about a fine.

That is what this amendment does: prohibits funding to allow the fine to be collected, thus making the survey voluntary.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I supported the gentleman's last amendment. I strongly oppose this amendment.

It is impossible for me to conceive that we want to run the greatest country on the face of the Earth without data, without information, without knowledge of what the circumstances of the citizens of the country are—how many daycare slots, where to locate VA hospitals, all of the other information that is generated through this community survey.

Now, I note that there is talk about a fine, but we haven't been able to identify anybody who has ever been fined. We do know that our neighbors to the north, when the Canadians moved to a voluntary system in their rural areas, they stopped getting almost any compliance.

If the Federal Government is going to plan in terms of Federal highways, in terms of Federal programming, and a whole range of items that flow through formal grants, not through earmarks, but by knowledge of what is happening in communities, these surveys are critical.

The idea that we would say we are going to run this great country, we don't want any information, we are going to put on blindfolds and just kind of hope for the best when we are making public policy about education and housing and transportation needs or health care needs, it doesn't make a lot of sense. It may have some popularity politically, but as a notion for actual intentional leadership for our Nation, to say that we want to separate ourselves from actual information about what is going on in these communities, I think that the gentleman, as right as he was in the original amendment that I supported him on, in this particular matter I think he is headed in the wrong direction.

I would ask my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—put the party aside, put the national interest first, and know for certainty that no person would ever—you are always talking about running the government like a business—no one would run a business without utilizing data to understand the marketplace.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), chairman of the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman.

I want to express my strong support for my neighbor and good friend Judge POE's amendment because, again, our most important right as Americans is to be left alone.

In fact, the data, and I agree with my ranking member that this data is important, but it can be included as a part of the Census itself. Any really essential questions the Department of Commerce can include within the core

questions of the Census. They don't have to send this long intrusive and detailed and very invasive survey out to every American and subject Americans to the threat of a \$10,000 fine if they don't comply.

I support the gentleman's amendment as a further reflection of our commitment on this subcommittee and in this Congress to protect America's right to privacy and to be left alone by their government, as Mr. Mason and Mr. Jefferson intended.

I urge Members to support Mr. POE's amendment. And remember, if the government needs this data, they can just put it in the basic Census itself.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining between the gentleman who is the proponent and myself?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. And I assume he has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. Yes, he does.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, let me remind the House that we had another Texan—he was the President of the United States—and it was under his administration that the questions that were put together in the community survey were developed under that administration.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania does have the right to close.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, well, then at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for bringing up the American Community Survey and where it came from. That is irrelevant. The issue is Americans should not be required to give personal information to the Federal Government. If they want to fill out this form, go for it. Make it voluntary. Fill it out and send the Federal Government all the information you can come up with about what takes place in your residence. But it should not be required.

The Federal Government could get this information some other way. They could go to polling. The idea that they have got to go door to door to get this information when information is gathered all over the country by different businesses not going door to door—the government can do it other ways and not violate the right of privacy.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted that basically requires the American Community Survey to be voluntary, and that the fine that is allowed by law not be allowed or not be collected under this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, let me close by just saying that I just want to make sure that, because there is some antipathy about, sometimes, anything that may emanate from this administration, I just want to make it clear

that this was not some Democratic scheme here to gather up people's private information; that this is actually a legitimate activity of the Federal Government. It is one joined in by the Chamber of Commerce and other business organizations who tell us that this is vitally important.

I think just from a commonsense basis, we actually know as politicians, because when we are engaged in activities that are important, we try to get a lot of information. So we know it is important. It is actually important for making sure that Federal programs are focused on the priorities of your community. And if we don't have the knowledge of how many people need daycare slots or how many veterans there are or what the other circumstances are in a particular community, it is impossible to do the planning that is necessary.

I would ask that we reject this amendment and that we continue to use data as a basis to make informed decisions here at the national level.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, offered jointly with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), my colleague.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 543. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to fund any Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chair, every year, hundreds of billions of dollars is transferred out of States that pay far more in Federal taxes than they receive back in Federal spending—the so-called “payer States.” And this money is transferred into States that receive a lot more Federal spending than they pay in taxes—the “taker States.” This is an enormous and economically unjustifiable redistribution of wealth between the States.

The payer States can be characterized in a number of ways, but most of the payer States are large population States, while virtually all of the taker States are smaller, which means that they are overrepresented in the Senate.

Over time, Senators from these States have inserted hundreds of programs that systematically steer money into the taker States. Our amendment takes a first small step to begin rolling back these taker State preferences by eliminating one of the most unjustifiable of them all: the Experimental Pro-

gram to Stimulate Competitive Research, commonly referred to as EPSCoR.

□ 2240

EPSCoR was started as an experimental program in 1978 with the goal of redistributing Federal research dollars into States that traditionally received less than their “fair share” of NSF funding.

However, because “fair share” was determined on a per State basis, rather than on a per capita basis, it has devolved into just another program that steers money into smaller States that already get far more than their fair share of Federal spending.

Since no allowance is made for whether the State has a big or a small population, the EPSCoR program systematically discriminates against researchers simply because they come from States with large populations. The EPSCoR States are hardly lacking for Federal largesse.

According to the Tax Foundation, in a typical year, the EPSCoR States received approximately \$60 billion more in Federal spending than they paid in Federal taxes.

How does one justify a program that excludes researchers in States like Florida or Texas, which over the past 3 years got only an average of about \$7 per capita in NSF funding while steering money into States like Rhode Island, Alaska, and New Hampshire, which already got 5 times more?

Why should a researcher at Brown University in Rhode Island be eligible for a grant set-aside that is unavailable to researchers at SMU, FSU, UCLA, Rutgers, or Northern Illinois?

As a scientist, I find that it is not surprising that it is very difficult to find supporters for EPSCoR in the scientific community. Precious research funding would be far better spent in a competitive, merit-based process as it will be if our amendment is adopted.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the cosponsor of my amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for his work on this issue. I am honored to serve alongside him on the Payer State Caucus as well.

Madam Chair, this program is yet another example of good intentions and bad policy. What was intended to be a temporary assistance to a select group of States to build a research infrastructure and then exit the program has become a permanent and growing pot of taxpayer subsidies. This, of course, is in addition to the permanent and growing pot of subsidies the government has already enacted for the States.

For three decades, 30 years after establishment, this program continues to be called—what?—an experimental program, and no State—none—has graduated from the program; yet it exists 30 years later.

This can only demonstrate one thing, Madam Chair, that this is yet another

example of ineffective, wasteful redistribution programs that the taxpayers are compelled to financially support. The Foster-Garrett amendment would relieve the taxpayers of this burden.

Again, I thank Mr. FOSTER for his work in protecting the payer States, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, this program is designed to ensure that academic institutions and industry can develop science and engineering capabilities that are outside of traditional research hubs.

The partnerships support areas of strategic importance in such disciplines as aerospace and aerospace-related research. I do urge a “no” vote on the gentleman's amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would eliminate the EPSCoR program.

For more than 60 years, the National Science Foundation has provided academic research funding to colleges and universities around the Nation, and it has been critical to ongoing research that is essential to maintaining our competitive edge in scientific advancement.

The NSF's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, commonly known as EPSCoR, is an authorized program whose mission is to help balance the allocation of NSF and other Federal research and development funding to avoid the undue concentration of money to only a few States.

This successful program has had a profound impact on my home State of Rhode Island, allowing nine of our academic institutions to increase research capacity, to enrich the experience of their students, and to contribute to advances in a variety of fields.

Currently, 25 States, including Rhode Island, and 3 jurisdictions account for only about 10 percent of all NSF funding, despite the fact that these States account for 20 percent of the U.S. population. EPSCoR has helped to stabilize this imbalance in funding and should continue to do so in the 2016 fiscal year and beyond.

In order to ensure robust academic research and outcomes across the country, geographic diversity in funding should be considered to ensure that we are taking advantage of the particular experiences, knowledge, and perspectives of academics and institutions from every State. This amendment to

eliminate this successful program would be a step backward for the United States' commitment to research and development.

Investments in critical programs, such as EPSCoR, are essential to creating jobs, innovating for the future, maintaining our competitive edge in scientific research and a global economy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in strongly opposing this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I would ask Members to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Justice to negotiate or conclude a settlement with the Federal Government that includes terms requiring the defendant to donate or contribute funds to an organization or individual.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment prevents the Department of Justice from requiring mandatory donations as part of settlement agreements. The Department of Justice is systematically subverting Congress' budget authority by using settlements to funnel money to third-party groups.

An investigation by the House Judiciary and Financial Services Committees reveals that, in just the last 10 months, the Department of Justice has used mandatory donations to direct as much as half a billion dollars to activist groups.

These payments occur entirely outside of the congressional appropriations and oversight process. In some cases, the Department of Justice is using mandatory donations to restore funding that Congress specifically cut. This is money that could otherwise be going directly to victims.

The Department of Justice continues to resist document requests, but what little has been provided confirms that

activist groups which stood to gain from mandatory donation provisions were involved in placing those provisions in the settlements.

The committees raised concerns with the Department of Justice in 2014, but instead of suspending the practice, the Department of Justice has doubled down. It recently entered into an over \$50 million settlement relating to robo-signing; \$7.5 million of that did not make it to victims.

□ 2250

Instead, it went to a third party. Incredibly, the settlement specifically provided that there would be no oversight of the money.

The situation is even more egregious when one considers that the required donation will nearly double the net assets of the DOJ-specified recipient. It is deeply troubling for that to happen at the unilateral discretion of the executive branch.

This amendment takes no money away from any organization. It is purely prospective. It ensures that settlement money goes either directly to victims or to the Treasury for elected representatives to decide how it is to be spent.

It is critical that we act. The Department of Justice is ignoring Congress' concerns, increasing the use of third-party payments, even as we object. The purpose of enforcement actions is punishment and redress to actual victims. Carrying that concept to communities at large or activist community groups, however worthy, is a matter for the legislative branch and is not to be conducted at the unilateral discretion of the executive.

This is fundamentally a bipartisan institutional issue. There was abuse of third-party payments in the Bush administration. This amendment is about preserving Congress' appropriations authority. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I am not planning on strongly objecting to this, but I want to make a few points. One is that this is something that should be dealt with in an authorizing circumstance, but I think because it is on an appropriations bill, it could have unintended consequences.

As I understand the plain English of what is being said, an administration faced with, for instance, the Gulf oil spill could not have been involved in a settlement in which various entities received dollars to try to find redress for harm that was created in the Gulf. I think that that would be very problematic because there were a lot of groups—fishermen, other associations, chambers of commerce, others—who received support through that settlement.

I just think we ought to be careful. It would probably be better that there be hearings and that there be an understanding around what this actually means. I have offered my own bipartisan-supported legislation that would create a congressional framework for settlements. I am not opposed to the thrust of what is being said here.

I do recognize that there have been circumstances in past administrations. I am not aware of the instances that the chairman speaks of now, but I would just hope that rather than rushing forward, we would be mindful that this is probably the kind of thing that we really would want authorizers to handle and not have it tucked into an appropriations bill at this time. Plus, if you really think that the executive branch is using their authority, the idea that they would then sign it away by signing our appropriations bill, if it is so meaningful to them, it might slow down the passage of our very important piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his concern about this. I want to assure the gentleman that the language in this is designed to make it clear that it applies to donations and not to anybody who is a victim of a lawsuit where redress is sought for them because the compensation for them is not a donation. That is actual recompense for the harm that they suffered.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I know the chairman is quite aware of how these words, "donation," "mandatory," "settlement," so forth and so on, might be applied and abused in various ways.

Again, obviously, if this is something the majority wants to do, they will do it. I just think that it may have unintended consequences; and this administration, the next administration, and various administrations going forward, there should be a congressional framework for settlements. I have offered legislation that is bipartisan in that regard. I am not opposed to creating a congressional framework. I just think that we don't want to have unintended consequences here if we can avoid it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I want to express my strong support for Chairman GOODLATTE's amendment. The words he has chosen have been chosen very carefully. A donation or contribution is just that. It is a gift. It is a donation. If the money is paid in compensation for an injury as a result of a claim, it is not covered. So the

chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has written this very carefully and very narrowly to address a very real problem. I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and have worked with him and his staff on it.

I really, genuinely appreciate the good work that your staff has done, Mr. Chairman, in working with you to find common ground.

This is one of those areas that I believe we are doing good public policy. I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time just to say this is an important principle, not only to address the abuse that has taken place in the executive branch, but to protect the prerogatives of the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

These are funds that, if they are not expended for the specific purpose of providing compensation to victims, relief to victims in these lawsuits, those funds should go back to the General Treasury of the United States, and they should be appropriated by the Congress—in fact, by this very subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations—to make sure that the people's will is exercised with regard to the expenditure of these funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any inspection under section 510 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 880) with respect to narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V of section 202 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 812), or combinations of such drugs, being dispensed pursuant to section 303(g)(2) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)) for maintenance or detoxification treatment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, that is a rather imposing title to deal with a relatively simple concept.

We have a national epidemic dealing with opioid painkillers. Prescription drug overdoses are a serious problem. We find people who become addicted. We are finding that, in a routine matter of course, this drug dependence often leads to heroin, and we are watching a chain of events.

In Oregon, we found that 15 percent of young Oregonians between 18 and 25 abused prescription pain relievers last

year. I mentioned that chain of causality. We are finding that people in this sequence often use heroin as a substitute when the pills get too expensive or the high is no longer high enough. It is easy to switch to heroin.

It is not just a problem in Oregon. We have seen the CDC chart heroin deaths doubling between 2010 and 2012 in 28 States.

Opioid addiction can be devastating, but there is a drug that can be used to safely and effectively treat this addiction. For more than 12 years, buprenorphine has been a critical weapon in our fight against opioid addiction. It can be taken on an outpatient basis. It is easy to administer.

But we have seen artificial barriers to treatment. In fact, we have made it harder for doctors to prescribe these schedule III addiction treatment drugs even though it is comparatively easy to prescribe the schedule II drugs that cause addiction in the first place, such as Vicodin and OxyContin. And the schedule III drugs, we are finding that there are audits that are taking place by DEA.

□ 2300

Doctors who complete the 8-hour certification process have been approached by DEA agents in my community before they even write a single prescription. They report hostile and intimidating behavior from agents who demand inspections of their prescription records at random, unscheduled intervals. As I say, these are doctors who can simply write a prescription for powerful narcotics without having to worry about random DEA inspections.

We need to allow doctors to treat their patients with compassion and with the care they deem appropriate. They shouldn't have to worry about DEA agents having a super overlay of attention.

We need to encourage opportunities to make sure that doctors can treat patients and be able to withdraw them from the symptoms. And I would respectfully suggest that the DEA should focus their efforts on chasing criminals, the pill mills, and the drug dealers, not doctors who have worked hard to be part of the solution.

This amendment solves the problem by ensuring no funds are available to DEA to enforce inspections of the physicians who prescribe buprenorphine and allow them to proceed with the treatment of patients without fear of getting into trouble with the Federal Government while helping hundreds of at-risk patients who want to beat their addiction in a healthy, effective way.

The irony is the powerful addictive drugs don't have as much interference and oversight. The opportunity to have drugs at schedule III—not schedule II—that can be used to treat it is much more difficult and intrusive for medical professionals. That is not right.

I would respectfully suggest that we adopt this amendment to correct the situation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding, and I rise to join him in opposition to this amendment.

Madam Chair, this amendment would undermine diversion control and thereby potentially increase drug abuse by creating a significant loophole in the system of controls established by the Controlled Substances Act.

The amendment would cause this highly problematic result by effectively exempting DEA registrants who dispense drugs for addiction treatment from being subject to administrative oversight under the CSA. At present, buprenorphine is the only schedule III–V controlled substance contained in a drug that has been approved by the FDA for drug addiction treatment.

While it is also true that the amendment would not preclude DOJ/DEA from obtaining a criminal search warrant to obtain the foregoing types of records, this does not come close to being an adequate substitute for the administrative inspection authority. Obtaining a criminal search warrant must be predicated on evidence sufficient to establish probable cause that the registrant has committed a criminal violation of the Controlled Substances Act.

The very point of the administrative inspection authority that Congress provided under the CSA 45 years ago was to have a robust system of administrative oversight that would help to prevent regulatory violations before they occurred, and even more so, before criminal violations occurred. This is because Congress recognized that controlled substances, when abused, can have dangerous and sometimes deadly consequences, and thus that the widespread problem of drug abuse in the United States cannot be solved exclusively through criminal provisions of the Controlled Substances Act.

It also bears mentioning that this drug is highly subject to diversion, as it is a narcotic drug that is much sought after by many persons who are addicted to opiates and/or who seek to abuse opiates for nonmedical purposes.

Indeed, the heightened risk of diversion associated with dispensing of this drug to a drug-addicted patient population actually warrants greater scrutiny, not less scrutiny, than with many other categories of prescribed controlled substances.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. I join the chairman in urging my colleagues to oppose this amendment on many grounds. It is a technical issue that should be dealt with by the authorizing committees. This is not an appropriate place to handle it.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING), who has personal experience and knowledge in this area as a physician, and who can speak to this in opposition as well.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Chairman, years ago, one of the positions I served was as a director for drug addiction and alcoholism, and one of my duties was as a methadone doctor.

This drug is really a new form of methadone. It can be applied and can be employed in the treatment of heroin addiction. But at the end of the day, it too is highly addictive. It is a scheduled drug, and it is abused. So it deserves the same kind of safeguards and protections and oversight as any other addictive drug.

And so if my friends really want to see this used as an effective tool and not itself become a dangerous drug out on the open market being diverted and perhaps even sold on the black market, I suggest that we oppose this amendment and let's continue the good, strong oversight that we have under the CSA.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I would strongly urge my colleagues to talk to treatment professionals in their communities. My concern is that we don't have as much vigorous oversight for things that are much more highly addictive—we see them more abused—and that this extra overlay for something that is less dangerous and can in fact be useful for treatment, I think, is an area that deserves oversight.

I respect my friends in terms of their opinions, but I would urge them to have the conversations I have had with the people who are getting wrapped around the axle with the DEA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, with that, I would urge all Members to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF TEXAS

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose or to issue a rule that would change the Chief Law Enforcement Officer certificate requirement in a manner that has the same substance as the proposed rule published on September 9, 2013 (786 Fed. Reg. 55014).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I rise with an amendment to limit unnecessary bur-

dens on firearm owners and law enforcement officers.

The Second Amendment's intent is clear: firearm ownership "shall not be infringed." However, the ATF has proposed a rule requiring an additional layer of approval from local law enforcement officers to purchase suppressors and other firearms regulated by the National Firearms Act. This rule broadly expands existing requirements and further burdens local law enforcement officers who are already overworked and understaffed.

The ATF knows full well that there are cities and jurisdictions that refuse to give approval for political reasons.

□ 2310

Action films are fun to watch, but they are wrong about suppressors. Suppressors dampen the sound of a firearm, but do not make guns silent. They simply are a form of hearing protection for the shooter, for other human beings, and for any hunting dogs that are around.

Suppressors increase safety while shooting, allow people to easily hear and react to range safety instructions and to other sportsmen.

My amendment ensures Americans' rights are protected and does not eliminate background checks. It will protect suppressor suppliers; manufacturers; tens of millions of dollars in annual revenue; thousands of jobs nationwide; and, more importantly, the Second Amendment rights of a law-abiding gunowner.

I urge support for this commonsense provision, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. If the gentleman from Texas would join me in a quick colloquy.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I would be happy to.

Mr. FATTAH. This is the amendment relative to trust and gun trust and whether there needs to be a background check or not?

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. This is the amendment that requires an additional approval by a law enforcement officers for purchases of certain either weapons or suppressors.

Mr. FATTAH. Right. Now, in this instance, in 2006, our information is that there were 4,600 of these applications, and then that grew to 40,000 in 2012 and then 72,000 in 2013 and 90,000 in 2014.

Are those numbers relatively accurate, as best as you know?

Mr. CARTER of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, those numbers could be accurate. I cannot contest those numbers.

However, it has been made absolutely clear, both by target shooters and by

hunters, that suppressors make for a more accurate weapon, less damage on the shooter, less damage on the people and animals around the shooter, a better ability to be safe with your fellow hunters.

Mr. FATTAH. Thank you, Judge.

Reclaiming my time, I rise in opposition to this. It is clear, given the majority that we have, that we won't be on a successful vote count on this.

I do want to make the point, right, that the Second Amendment, as it was ruled on by the Supreme Court, says that there can be reasonable regulation, and so that is our job. That is where we come into this picture at. We are supposed to be the reasonable regulators. We are supposed to decide where and when and under what circumstances there should be some speed bump.

The question here is, for these types of circumstances, where someone is going to have a weapon in which discerning that it has been fired, you are going to be less able to do it, whether that is something where someone should have to have a small speed bump on the way to getting it.

Now, it doesn't seem like there is a major hurdle here because we have jumped from 4,600 of these in 2006 to 90,000 in 2014.

I don't know, unless we are going to just have a universal access to them, there doesn't seem to be a major impediment.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Because an application was made doesn't necessarily mean that the law enforcement people dealt with it and approved that application. Now, if you are telling me these are 90,000 approved applications, I understand your argument.

One of the issues seems to be finding a law enforcement agency in the modern society we live in that actually has some knowledge of the individual that is making the request and is willing to process it.

Mr. FATTAH. Judge, I will just say this then, reclaiming my time, that everybody, even those who are not involved in law enforcement, understands the challenge of having a firearm in which the sound is suppressed.

We just had an incident in one of our Capitol buildings where someone tried to bring a weapon in. We know that weapons are dangerous. That is why you can't bring them into the U.S. Capitol.

Making them more accessible in the communities and among the people that we represent, if we think that is a great thing to do, the majority will have its way on this. I stand in opposition to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Chair, I only claim time to say that I serve on this subcommittee with both these honorable gentlemen. I want to commend them for a great bill.

The chairman has asked for time. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do want to express my strong support for the gentleman's amendment. It is an appropriate and necessary additional protection for Americans' Second Amendment rights.

Judge CARTER is exactly right. This is the right place for the bill. This is the right place for this amendment. He has drafted it very narrowly and very carefully, and I urge Members to join us in supporting this very important Second Amendment amendment before the House.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. To finish, I am honored to serve on this subcommittee with these two fine gentlemen. They have made a great work product here, and I am very glad that we were able to all work together.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used to prevent a State from implementing its own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of industrial hemp, as defined in section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I rise to offer a bipartisan amendment with Mr. MASSIE to restore power to the States to regulate the cultivation of industrial hemp within their own borders. The House adopted this amendment last year with strong support from both sides of the aisle.

This amendment is very simple. It would move our country in line with industrialized countries around the world that long ago recognized the importance of industrial hemp as a natural resource, an agricultural commodity, and a versatile component that is now found in more than 25,000 commercial products.

In fact, not only does this amendment bring America in line with much of the rest of the industrialized world, it brings America back in line with our country's history. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson grew it. The first drafts of our Constitution and first laws were written on paper made from it.

During World War II, the USDA encouraged patriotic American farmers

to raise it for the war effort. They even produced a slick promotional film titled "Hemp for Victory." Now, at least 23 States have passed laws to allow farmers to grow it, too.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government stands in the way of family farmers who want to grow hemp. The senseless classification of hemp as a schedule I drug contributes nothing to public safety; instead, it robs our farm economies of a potentially multibillion-dollar crop that is used to make everything from rope to soap.

The amendment would simply allow farmers to grow hemp in accordance with their own State's laws. The amendment does not eliminate regulation in hemp cultivation; it simply divests the Department of Justice and the DEA of their ability to treat hemp like marijuana because hemp is not marijuana.

So far, 23 States have passed laws to allow farmers to grow hemp. Right now, farmers in California, Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia are waiting for the Federal Government to get out of the way.

Because the Department of Justice refuses to acknowledge what Washington and Jefferson knew, that hemp is an agricultural commodity and not marijuana, these State laws take a back seat to Federal overreach.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my cosponsor.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I am very excited to report that, thanks to the farm bill amendment that allowed for pilot programs, we grew many pilot programs in Kentucky last summer; and this summer, there will be about 1,800 acres of hemp grown in Kentucky in pilot programs.

□ 2320

We have venture capital coming to Kentucky. I met with two companies in Kentucky that are investing in hemp, but the problem is right now they can only do the pilot programs. Yet they are still going to grow 1,800 acres of it in Kentucky alone. They grow 100,000 acres in Canada.

It is time to let our farmers have this opportunity. We need to take away the restraint that it is just a pilot program. We have addressed a lot of the concerns that people had last year before these pilot programs. Law enforcement are okay with hemp now. They have seen that it is not its cousin.

With that, Madam Chair, I urge passage and urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chair, the cultivation of cannabis for industrial purposes is governed by the Controlled Substances Act and permitted pursuant to the registration requirements found in title 21, United States Code.

Let's face it, hemp is very closely related to cannabis. And DEA agents tell us that it is very difficult to detect, determine, and distinguish between hemp and marijuana, so it only makes their job more difficult. However, the Agricultural Act of 2014—and Mr. MASSIE just referred to this, I believe—permits institutions of higher learning and State departments of agriculture to grow or cultivate industrial hemp as defined in the statute for purposes of research conducted under an agricultural pilot program or other agricultural or academic research.

In short, we are studying it, we are analyzing it, and we are evaluating it, but we don't have the results yet of those studies. I think it would be premature, especially considering the problem with the rapid expansion of the marijuana industry and the problems which I will speak about later this evening with marijuana and abuse of marijuana and the damage to brains of our children and so forth. The last thing I think that we want to do now is to create more problems for enforcement for the DEA.

Madam Chairman, if we are going to study it, let's study it, but I do not believe it is time that we remove these restraints on industrial hemp.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, may I inquire into the amount of time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my colleague.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her leadership on this issue.

Madam Chairman, as a practical matter, industrial hemp is not marijuana. With less than 0.3 percent THC, it is not a drug. As a practical matter, it is not hard to distinguish it, and, in fact, it is sort of a myth that somehow people will use industrial hemp to disguise the cultivation of marijuana. They don't want that. It cross-contaminates. It makes it a less effective product.

We have a situation where the rest of the world deals with industrial hemp, where there are countless products available to purchase today, it is just that Kentucky farmers or Oregon farmers can't produce it. Last year the House overwhelmingly passed this amendment. We are starting down a path towards rationalization.

Twenty-three States have removed the barriers to production of industrial hemp. The Federal Government should get out of the way. Congress should

adopt this amendment and allow it to proceed.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has the right to close since the gentleman from Louisiana is not on the committee.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, I would just say in conclusion that DEA tells us otherwise, that it is difficult to distinguish. It is a problem for them. They are the ones who have to enforce this. Also, there isn't any product that you can get from hemp. Hemp production, industrial hemp is not abundant in many other ways, whether it is paper, rope, or what have you. So with that, it is not necessary. It is not some vital resource that we can't do without. It does create and complicate problems when it comes to the enforcement of schedule I drugs such as marijuana.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, as we have heard this evening, it makes no sense that industrial hemp is legal to have and legal to use in manufacturing but can't be grown by our own farmers. Right now the companies that are manufacturing with hemp have to import it from places like Canada and China. They should be able to grow it in our own country.

Please support this bipartisan amendment. Industrial hemp is grown differently from marijuana. It looks different. The enforcers can tell it apart. Let's let our farmers grow industrial hemp. Please support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities for which funds are made available under this Act as part of the \$125,000,000 for DNA-related and forensic programs and activities, unless such funds are used in accordance with paragraphs (3) and (4) of section (2)(c) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-546; 42 U.S.C. 14135).

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, Congress in the last several sessions has done, I think, an admirable job of dealing with this crime of sexual assault in the United States. Several pieces of legislation have passed the House, under several administrations, going all the way back to the Violence Against Women Act. More recently, under the Debbie Smith Act, SAFER legislation, here is what is taking place.

We now know because of DNA that old rape kits can be analyzed to determine who the suspect was that committed that sexual assault, generally against females, and that is a good development.

Because of that legislation, the Debbie Smith Act was passed; and the SAFER Act says that Debbie Smith, which grants funds to do rape kit backlogs, that 75 percent of that money, of those grants, will go to actually analyze backlog rape kits. Get those backlogs analyzed, go after the bad guys, find out who committed these crimes, and bring those 400,000 rape kits up to date by getting them analyzed.

This all sounds good. The problem is the Justice Department doesn't follow the law. They are not analyzing these cases. There is still a backlog. They are spending the money, but they are spending it on other things like research rather than what the law says: analyze those cases.

Madam Chair, 75 percent of that money is to go to analyze that backlog of rape cases.

□ 2330

My amendment just tells the Justice Department to follow previous law, analyze those cases, use 75 percent of the money that is available to analyze those cases. That is what the amendment does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I strongly agree with the gentleman's amendment and intend to work with him as we move through conference to address this problem in the way he suggests and make sure the law is complied with.

I understand the amendment may be withdrawn. Before the amendment is withdrawn, if I could address the merits of your amendment, I think you are exactly right. We plussed up funding for rape kits. We want to make sure that this backlog is taken care of as rapidly as possible. I know my friend from Philadelphia and the members of this committee share your concern. We want to make sure the backlog rape kits are cleared out as rapidly as possible and these criminals are taken off

the street as rapidly as they can be. We want to make sure the Federal law is complied with, so I will work with you to make sure that through the oversight authority we have got on this subcommittee that the Department is enforcing the law as written by Congress and doing so aggressively.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I concur with your point of view, and I hope that the amendment is withdrawn. But I think that the maker of the proponent amendment is correct that we need to move in this direction. We not only want to make sure that the backlog is ended and that we get bad people off the street; we also don't want innocent people incarcerated for crimes they didn't commit. So this is where the science can help.

But you are right that we need to make sure that there is specific direction. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. And we can do that through oversight, and we will work very closely with you, Judge POE, on this. And I thank you for your work on this effort. There is no penalty severe enough that can be imposed swiftly enough on anyone who would injure a woman or a child.

I understand the amendment is going to be withdrawn.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman, and I also thank the ranking member.

What the amendment does—and I will work with the committee on this—is exactly what the ranking member said. In one word, it finds out “justice.” We free the innocent and we convict the guilty, but we can't do it unless these rape kits are analyzed. So I hope the committee figures out a way to have the Justice Department do what they are supposed to do that Congress has already told them to do. Good luck with that.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice in violation of—

(1) the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution; or

(2) the memorandum issued by the Attorney General on March 31, 2015, and entitled “Guidance Regarding the Use of Asset Forfeiture Authorities in Connection with Structuring Offenses”.

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I offer this amendment with the support of the chairpersons of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the Progressive Caucus.

This amendment would prevent funding from law enforcement agencies that engage in discriminatory profiling based on gender, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or national origin.

It would also prevent the use of funds to repeal the December 14 revised profiling guidance issued by the Department of Justice. Discriminatory profiling is wrong. It doesn't help prevent crime. It creates a culture of fear and resentment within our community. It is contrary to the core constitutional principles, and the Federal dollars shouldn't be spent perpetuating this activity.

I commend the work of Attorney General Holder to revise profiling guidance, and I believe that we must do more to close the remaining loopholes in profiling guidance.

You shouldn't be able to profile at the border. You shouldn't be able to map people without cause. You shouldn't be able to use national security as an excuse to engage in prejudicial policing.

And we need comprehensive antiprofiling legislation like the End Racial Profiling Act introduced by the dean of this Congress, JOHN CONYERS. In the absence of such comprehensive reform, we should at least prevent Federal funds from being used to discriminate against citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not actually in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I think that what we should be for is effective law enforcement techniques. We know by every empirical evidence that profiling does not work, and our experts in every aspect of law enforcement—local, State, and nationally—tell us that it doesn't work. So I agree with the gentleman and I support his amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I will close and just say that racial profiling

has no place, and we urge a "yes" vote for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, this is a very simple amendment which says that the moneys appropriated by the U.S. Congress should go to contractors who deal fairly with workers and who do not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This particular amendment is not an allegation; it only applies to contractors who have been found in violation, who have been forced to disclose those violations based on the requirements of law and their violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This amendment would prohibit the Federal Government from using funds in this bill to hire contractors with wage theft violations.

Madam Chair, we live in a time when it is so hard for workers all across this Nation to make a living. People go to bed at night calculating whether they are going to be able to meet their monthly expenses. If the work that they do can't even be fully paid because they are victims of wage theft by an unscrupulous employer, I think that the Federal Government should not be doing business with that employer.

The fact of the matter is that in this appropriation, we should reserve Federal money for the millions of contractors who do an honest contract, who provide the Federal Government with good work. Evidence suggests that wage theft is widespread and costs workers billions of dollars every year—greater than the cost of burglaries, robberies, larcenies, and other sorts of problems.

Wage theft among Federal contractors is also a problem. Federal contractors are among America's companies that we rely on to discharge good service. But that service should be within the law; that service should be honoring the work that workers do. And

Federal contractors, some of them, certainly not all, but some have had a problem in this area.

A national employment law project found that nearly one in three low-wage contractors in the D.C. area reported stolen wages.

□ 2340

A report by the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee revealed that 35 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

Now, there are many excellent Federal contractors. These people should not have to compete with companies that circumvent the requirements of the law. In total, those Federal contractors who did had to repay employees \$82.1 million in back wages for violations between 2007 and 2012. Despite these violations, many of these same companies received Federal contracts again in 2012.

The fact of the matter is that wage theft is wrong, and the people who engage in it shouldn't receive Federal funds. I hope that all Members will agree that a dollar earned is a dollar that must be paid and that the United States of America only wants to do business with contractors that obey the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I share the gentleman's concerns, but I think his amendment is written so broadly that it is going to have an impact far beyond anything he actually intended.

For example, if a very large company like Boeing ever failed to pay somebody overtime on one occasion, the way his amendment is drafted, this would bar Boeing from ever doing any business with the Federal Government. It would bar Lockheed, which is responsible for building the Orion spacecraft for NASA, and they are doing an extraordinarily good job in doing so.

It is almost inevitable. None of us are perfect. Everybody, somewhere or somehow, is going to make a mistake. It is just inevitable. In the way the gentleman's amendment is drafted, the Federal Government could not hire any company that was ever dealt with in a proceeding that included the term "Fair Labor Standards Act." It essentially blackballs any contractor who has ever had any violation of any kind, anywhere, anytime.

It is too broad. This is not the right place for it. You are going to do great damage to a lot of very good companies that have had very minor, one-time violations a number of years ago. I know that is not the gentleman's intent, but the language before the House that he has drafted is very broad and has implications far beyond what I know he has laid out here tonight.

The bill, as written, would actually, I think, wind up with a lot of very good companies being unable to do business with the Federal Government, so I would ask Members to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I just want to point out that the companies that the gentleman has identified ought to obey the Fair Labor Standards Act. Every company that does business with the United States Government ought to pay its workers fairly.

Federal contracts are lucrative, and Federal contracts make people rich. At the very least, those companies and those individuals who benefit from those contracts ought to make sure that their workers get paid properly.

The fact of the matter is that this is an appropriation from this year. It doesn't bar them in the future from applying for Federal contracts again, and if they should prove to have really cleaned up their acts, we can have a conversation about that.

I am afraid, Madam Chair, that if we do not pass this amendment, we will be telling all of the honest, hard-working contractors that you don't need to obey the law, that you can just do whatever.

Companies that don't obey the Fair Labor Standards Act and steal workers' wages actually gain a competitive advantage on the companies that do obey the law. I don't think that is anything that any one of us would like to see happen, so I would urge a "yes" vote on this; say "no" to wage theft.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I want to reiterate, the way the gentleman's amendment is drafted, any violation anywhere, anytime in the history of the company would bar them from ever doing business with the Federal Government. It is if they ever made a mistake anywhere in the past.

The amendment is far too broad and far too sweeping, and I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACK

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require, pursuant to section 478.124 of title 27, or section 25.7 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or the Office of Management and Budget Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting, that any person disclose the race or ethnicity of the person in connection with the transfer of a firearm to the person.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chairman, our Founding Fathers did not mince words when they authored the Second Amendment to our Constitution.

They spoke plainly and with conviction in writing, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Unfortunately, this administration hasn't always seen it that way.

Recently, President Obama's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives enacted a quiet change to its form 4473—a mandatory document for most gun transactions—that requires Americans to disclose their race and ethnicity in order to complete the sale. What is more, the failure to collect this information is considered an ATF violation that could result in government penalties for the gun dealer.

By placing an extra barrier of complexity between the law-abiding citizens and their right to own a firearm, I believe this intrusive reporting requirement sets up a direct challenge to the Second Amendment rights enshrined in our Constitution, not to mention the right to privacy.

Madam Chairman, we all want to see weapons kept out of the hands of criminals, but an individual's race and ethnicity has nothing to do with his ability to safely own and operate a firearm. Perhaps that is why even traditionally left-leaning groups like the ACLU have spoken in opposition to this requirement.

The fact is the government should be colorblind on all of our rights, whether it is the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, or the freedom to keep and bear arms. That is why my amendment states that the government cannot require gun buyers to disclose their race and ethnicity at the point of sale. It is really that simple.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this commonsense amendment so that we can reverse this latest regulatory overreach and ensure that fairness and privacy are upheld in our Nation's gun laws.

Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), my lead cosponsor and an ardent defender of the Second Amendment.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank Congresswoman BLACK for this amendment and

for bringing it to the attention of the House tonight.

Madam Chair, this issue came to my attention a couple of years ago when I was with constituents in my district. They were gun dealers, and they were complaining and telling me how the administration quietly began requiring the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—we call it the ATF—to record a firearms purchaser's race and ethnicity.

This, Madam Chair, is not law. It is not congressional action. We did not do this. The ATF, through administration rules, requires the race of the gun purchaser, and the seller who is selling the gun has got to check the box and write the race of the gun purchaser.

□ 2350

If they do not do that or they do it wrong, the ATF can come back later, look at the records, say "You left it blank on the race of the individual," and shut the business down.

Now, there are several problems with this new rule by the ATF. In order to avoid breaking this Federal regulation, the dealers then have to ask the customers their race, and when people are offended—and they get offended—they take it out on the dealers themselves. Sometimes refuse to give their race, and then what is the gun seller to do? Why is our government racial profiling people who exercise the Second Amendment? Why are they doing that?

Second, it is none of the government's business the race of a gunowner. The Second Amendment does not just apply to certain races. It applies to everybody. It doesn't exclude races and only include certain races. As the gentlewoman from Tennessee has said, the Federal Government ought to be colorblind across the board on every issue, especially when it comes to rights. The Second Amendment applies to everybody regardless of their race, just like the First Amendment applies to everybody regardless of their race.

So this amendment would simply tell the Federal Government, it is none of your business the race of a gun purchaser in the United States. Stay out of that issue. Just as equally important, you can't shut some business down if they don't put the right race or they leave the race block blank. That is none of the Federal Government's business.

I would hope that Members of Congress would support this amendment and keep the Federal Government from requiring racial profiling in the purchase of guns under the Second Amendment.

Mrs. BLACK. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Before we finish with this, you will be able to have a weapon,

you will be able to suppress the sound on it, and you won't have to identify yourself by these characteristics that are attacked in this amendment, but I want to just kind of set the facts straight.

First of all, this information has been required since 1968. I know people are excited about it tonight, I know there is a lot of enthusiasm about ridding the Nation of having this information, but since the Gun Control Act of 1968, prospective firearm purchasers have been required to record their race.

Now, sometimes, you know, we hear in law enforcement people trying to be politically correct and say, well, we don't want you to be too descriptive of a suspect in a crime, identifying them by race or something, but, you know, the reason why we have this information has nothing to do with prohibiting people's Second Amendment rights. This is about how to track down someone who has done something wrong, who was the original purchaser of the gun that was used in a crime.

The information is not held by the Federal Government, notwithstanding the excitement on the House floor tonight. It is held by the dealer. It is not centralized in any way, but it is a law enforcement data point. Sometimes we actually need data, we need information so that if something has been done with a gun that is unlawful, somebody can figure out who purchased it; and you can also clarify who these people are, if they have similar names, similar backgrounds, or whatever may be the case.

So it is just basic information that any law enforcement person would want to have, the race and ethnic background of the owner of the weapon that was used in a neighborhood near you to harm one of the people whom you have been elected to represent, and to decide tonight, well, what we want to do is strip this information away under some pretense. What we just heard was an argument that somehow someone was trying to say that the Second Amendment discriminated against somebody on a racial basis, and of course anyone can win that straw argument because it is nonsensical. No one is arguing that.

We are talking about basic information that is needed for law enforcement purposes that the majority tonight wants to deny from the ATF. That is something that I would hope the majority wouldn't do, but they obviously have the votes to do as they please. I will be against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHMOND

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the aggregate amount made available for "Federal Prison System—Salaries and Expenses", and by increasing the amount made available for "Office of Justice Programs—Juvenile Justice Programs" for youth mentoring grants, by \$155,900,000.

Mr. RICHMOND (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, which amendment is the gentleman offering?

Mr. RICHMOND. I only have one amendment, and it is the amendment to move \$155 million from the Bureau of Prisons over to the Juvenile Justice program.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will continue to read the amendment.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Chair, I rise today to talk about something that I would hope is important to both sides of the aisle, and that is our youth. Here in Congress we talk about how important a lot of things are: education, public safety, strong communities, freedom, and prosperity. If we have a goal of keeping our children in school and on the path to success, cutting Juvenile Justice programs is the wrong way to go in order to reach it.

We know that supporting programs that keep our children out of jail is one of the best investments we can make, and it gives us one of our highest returns on our investment.

On any given day in this country, there are over 70,000 juveniles in jail around the country. This incarceration is not cheap. We spend about \$6 billion a year on juveniles in prison. Interactions with the criminal justice system at a young age have a ripple effect that makes it harder for children to achieve success later.

Students who are arrested early in high school are six to eight times more likely to drop out of high school. What is more, children who are incarcerated are almost 40 percent less likely to graduate from high school and 40 percent more likely to be in prison at the age of 25. Finally, if someone with an arrest record as a juvenile does graduate high school, they are still only half as likely to enroll in a 4-year college.

In short, keeping our children out of jail has benefits to the children, their

families, our communities, and to the Nation as a whole. This President realized all of this when he made his budget request. That is why he requested more than \$300 million for a variety of authorized programs aimed at improving public safety and keeping children on the path to college and careers instead of the path to prison.

Unfortunately, the bill in front of us calls for devastating cuts to these vital programs. The funding level in the bill is more than \$155 million below the President's request, and even \$68 million below last year's funding level.

My amendment today would simply bring the funding for Juvenile Justice back in line with the President's request by funding one of the only programs left available in the bill, and that is mentoring. By increasing the role and capacity for mentoring programs across the Nation, we can have a true impact on children in every community.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will assert my point of order against the amendment, depending on what the gentleman intends to do.

Does the gentleman intend to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. RICHMOND. I would like to know what the point of order is. I am just shifting money from one thing that is already in the budget to something that is already in the budget.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CULBERSON. The amendment is subject to a point of order on the basis that it proposes to increase an appropriation not authorized by law, Mr. Chairman, and, therefore, is in violation of clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

Although the original account funding for the Office of Juvenile Justice contains a number of programs that are unauthorized, it was permitted to remain in the bill pursuant to the provisions of the rule that provided for the consideration of this bill.

When an unauthorized appropriation is permitted to remain in a general appropriations bill, an amendment merely changing the amount is in order, but the rules of the House apply a "merely perfecting standard" to the items permitted to remain, and do not allow the insertion of a new paragraph that was not part of the original text permitted to remain to increase a figure that was permitted to remain.

This amendment proposes to add funding as a reach-back to an unauthorized program, and the amendment, therefore, cannot be construed as merely perfecting.

And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair rule the amendment out of order.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STIVERS). Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FATTAH. I understand the spirit of the chairman's statement. I just

want to comment that one of the things that we have done is we have worked over a number of years and doubled the amount of money going into youth mentoring.

I think that the chairman and I agree with the spirit of your amendment and that it is a much more worthy investment for the country to keep our young people on the straight and narrow than to try to repair, as has been said, a broken adult.

We continue to have an interest in building this part of the appropriations bill. Notwithstanding the complicated set of rules relative to the authorized and the non-authorized portion, we continue to want to work with you as we go forward on this matter.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to, if I could, express my support for the ranking member's comments, but I do need to assert the point of order.

Mr. RICHMOND. If the gentleman does not assert the point of order now, then what I will do is just wrap up and ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. If the gentleman withdraws the amendment, I withdraw my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman seek to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. RICHMOND. I was going to close and use the remaining time and then withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is currently pending.

Mr. CULBERSON. I reserve my point of order. Once the gentleman withdraws, I will withdraw the point of order, but we do need to conclude this. We will work together with Mr. FATTAH on juvenile justice to keep young people out of prison.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. CULBERSON. I reserve the point of order. I will withdraw its assertion at this time, but I reserve it pending the gentleman's conclusion and withdrawal of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's earlier point of order is withdrawn. A point of order is now reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, I would just say I started coaching Little League at 16, and I continue to do that today, and I continue also to mentor.

I would just say that as we look at the budget and we try to do things to bring the budget back into balance, we keep leaving out the point of return on investment. And if we continue to invest in things that are going to give us more than a one-to-one return, then we are actually gaining a benefit that will allow us to cut down the deficit.

And then I would just quickly add in the spirit of bipartisanship and working together that it is almost like the field of dreams for the Bureau of Prisons. If you appropriate it, they will spend it. And if they build it, they will fill it. We don't want to do that when

we have a greater avenue, I think, to put our youth on a better path and not only save money, but create less victims of crime.

So with that, I would just remind all of our Members that I hope we continue to work together. And we should really be careful here because the life you save may be your own.

I thank the chairman for his cooperation, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or enter into a trade agreement that establishes a limit on greenhouse gas emissions for the United States. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. My amendment would prohibit the administration from using any funds from this bill to advocate or support a position in trade negotiations or enter into a trade agreement that would limit greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. Basically, the amendment would prohibit the Obama administration from trying to address "climate change" through trade agreements.

The last few years, we have seen the administration intentionally work around Congress to implement its own agenda.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. There are many worthwhile amendments that need to be debated and heard, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I am not sure this is the right place to be imposing on trade agreements. We would be opposed to this. We won't be seeking a recorded vote, but we would be opposed to this. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, who has done great work.

Mr. CULBERSON. I strongly support this amendment. It is important that these trade agreements not be negotiated in ways that would supersede the authority of this Congress. Any limitation on greenhouse gases should be debated in this Congress and en-

acted by Congress and should not be any part of any trade agreement.

So I strongly support the gentleman's amendment in the same spirit that we have got language in this bill that prohibits use of funds to negotiate or to implement the U.N. arms control treaty, which would interfere with our Second Amendment rights. We have prohibited that. We have shut down the U.N. arms control treaty in this bill. Similarly, let's shut down any attempt to impose greenhouse gas limits on the United States through a trade agreement.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and urge Members to vote "yes."

Mr. FATTAH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be waived.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule this year and in the last Congress as well.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractors. Specifically, the list would include contractors who within a 3-year period preceding an offer have been convicted or have had a civil judgment rendered against them for fraud, violation of Federal or state antitrust laws, embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, violation of Federal tax laws, and other items outlined in section 52.209-5 of title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

□ 0010

These are all offenses which any contractor doing business with the Federal Government must disclose to a contracting officer, but oddly enough, the contracting officer would then be free to ignore these transgressions and award contracts to offending entities, absent my amendment.

I commend the authors of this bill for their inclusion of section 523. I still believe, however, that we can improve on this bill by prohibiting agencies from contracting with those entities who have engaged in the activities described above.

It is my hope that this amendment will be noncontroversial, as it has been on every previous occasion and again be passed unanimously by the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. I am not opposed to the amendment. I am prepared to accept the amendment and support it, and I thank the gentleman for offering it.

I speak even for the chairman in this matter. We are ready to rock and roll, so we accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat any M855 (5.56 mm x 45 mm) or SS109 type ammunition as armor piercing ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, I want to voice my strong opposition to the Obama administration's continued assaults on our Second Amendment rights.

I ran for Congress to stand up against this overreach and to keep Washington bureaucrats' influence out of our lives and their hands off our freedoms and their hand off our guns. That is why I am offering an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill that would stop President Obama's green tip ammo ban.

As you recall, the ATF recently tried to ban common rifle ammunition that has been legally used by law-abiding American sportsmen for decades. It was only after receiving intense pressure from Congress and more than 80,000 public comments and, frankly, the direct intervention of Chairman CULBERSON that the administration stalled their proposed ban.

As the clock ticks down on this President's second term, the administration is cooking up more than a dozen gun control regulations and has left the door open to reconsider future ammo bans.

This determination to unconstitutionally restrict one of our most fundamental rights and—I would argue—our first freedom has nothing to do with safety or security and everything to do with government control.

My amendment, previously introduced as a stand-alone bill by my good friend and colleague, Chief Deputy Whip PATRICK MCHENRY, from North Carolina, would put an end to this attack on our Second Amendment rights by ensuring this popular ammunition remains available and not subject to any future ATF bans.

Mr. Chairman, like many of my constituents from North Carolina, I like to spend time outdoors in a deer stand, in a field, or at the range. I will not stand idly by and allow a unilateral executive fiat to threaten our right to enjoy this cherished American tradition.

The Second Amendment is not about hunting or shooting sports. Our right to keep and bear arms is a right that ensures our ability to protect all of rights. That is why I refer to it as our first freedom. This fundamental freedom must be defended and protected.

For that reason, I encourage my colleagues in the House to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand with my colleague from North Carolina in support of this amendment. In the eyes of our Founding Fathers, the right to bear arms was just as fundamental as the freedom of speech. The Second Amendment en-

ures our right, as law-abiding American citizens, to bear arms to protect ourselves from enemies, both foreign and domestic.

It is no secret that our Second Amendment rights have been threatened by the government bureaucrats in the Obama administration. Earlier this year, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives doubled down on attempting to ban lead projectiles, as they claim the ammunition is armor piercing.

They proposed a ban on the manufacturing and sale of certain AR-15 ammunition that could have drastically reduced the availability of ammunition commonly used for sporting and other legitimate purposes.

Because of the strong objections from gunowners and constitutional conservatives across the country, ATF decided to table their proposal, at least for now.

Mr. Chairman, our constitutional rights should not be left up to the whims of Federal bureaucrats in Washington. This amendment simply ensures that Federal funds cannot be used to ban certain types of commonly used ammunition, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. They must have some special kind of deer in North Carolina. They are running around in the woods with bulletproof vests on.

The idea that a sportsman needs an armor-piercing bullet to go after a deer, I mean, I don't really buy it; but if the majority is willing to buy it at this hour of the night, it is fine with me.

On a serious note, for those who are in law enforcement, who are out in dark alleys, and who have to confront circumstances that they don't know the exact dangers that they are going to face, the fact that we want to have weapons that suppress the sound—now, we want to have bullets that can pierce armor and that we want to make sure that are under the guise of the Second Amendment, that you can have all manner of armament, without any type of reasonable speed bumps that might protect the American public is something that I am not sure that the majority would want to take such an enthusiastic effort around.

Obviously, they do, and they have decided that this bill is the bill for it, that this bill is the place where they want to do this activity, right?

I think it is unfortunate. As for me and for my side, we will be in opposition, and we will let the majority work its will.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's rhetorical question. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that the point is a 5.56 green tip bullet is not an armor-piercing bullet. The only reason it has been called an armor-piercing bullet is because of a loophole, and that is my point.

We have an administration that has just put out a whole list of regulations that say they want to restrict the rights of people because they may or may not have a mental illness. They want a whole list, a whole range of regulations that they would like to roll out in the final days of this administration to limit, to infringe upon our Second Amendment rights. What I am saying is we are not going to stand for that.

The bullet, the round that I am talking about is not an armor-piercing round; it has never been defined as an armor-piercing round, but because of a loophole, this administration tried to ban it as such.

Having said that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. I want to express my very strong support for the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman's amendment is necessary because the ATF did come out with a very broad legal framework within which they were attempting to ban not only 223 ammunition, but potentially whole other categories of ammunition, and that is just not what the statute was intended to prevent.

The statute was intended to prevent specific types of armor-piercing bullets from being used in pistols. The ATF was taking that far beyond the statute. It was necessary for—as new committee subcommittee chairman, I was able to step in and persuade the ATF to drop their ammo ban.

Mr. HUDSON's amendment is necessary to make sure it doesn't happen again in the future, and I urge Members to support his amendment in the strongest possible terms to defend our Second Amendment rights.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0020

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just hope that none of my good friends on the other side decide to test this theory about whether or not it can pierce armor, that you don't take the rhetoric to an extreme here. It is a fact that there is some concern about what this means for law enforcement. I know that the majority would want to be seen, and I think truly is, in support of law enforcement.

Why would we want to put this type of ammunition in guns that we want to suppress the sound on, in which we want less information about the purchaser, at a time like this in our Nation I don't actually understand. But there is obviously some thread that

runs through the other team over here that suggests that this is the time for them to proceed along this line. I think that the American public will have to make whatever judgment they want to make about that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to a State, or political subdivision of a State, that has in effect any law, policy, or procedure in contravention of immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment, and I withdraw the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with basically a commonsense amendment on H.R. 2578. I appreciate the hard work that Chairman CULBERSON, Ranking Member FATTAH, and other members of the Appropriations Committee have put into this bill.

This bill contains many important provisions to protect law-abiding Americans and public safety while spending responsibly; however, I want to make it absolutely clear that no funds appropriated under this bill are used to assist States and localities whose laws and policies are in direct contradiction to Federal immigration law and enforcement efforts. My amendment does just that. It ensures that we do not reward State and local governments with Federal funds when they ignore the rule of law.

State and local jurisdictions are implementing policies that directly contradict U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's statutorily mandated mission to identify and remove illegal aliens who are currently incarcerated. At this point, we even have seen some local sheriffs who choose to follow Federal law and honor ICE detainees slapped with lawsuits for cooperating, for following the law.

I know we are late. I know there is some discussion about this, but really this is simple.

Hard-working taxpayers should not have to sit idly by and watch their tax dollars go to localities that choose to encourage illegal immigration through their nonenforcement policies. My amendment sends a clear message that, if localities implement policies in contradiction to Federal immigration law, they will not be eligible to receive funds under this act, specifically Federal reimbursement grants under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was offered and accepted last year. We are offering it again and would ask favorable consideration.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. FATTAH. I would like, at this point, unless there are more comments, to assert the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may state his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2, rule XXI.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will at least respond to the point of order.

This amendment is not in contradiction of current law. In fact, it simply states that the amendment would not allow funds to be used in support of holding up law as it is currently written. This is not a law that is written to circumvent current law. In fact, all it says is that States and localities who receive the money will actually support current law. So I am not sure what the point of order is actually trying to say.

This was put in last year. It was approved. I understand. I appreciate the gentleman's concern. But, basically, we are saying if you enforce the law as it is written, which is all we are asking, then the grant is there. If you choose not to enforce Federal law, then that is money that will be withheld.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Not at this point.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, we will respect the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate that I agree with the gentleman from Georgia. This does not change existing law. It simply states that if you expect to receive Federal money, you need to be in compliance with Federal law. It is pretty straight up.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the status of local law.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or enter into a trade agreement whose negotiating texts are confidential. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is akin to an amendment that was considered just a few moments ago offered by Mr. MEADOWS. This amendment is meant to address a problem that has arisen with trade agreements that has become visible to all of us as Members of this august body.

What has happened is that the Trade Representative, for no apparent legal reason, with no apparent legal authority, has taken it upon himself to negotiate trade agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership in secret—not entirely in secret, just in secret from us and from members of the American public.

The corresponding provision, the TTIP provision, has been posted by the European Union, which is our negotiating partner in this on the Internet.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership itself has been negotiated in secret, but that has been posted by WikiLeaks, to the embarrassment of our government in an unnecessary manner.

What we have seen over the past several years is that the Trade Representative has turned a deaf ear to our concerns as Members of Congress who

must perform our oversight functions whenever we ask for information about what the Trade Representative is doing on behalf of the American people.

Three years ago, we had the strange circumstance come up that over 100 Members of Congress, 100 Members of this body, wrote a letter to the Trade Representative saying: We hear you are negotiating something called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Would you please give us a copy?

And the answer came back: No. We are not going to give you a copy.

For the past 5 years, the Trans-Pacific Partnership has been negotiated in secret. Only in the last few months, Members of Congress have been able to see it under the most extreme conditions imaginable. I was actually the first person to be able to see it, and the Trade Representative came to my office with his staff and offered to show it to me, but I couldn't take any notes.

□ 0030

I couldn't discuss it with my own staff. I couldn't even discuss it with other Members of this body. And of course I couldn't make copies or otherwise help myself to record what I had seen, much less speak to my constituents about it, much less speak to the media about it, much less speak to the public about it.

Respectfully, secret laws are un-American laws; secret agreements are un-American agreements. There is no such thing recognized under our Constitution as a "secret statute" or a "secret treaty." But that is, in effect, what we have been experiencing without any legal authority whatsoever on behalf of the Trade Representative.

Now, I am not saying the Trade Representative needs to stop negotiating these agreements; not at all. What I am suggesting is that we lift the veil of secrecy that has been dropped over these negotiations so that we can't see them, the American people can't see them, but foreign governments can see them.

Why is it that we have confidentiality? Why is it that we have a classified information system? Generally speaking, it is not to keep Americans from seeing this information; it is to keep foreigners from seeing this information. And here the world has been turned upside down, and we have a situation where foreigners get to see it, but even the highest members of our own government—our Senators, our Congressmen—we don't get to see it. That is absolutely unacceptable; it is un-American.

The only way to come up with agreements that satisfy the needs of this country is through an open, fair, transparent process. That is what this simple amendment will accomplish. It says: None of the funds made available in this act, which includes funds made to the Trade Representative, may be used to negotiate or enter into a trade agreement whose negotiating texts are confidential.

It is time for a little sunlight. Sunlight is the best disinfectant. It is time for the Members of this body to take control of our constitutional responsibilities, not to let the Trade Representative or any member of the executive branch tell us to stuff it when we need to find out things in order to be able to do our jobs properly.

Wouldn't it be a better system if we were able to tell a trade representative what we think, what our constituents think, what the members of the American public think about these documents before they are simply dropped on us?

This is a simple commonsense amendment. There is no existing legal authority that allows the Trade Representative to do what he has been doing. I say the time is up and we should insist that these agreements, which will determine the course of economic history in America for the next 20 or 30 years, are agreements that are negotiated in public with our approval and with our input.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida I know has worked in the past as an attorney and represented clients and undoubtedly has settled cases before. And those settlement agreements, those negotiations, when you were designing those agreements, Mr. GRAYSON, I know were not something that you wanted to disclose. You wanted to negotiate those settlements in private with your client confidentially, because had the world seen what you were working out, that would have damaged your client's ability to negotiate a fair settlement with the other party in the case.

As here, with trade promotion authority, the countries with which the Trade Representative is negotiating, Japan, for example, I doubt the Japanese want the Australians to see what the Japanese are agreeing to. That is just common sense. I doubt that the Koreans want the Japanese to see what the Koreans are attempting to agree to.

So it is perfectly understandable that the agreement itself would be confidential until it is finalized. Members of Congress can go see the agreement, but the Korean-American Trade Agreement is going to be confidential until it is finally settled because Korea doesn't want Japan or Australia or Vietnam to see what they are negotiating, in the same way you did not want your clients, the agreement you were attempting to negotiate on behalf of your client, you didn't want to do that in the open sunshine. Sunshine is a good thing, but there are times when a negotiation like this on a trade agreement is just common sense. You are not going to want the other countries that you are competing against to see what kind of a deal you are fixing to work out with the United States.

The Members of Congress can see it, of course, as we should, and the agreement itself must be available to the public to view 90 days before the President can even sign the agreement, and the Congress is going to have this debate. In fact, I understand that this trade promotion authority agreement that is under discussion, the new law that Congress is proposing, would for the first time give either House of Congress a veto over the agreement with a majority vote. So the House could decide on our own to veto a particular trade agreement by majority vote; the Senate could veto a trade agreement by majority vote.

The only part of the deal so far that is confidential is the ongoing negotiation, which is exactly the way you handled and protected your client's best interest as an attorney. I am quite confident as an attorney you handled your client's litigation in a way that was professional and confidential, and I imagine you never disclosed a pending settlement agreement that was being negotiated, you never released that publicly, did you ever, Mr. GRAYSON?

Mr. GRAYSON. Is the gentleman yielding to me?

Mr. CULBERSON. Did you ever release a negotiated settlement agreement to the public before it was finalized?

Mr. GRAYSON. Is the gentleman yielding to me?

Mr. CULBERSON. No. Answer my question, yes or no.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, I can't answer your question unless you are going to yield to me.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is why I am asking a question. I am asking you, did you ever release the terms of a settlement agreement you were negotiating before it was final?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes. And I am asking a question.

I was an attorney myself. I defended businesses in civil litigation, and any settlement agreement that we worked on was done confidentially. And I would ask Mr. GRAYSON, did you ever disclose a confidential settlement negotiation publicly when you were negotiating on behalf of your client?

Mr. GRAYSON. Is the gentleman yielding the balance of his time to me?

Mr. CULBERSON. No, I am not yielding the balance of my time. I am just asking a question.

I am quite confident Mr. GRAYSON always kept those negotiations secret. That is all that is being kept secret here. And it is actually not secret because Members of Congress can go read the text of the trade agreement that is being negotiated. And if any of us have any sort of an objection, that is a good time to raise it, to tell the Trade Representative that we think this or that provision is going to either be in violation of Federal law or cause a problem for American industry and we think you ought to drop it.

So you have actually got an opportunity to have your 2 cents' worth heard during the course of the negotiation. So I would urge Members to oppose Mr. GRAYSON's amendment for the same reason that Mr. GRAYSON always kept his settlement negotiations confidential on behalf of his clients.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 15 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for another minute beyond my 15 seconds.

Mr. CULBERSON. I object. We are limited to 5 minutes and it is 12:30 at night.

The Acting CHAIR. There is an objection. The gentleman has 15 seconds.

Mr. GRAYSON. First of all, I represent the American public here, not the American private. When I was an attorney, I represented private interest, just as you did. Now I represent the public. The reason we refer to the American public as the public is because the public's business needs to be public. That means no secret negotiations, no secret acts, no secret agreements, nothing but the public interest in public.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. GRAYSON's answer confirms that he did not ever disclose a negotiated settlement before it was final, and that is just common sense. And here, under trade promotion authority, the trade agreement, as it is being negotiated, needs to be kept confidential. But any Member of Congress can go in and see it and have our voices heard, object, suggest changes to it, as it is being negotiated. And then once it is finalized the text must be made available to the public 90 days before the President signs the agreement, and then either House of Congress can void the agreement by a majority vote. We are going to have this debate, and I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice

may be used, with respect to any of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, or with respect to either the District of Columbia or Guam, to prevent any of them from implementing their own laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of medical marijuana.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 0040

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Today, I ask my colleagues to make a practical as well as a principled vote. My amendment would prohibit any Federal funds from being used to supersede State law in those States that have legalized the use of medical marijuana.

Let's be clear. The intent of this amendment is to make it illegal for Federal employees to engage in efforts to enforce Federal law that makes the medical use or distribution of medical marijuana illegal in States where the use of marijuana for medical purposes has been made legal.

The practical aspect of this vote is based on the realization that, at a time of severely limited resources, it makes sense to target terrorists, criminals, and other threats to the American people rather than use Federal law enforcement resources to prevent suffering and sick people from using a weed that may or may not alleviate their suffering.

There are many examples—yes, anecdotal—in which the use of marijuana has helped end severe suffering.

Trying to prevent this use of marijuana once it has been legalized by a State government is a travesty, an inexcusable waste of our limited resources. That is the practical reason to vote for my amendment.

As for the principle, we Republicans claim to base our decisions on individual freedom, on states' rights as mandated by the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, and especially on the doctor-patient relationship.

Don't bother to use rhetoric about those principles on other issues if you vote for the Federal Government to supersede individual rights, states' rights, and the doctor-patient relationship when it comes to marijuana.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield myself 10 seconds.

Stop this waste of limited Federal law enforcement resources. Stop the roughshod use of the Federal bureaucracy from busting down doors to prevent sick people from using a substance that his or her doctor believes might alleviate his or her pain.

Vote for the Rohrabacher amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

First of all, I hear constantly of this idea about individual rights, about the 10th Amendment, et cetera. This was all settled back in 2005 in the Supreme Court with *Gonzales v. Raich*, which was a 6-3 victory in favor of the government's having preemptive rights when it comes to the drug laws, the CSA. That has been settled. We can claim this over and over again, but bring it back to the Court and see if you can change that.

Now, how is this affecting us in real life? It is now legal in Colorado, but Nebraska and Oklahoma are now suing Colorado. Why? It is because of all of the problems that are developing across the State borders—again, interstate commerce, a big problem.

Let's talk about the huge problem that marijuana represents. First of all, it has no accepted medical use.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

There are synthetic marijuana equivalents that are useful—yes, indeed—but the drug itself, which is the smokeable part of it, is not safe and has not been accepted.

Here is the thing. It is known to have brain development alterations; schizophrenia and other forms of mental illness, psychosis; heart complications; and an increased risk of stroke.

A study recently found that even casual users experience severe brain abnormalities found on MRIs and that pot smoking leads to the loss of ambition; to lower IQs; and that it impairs attention, judgment, memory, and many other things.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, Congress needs to represent the States that they were elected in. It is time that we represent them here in the United States Congress to allow medical marijuana laws in those States that have been approved by the voters and approved by their legislatures—39 States, the Dis-

trict of Columbia, and Guam. That is 41 total, the majority of the American population. It is a states' rights issue.

Support this amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the supporters of this amendment claim that this is a states' rights issue. However, it is not that simple, not hardly. Drug manufacture and use is inherently an interstate problem.

For example, we need look no further than at one of the two States where marijuana has been legalized. The Colorado Department of Revenue has reported that 45 percent of marijuana sales in the State were to out-of-State ID holders.

Indeed, earlier this year, Colorado Governor Hickenlooper said, "If I could've waved a wand the day after the election, I would have reversed the election and said, 'This was a bad idea.'"

In fact, Colorado is now being sued by Nebraska and Oklahoma, which claim Colorado has created a "dangerous gap" in the control of marijuana and that marijuana is flowing from Colorado to neighboring States.

However, Mr. Chairman, of far greater concern to me is the increased availability of marijuana to children, which will inevitably result from a loosening of restrictions on this dangerous drug.

Though my colleagues may not like it, marijuana remains a schedule I narcotic because it has a high potential for abuse and no legitimate medical use. In fact, Mr. Chairman, statistics show that 78 percent of the 2.4 million people who began using marijuana last year were aged 12 to 20.

There is little doubt that this drug poses a significant danger to our children, and I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment.

In States with medical marijuana laws, patients now face uncertainty regarding their treatment, and small-business owners, who have invested millions in creating jobs and revenue, have no assurances for the future.

It is way past the time for the Justice Department to stop its unwarranted persecution of medical marijuana and to put its resources where they are truly needed. There is no way that Members of Congress should tell people who live in States where these laws have been passed that what their doctors prescribe, which could prevent pain, should not be allowed.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the time, and I appreciate all of the work that Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. FARR have done, and I am happy to join with them.

Mr. Chairman, Justice Brandeis said the States are the laboratories of democracy. That is what they are doing here. Some of the arguments we have heard are "Reefer Madness" 2015. It is over. One of the gentlemen said children are doing marijuana at age 12. That will show you how good the laws are doing right now.

If we had more money going into heroin and not marijuana, we could stop people from dying, and that is what we should be doing. Tell Montel Williams, who has MS, that marijuana doesn't work. Tell cancer patients that it doesn't help them with nausea. Tell people that it doesn't work.

It works. It helps. It is the States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, by the way it has been talked about by some on the other side, to be clear, this amendment does not legalize marijuana. It simply ensures that the Federal Government doesn't waste its limited resources in prosecuting men and women who are acting in compliance with State and medical marijuana laws. That is all it does.

It is very reasonable that States have enforcement priorities in this area, and we want our Federal resources geared towards crime that we view as more important. Have them go after the meth lab. Have them go after the heroin ring.

□ 0050

Colorado has had legal medical marijuana for nearly a decade. Some in our State are for it; some are against it. It is our right as a State to determine that. That is why I support this amendment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about standing up for states' rights and protecting businesses, doctors, and patients who are acting legally under the medical marijuana laws of some 41 States and territories, including Nevada. Congress needs to catch up with State legislatures, and the Federal Government needs to stop wasting money busting good citizens who are trying to do the right thing.

Mr. FLEMING. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Let me say, first of all, this whole idea of medical marijuana is a big joke. It is an end run around the laws. There are more pot shops in California than there are Starbucks or McDonald's; okay?

Now, is it really a medical treatment? Well, the AMA says no. The American Society of Addiction Medicine says no. Even the American Glaucoma Society, which is of course in charge of glaucoma treatment, says that this is not a medical treatment for glaucoma. So there is no single approved use of marijuana for medical diseases.

The whole idea about medical marijuana is to get around the laws on legalization or illegalization of marijuana. But make no mistake about it, the most common addiction diagnosis for young people admitted to drug treatment centers is addiction to marijuana. The rate is 9 percent addiction rate in adults; it is 17 percent in young people.

We all know the studies show very clearly that the States that are more permissive have higher addiction and abuse rates than any others. We also know that NIDA tells us that it is a developmental disease. What does that mean? It means the younger a child is exposed to it, the more likely that child will later become an addict to something else, like methamphetamine, prescription drugs, heroin. So if you support this, which is really the legalization of marijuana, then you are really supporting allowing our children to be harmed and addicted to this terrible drug.

Now, I am all in favor of research, and we are in discussions with DEA about allowing it in some way, whether we go to a 1a category to allow such research. Some suggest that it may have some benefit for seizures. That is yet to be seen. Some suggest that it may be beneficial to those who have spastic muscle disease, but there is absolutely no proof of that.

So with that, I urge everyone to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the doctor's remarks, the truth is that almost no research has been put into marijuana in terms of its medical efficacy. You have epilepsy and a whole host.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Okay. I am not going to dominate the gentleman's time.

This has been under study for over 40 years. My university, the University of

Mississippi, has been legally growing pot for over 40 years and studying it, so it has been studied.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I know a little bit about this subject. The bottom line is that in terms of its medical viability, in terms of epilepsy and a lot of other issues, there is some need for a real study of this, not just about the way that we have proceeded so far. I think that this amendment and what is happening in the States should be allowed to go forward.

I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for an opportunity to close on this subject. At that point then I would yield back the remainder of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may not yield blocks of time and must remain on his feet.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. ROHRABACHER.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may not yield blocks of time.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield such time as he may consume, as long as he doesn't go over 1½ minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I appreciate that from my colleague.

Look, our Founding Fathers didn't want criminal justice to be handled by the Federal Government. I don't know what government you want to have in our country, but most of us here don't believe that the Federal Government—neither did our Founding Fathers—is an all-wise system, that the Federal Government is the only government that has wisdom to make the decisions for the families.

This is absolutely absurd to think that the Federal Government is going to mandate all of these things even though the people of the States and other doctors, many other doctors, would like to have the right to prescribe to their patients what they think is going to alleviate their suffering. No, we should not get in the way. As I said in the first debate, it is sinful for us to try to get in the way between a doctor and his patient, saying, Oh, no, the Federal Government knows better.

This is a states' rights issue. This is the issue of what our Founding Fathers had in mind for this country, where the decisions would be made like this. They didn't want the Federal Government to have a police force that can bust in people's doors. No. They wanted to have individual freedom, personal choice. They want parents to take care of their kids. They didn't want an all-controlling nanny State to control our lives. That is what this country was supposed to be all about. I thought that is what Republicans were supposed to be all about, and I hope my Republican colleagues will start reexamining whether or not they believe in the fundamental principles of limited government and individual freedom that we have always talked about.

So I would ask my colleagues to join me, reaffirm what our Founding Fathers had in mind, which is freedom,

states' rights, limited government, and people making choices about their own lives and being responsible for their families and not shoving that off on the Federal Government.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming the balance of my time, I think I hear that echo again about the right to be left alone.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let me just say this. I just wish you would have talked to the very doctors and people I know that have been suffering, and they have gone to their doctor and asked for help, and the doctors have said, "Yes, medical marijuana will help you"—to believe that the Federal Government can stop that.

I have met people whose suffering has been alleviated. Some veterans I know have gone through seizure after seizure, and they were only helped by medical marijuana. If we have a heart, if we have our beliefs, let's make sure that we stand for freedom in this vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compel a person to testify about information or sources that the person states in a motion to quash the subpoena that he has obtained as a journalist or reporter and that he regards as confidential.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has nothing to do with medical marijuana. It was passed last year by a vote of this body of 225-183; in other words, it passed by a majority of 42 votes.

□ 0100

The purpose of this amendment is to raise the possibility of a Federal shield law that corresponds to protections already in place in 49 States but not at the level of the Federal Government.

Again, to be clear about this, 49 States have a Federal shield law. The Federal Government does not—at least up to this point.

A shield law is designed to protect a reporter's privilege: the right of news reporters to refuse to testify on information and sources of information obtained during the news gathering and dissemination process. In short, a reporter should not be forced to reveal his or her sources under penalty of imprisonment.

This issue has come up in court cases at the Federal level and the Supreme Court level, beginning with the 1972 case of *Branzburg v. Hayes*. In that case, a reporter wished to inform his readers about the nature of the drug hashish, and he realized that the only way to go about that was to actually find and interview people who had actually used the drug hashish, so he did that.

After he published his article, relying upon two confidential sources, he was subpoenaed by the police to provide his sources so that they could be arrested, compromising their identity and compromising his journalistic integrity. So he was forced to choose whether he would conceal his sources and go to prison or he would reveal his sources and have them go to prison, simply because he wanted to inform the public about this matter of concern.

Some of us may remember the case of Valerie Plame, who was publicly identified as a covert operative. Reporters were continually asked to name the sources used in their reporting, and one reporter was jailed for 85 days for refusing to disclose sources in that government probe.

At this point, under current law, journalists are in a quandary—an unnecessary and unhealthy quandary. They realize that they need to protect their sources, but that right is codified only at the State level and not yet at the Federal level.

So what I am seeking to do, as I did last year with the assistance of this House, is to offer the journalists the protection they should have in order to do their jobs properly.

Freedom of the press is not just an important principle, but it is part of the foundation of American law. The Constitution and the First Amendment provide for freedom of speech and of the press. It is completely incongruous to say that we have freedom of the press, but the Federal Government could nevertheless subpoena sources and put reporters in prison if they don't comply.

I think that we should have settled this issue years if not decades ago. We did settle it last year successfully in this body, but we are here today to try to address it once more.

Respectfully, I submit this amendment as a much-needed and long delayed clarification that the Federal Government treats the issue of freedom of the press just as respectfully and just as importantly as the great majority of our States do—49 out of 50.

I ask for support of this amendment from my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from the Seventh District of

Texas, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It is drafted far too broadly. And I would point out that in a grand jury proceeding—those that occur in the District of Columbia, for example, are done under the auspices of the Department of Justice, and that is a Federal grand jury proceeding. A journalist would not have the privilege of protecting the confidentiality of his sources because in a grand jury everything that is discussed is absolutely confidential.

I also, frankly, think it is astonishing that under Mr. GRAYSON's amendment a journalist has the ability to self-certify what is confidential and what is not. I certainly agree with the principle of a strong and free press, but Mr. GRAYSON's amendment is written far too broadly and, frankly, would not provide protection to a journalist in a grand jury setting. I think he has neglected that problem.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chair of the Judiciary Committee, to also speak in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for joining me in opposition to this amendment.

Shield laws for reporters are not a bad concept at all, but this is hardly the way to go about doing it. No State has a law like this language here, where it is so vague that virtually anyone in the United States claiming to be a journalist or reporter—and, by the way, nowadays, when lots of people maintain blogs or posts on the Internet, they could easily claim to be a journalist or reporter—would be covered by this.

So no one intends to have that broad an exception that would allow anyone to evade the requirements that they respond to a legitimate subpoena for investigation by law enforcement, a violation of the law.

This is far too broad. It is something that clearly should be handled by the authorizing committee, the Judiciary Committee, which worked on this for a long period of time and has struggled with that very definition of journalist or reporter that the gentleman from Florida simply glosses over in this.

And then, to give further exception to simply say that that individual who first claims they are a journalist or reporter and then says, Oh, yeah, that is confidential, that would breed criminal misconduct because criminals would be before the court claiming that they were reporters and that they regarded their information as confidential and, therefore, do not have to respond to a subpoena.

This is a very harmful, very bad way to go about providing protection to le-

gitimate journalists and reporters and should be defeated. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

Mr. GRAYSON. This is the same parade of horrors that we heard last year before this body voted in favor of the Grayson amendment. It is almost the same, word for word.

Last year, we heard that this somehow would allow people to self-certify. Well, in fact, anybody who self-certifies falsely in front of a grand jury is looking at a lot more than 83 days in jail. They are looking at 5 years in Federal prison. They would be prosecuted for perjury if they claimed to be a journalist and weren't actually a journalist—a fact that I pointed out last year before this amendment was actually passed.

I also want to point out that there is no distinction between a grand jury and an actual jury for this purpose. Forty-nine States all agree that there is no distinction whatsoever. So it is simply false to say that this doesn't apply to grand jury proceedings. It certainly would apply and does apply to all grand jury proceedings at the State level.

And there is nothing vague about this provision at all. In fact, the wording that has been referred to here, that the information has been attained as a journalist or reporter, is exactly the same wording that was in the Grayson amendment last year that passed with a margin of 42 votes.

So none of these old attacks, these unsuccessful attacks, are anything new and deserve any more credence than they received from a majority of this body last year.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, with that, I would urge Members to oppose the amendment and urge Members to vote "no", and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCLINTOCK

Mr. MCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that I offer with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used, with respect to any of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi,

Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, to prevent any of them from implementing their own laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of marijuana on non-Federal lands within their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. McCLINTOCK (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not an endorsement of marijuana. I have never used it. My wife and I raised our children never to use it. And I believe that local schools ought to assure that every American is aware of the risks and dangers that it may pose.

This amendment addresses a much larger question: whether the Federal Government has the constitutional authority to dictate a policy to States on matters that occur strictly within their own borders. I believe that it does not. But even if it does, I believe that it should not.

In 1932, Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis described the beauty of the 10th Amendment this way. He said: "A State may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory; and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country."

□ 0110

That is exactly what States like Colorado and Oregon have done with legalization and what many more have done with aspects of it. They believe that the harm that might be done by easier access to this drug is outweighed by removing the violent underground economy that is caused by prohibition.

I don't know if they are right or wrong, but I would like to find out, and their experiment will inform the rest of the country.

Now, the Federal Government has a legitimate authority to protect neighboring States by forbidding transport across State lines, which this amendment protects; but, at the same time, it protects the right of a State's citizens to make this decision within their own boundaries.

It is not necessary to become embroiled in the debate over marijuana. These States are having that debate and establishing their laws.

The question is over the right of their people to have these debates, to make these decisions, and for the rest of the Nation to observe and benefit from the outcome for good or ill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My friend Mr. McCLINTOCK makes the point that this should be an experiment within the States, and certainly, that is something that has been a long-held goal and value, but we already have that ongoing.

Today, Colorado, as everyone knows, has legalization of marijuana, notwithstanding what is going on with the Federal Government and its laws, and the information is rolling in, and the information is bad. The black market is worse than ever when it comes to drugs. Interstate commerce has increased, not decreased.

Again, as I stated before, two States, Oklahoma and Nebraska, are now suing Colorado over the bleedover of problems that are occurring. The strength of marijuana is much stronger today in Colorado than it has ever been. The problems are much worse. We are actually seeing related deaths, accidents; and we have even had an overdose death now with the stronger forms of marijuana.

Look, if this is about allowing doctors to work with their patients, let's admit it. We don't allow, as a society, doctors to just do anything with any patient. We do have some guidelines and restrictions.

Furthermore, children are the end result of bad decisions in all this. We know that the more it is in the homes, the more it is going to get into the brains and bloodstream of children.

Again, I will mention the number of problems that are developing from it are growing, mostly from what we are seeing in Colorado. Studies show that MRI scans show, even in casual users, profound brain changes. We see that the area that deals with ambition is being greatly affected, thus, the ambition killer sort of knowledge that we have and understand about this drug.

IQ, studies show a lowering of IQ.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for bringing forward this amendment.

I say to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, I am actually from Colorado, and I don't recognize the Colorado that you are talking about.

I come from the Colorado where underage marijuana use is down since legalization. I am from the Colorado where we have driven criminal cartels that seek to prey on our children every day out of business.

I am from the Colorado where our violent crime rates are down and where

we continue to regulate dispensaries to make sure they are not schools; rather than have a corner street dealer who doesn't care if they are selling to a 14-year-old, we moved that away and regulated it in a way to make sure that minors don't have access to marijuana. That is the Colorado that I am from. I welcome you to come visit. I welcome you to visit.

You know what, I don't have to convince you. I don't have to convince the State of Louisiana that they should do anything. I just wish that you would leave my sovereign State of Colorado alone.

Let our people and our State government decide what we want to do with regard to marijuana, rather than the Federal agents going around trying to arrest people for doing activities that are fully legal under State law. That is all I ask.

I am not going to send Federal troops into Louisiana to arrest people from whatever you do down there, smoking crayfish. You want me to ban that and send Federal troops down there? I bet maybe smoking crayfish ain't good for you. I don't know. What if it is fried? It might clog your arteries, huh? I bet that is not good for you.

You want me to send Federal troops down there? Is that what you want? Do you want me to send Federal troops to Louisiana to stop you from eating fried crayfish?

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. Yeah, I would like your answer. Yes or no?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

All Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if he wants us to send Federal troops to Louisiana to stop them from eating fried crayfish. I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. FLEMING. If the gentleman is yielding to me, I would point out that the Colorado he describes does not exist.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I am from Colorado. I know Colorado inside and out, and we have been tremendously successful in reducing the abuse of marijuana among minors.

Again, it shouldn't be up to us to convince him, just as I don't have to eat their darn fried crayfish—I don't want it. I don't want it. Get the Federal law enforcement apparatus to leave our State alone.

That is all this amendment does, is respect the sovereign will of the people of my great State of Colorado to have innovative policies to reduce the abuse of marijuana.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. I yield myself another minute.

What we are finding out from Colorado, we are learning a lot of lessons. One is the way that marijuana is now getting into baked goods, gummy bears. There is a huge spike in emergency room visits, children who are overdosing on marijuana.

Know that if you look, if you actually read what the media says and what the studies show is there are increasing problems in Colorado, not decreasing problems.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLEMING. I'm sorry, but I can't yield.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman is inaccurate with regard to his characterization of my State.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend. It is the gentleman from Louisiana's time.

Mr. POLIS. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FLEMING. I do not yield.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman does not yield. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Back to the constitutionality, we may all have different opinions about this, but it has been settled.

The Supreme Court in 2005, *Gonzales v. Raich*, 6–3, said that the Federal Government does have a right to enforce drug policies and for good reason because we know that drugs cross State lines. It is an interstate commerce issue. What happens in one State affects the other States.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, the arguments we are hearing from Mr. FLEMING are the arguments that ought to be heard in the States. I would remind him this measure does not affect marijuana laws involving any conceivable Federal jurisdiction.

It does not affect Federal districts or territories. It does not affect Federal jurisdiction over interstate commerce, including the Federal Government's responsibility to interdict transport among States.

It does not affect the Federal jurisdiction over Federal land. It does not affect Federal jurisdiction over the importation of marijuana from abroad. It only affects jurisdiction that is strictly and solely the rightful province of the States as pertains to their affairs strictly and solely within their own borders.

At some point, Mr. Chairman, we must ask ourselves: Do we believe in the 10th Amendment or do we not? Do we believe in federalism or do we not? Do we believe in the architecture of our Constitution or do we not? Do we believe in freedom or do we not?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. And who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has the only time remaining. The gentleman from California yielded back the balance of his time.

Mr. FLEMING. Again, my good friend from California would suggest that, really, Federal laws have no application, that we should just turn all laws and law enforcement over to the States. That simply isn't the case.

Again, yes, the Federal Government does have jurisdiction. It is called the CSA, the Controlled Substances Act, and it has been around for a long time, and it is enforced by the DEA and many other agencies. I would just say that the gentleman is just flat wrong on that and that the Supreme Court came down on my side.

Again, we can have different opinions, but that is where we are today. I would suggest that perhaps we get the Supreme Court to rule differently if we believe differently.

□ 0120

But again, what is important to me is not the law. What is important to me is what is happening to the children of our Nation, especially Colorado: overdoses, brain changes, loss of IQ, memory loss, and cognitive impairment.

Marijuana smoke has four times the tar of cigarette smoke. Who really believes that we are not going to see an epidemic down the road of lung cancer related to marijuana?

As far as use for medical purposes, again, we don't have a single approved specific use of marijuana for medical purposes. And for heaven's sakes, we know that up to 17 percent of people who use it become addicted to it. So the first rule for us as physicians—and I have been a doctor for 40 years—is first do no harm. Well, we are doing a lot of harm with marijuana by legalizing it and liberalizing its use.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to take any action to prevent a State from implementing any law that makes it lawful to possess, distribute, or use cannabidiol or cannabidiol oil.

Mr. PERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to talk about what this amendment is not, as much as to talk about what it is. This amendment in no way federally legalizes marijuana. It does not allow for the recreational use of marijuana, and I maintain that I am still opposed to the recreational use of marijuana. What it does is it simply prevents the Federal Government from interfering in States that have legalized CBD and CBD oil.

CBD—cannabidiol is how you pronounce it—is an extract from hemp. CBD oil has been known to reduce the amount or duration of seizures in those suffering from epilepsy or other seizure disorders. CBD oil contains no THC, the active psychotropic ingredient that makes people high. It contains none.

Numerous families in my district have children with epilepsy, and they are out of options. They have tried all the FDA-approved drugs, and they sit and they watch their children fade away. And that is their option. They can either do that, they can break the law, or they can move somewhere where they can get CBD. Some have had to move to States where it is legal. They have had to split their families apart to care for their children.

Mr. Chairman, 17 States—most recently, Texas, where the good chairman resides—have legalized CBD. These States have made the choice to help children with epilepsy and seizure disorders. Parents who want to treat their children should not be hindered by Federal prohibition.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), my good friend.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, last week I had an opportunity to sit down with Sophie Weiss, an inspiring young girl from Illinois. In many ways she is a very normal girl who enjoys spending her days playing with her sisters, but she also suffers from a severe form of epilepsy

that does not allow her to respond to the traditional medication. Because of this, she suffers through upwards of 200 seizures each and every day. Mr. Chairman, she can't read. She is 9 years old. Her 6-year-old sister reads to her. She can't do this because she blacks out and she seizes hundreds of times each and every day.

Unfortunately, Sophie's story is not unique, and there are girls just like Sophie in every State and every district across our country.

Mr. Chairman, we have already found lifesaving seizure relief for some families. In Illinois, CBD oil is legal and has shown to drastically reduce the frequency of seizures. But because of antiquated laws and Federal bureaucracy, this relief is unavailable to many.

Over and over again, the Federal Government has stood in the way of access to lifesaving care for these children. Why would we allow even one child, Mr. Chairman, to suffer while waiting for other options to be approved? If this natural therapy can help even one family, ensuring access to it is a must.

Mr. Chairman, I came to Washington to fight for commonsense, bipartisan reform that will improve the day-to-day lives of the people that I represent, and that is exactly what this amendment does. Quite simply, it ensures that States that already have legalized CBD oil can do so without Federal interference.

Helping these families is a reform that we should all be able to get behind. Regardless of political party, we can agree that the government's role is not to prevent families from getting access to lifesaving treatment.

Mr. Chairman, as a father looking at these children who suffer from thousands of seizures, who literally can't live their lives normally, is something that we can and must change. This amendment offers hope to thousands of individuals and their families, and I urge my colleagues to help children like Sophie in their districts by adopting this commonsense amendment.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, some of the things that have been said about this are quite true. First of all, it is pronounced—I can't even say it myself. We will say CBD oil for short.

It is not psychoactive, although it is an extract from the plant of marijuana. There have been anecdotal reports that it reduces seizures in kids who have severe seizure disorders, so-called Charlotte's Web. It is actually on fast-track evaluation by the FDA both for safety and for effectiveness. Actually, the early reports are disappointing. Despite the anecdotal reports, they are not finding, thus far, the benefits that have been promised. Also, they are

finding, in some cases, pretty severe side effects.

One of the things that hasn't been discussed on this issue is, just as we don't allow people or encourage people, at least, to eat mold in order to get penicillin as an antibiotic for disease, it doesn't make any sense to give a raw plant as a medication. What we do in health care by using the scientific method is to extract the component, make sure we have a precise measurement, fully study it for safety and for efficaciousness, and then we prescribe it under the direction of a physician.

The CBD oil right now is not being produced. It is not in a pill or injectable form or even in a liquid form. It is sort of grown on the side, and people are sort of experimenting with it to see whether it works.

What I would say to my colleagues is let's let this thing play out. Let the FDA finish its fast-track evaluation. If they find it to be efficacious and safe, let them put it in the proper measurement form. Let's make sure we know what all the side effects are. As far as I am concerned, we would make it a nonscheduled drug.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Again, I think this is a similar thrust to the previous debate, so I won't prolong it. But we need to be exploring relief for families in which no other relief is available and for individuals in which no other relief is available. This provides an opportunity for potential relief. We should explore it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, what my colleagues are suggesting here is that we just pull a plant from someplace or something off the shelf and we give it to children, something that has not been a practice in probably 100 years.

□ 0130

We just don't do it that way. That is why we spend millions, if not billions,

of dollars of research to be sure that what we give the public is going to be healthy for them and safe for them.

You may recall a drug that was prescribed for pregnancy, nausea and pregnancy, which was approved back in Europe but not approved here, and we found out that babies were born without arms and legs as a result. Saving children in America—why? Because we waited to be sure that not only was it efficacious, but it was safe.

So I would say to my friends, my heart is in the same place. I want to see treatment for children who may have severe seizure disorders. We have it on a fast track. We may be months away.

But I don't think turning this over to parents and others who may fiddle with it and experiment with it, in essence, making our children guinea pigs, is the right way to go.

There are centers that are doing these studies, and certainly children can go and talk to those doctors, get on their studies, and get the trials. But I would again warn people that the preliminary results are not good, and in some cases we are seeing adverse side effects.

So I think we need to stay with the scientific method. We need to stay with the discipline that has made us the leader in the world when it comes to health care. We should not depart from something that has been proven right.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my friend.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank Mr. PERRY for his work on this.

I have a friend in my district who has been seen on TV many times because they have to carry their child to Colorado for this treatment. And I have had extensive discussions not only with people in Georgia who need this treatment for their kids, but with the sheriffs of my district as well. I certainly wouldn't support the cannabis oil and the use of cannabis oil and those type of things if my local sheriffs were not in favor of it.

You might be interested to know that the Georgia Sheriffs' Association actually endorsed a piece of legislation a couple of years ago that would allow the use of cannabis oil for these children with seizures.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, some things have been said about the side effects of this. These are not the same side effects as with people who smoke marijuana. This is not smoke. This is an oil extract, usually given with the care of a doctor. It is not some weed grown along the road; it is actually classified in the therapeutic temp category because the plant has very scientific properties.

I understand and I respect the gentleman from Louisiana very much. When he says that he is concerned

about the side effects for these children, understand children are in hospice, they are looking at their final days, their parents are looking at their final days. They take the oil extract and they start on the road to recovery. The side effect is the choice of death or life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement the United States Global Climate Research Program's National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866.

Mr. PERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents funds from being used for the implementation of the United States Global Climate Research Program's National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866.

Mr. Chairman, this administration and others before it have taken unilateral actions that push a climate change agenda that hinders our own domestic business and industry.

Programs such as the United States Global Climate Research Program's National Climate Assessment and Agenda 21 drive burdensome regulations on unsound science, such as the new ozone rules set to take effect this

October, the waters of the United States, and regulations on coal-fired power plants.

I wonder why do we want to fund programs, panels, and treaties that create propaganda, propaganda that looks to drive industry out of this country.

With that, I urge passage of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object, but I am in opposition to the amendment. So as long as the chairman will yield me half of the time, I think we are fine.

Mr. CULBERSON. Of course.

Mr. FATTAH. Go right ahead.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do want to express my support for the gentleman's amendment. I think it is very important that we restrict this or any other President's ability to enter into agreements that would interfere with our rights as Americans, would interfere with the laws as enacted by Congress. And that is the intent of your amendment, to ensure that the laws enacted by Congress or by the legislatures of the several States reign supreme and no President can enter into any kind of an agreement. We are not going to subject ourselves to the law of the U.N. or any of these other agreements in here. So I strongly support the gentleman's agreement.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. And just as strongly as the chairman supports it, I oppose it. Even though I supported your last amendment, this one is headed in the wrong direction.

We have a need to deal with the challenges around our stewardship of the planet Earth and the questions around climate and working with our international neighbors.

I want to commend the administration for getting an agreement with China around some of these issues. It is necessary for our children and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren that we act as proper stewards. It is our obligation, at least in most of our religious teachings, that we have a responsibility to be good stewards.

So we can't ignore even for the point of profits. You mentioned how this might interfere with business interests. It is beyond the question of business interests. We need clean water, clean air, we need a climate that is capable of human habitation, at least until we can have Europa as a second exit opportunity. This is the only planet for human beings that we know of and we, therefore, have a responsibility.

And the President under our Constitution is the carrier of our inter-

national activities in terms of the conduct of foreign policy, not this President or some other President, but the President of the United States has that burden and that responsibility under our Constitution.

So I would hope that the House would vote this down. I know we won't. But I also know that there will be another day in which this legislation will have to be considered in a format in which it won't be just the House majority making these decisions.

And thank God for that, because even the House majority could be wrong every once in a while, as proven by this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect the thoughts of my good colleague and good friend from Pennsylvania. I also want to remind him that we went through this last session. This very same amendment passed by vote. And while we do absolutely have the requirement and responsibility for the stewardship of the planet, I just want to remind everybody here, in case you don't know, we have these new ozone rules coming out, set to come out, or be codified in October. Yet from this administration's EPA, ozone levels have plummeted 33 percent since 1980. That is reported from the current administration's EPA. Let me just repeat that: ozone levels have plummeted 33 percent since 1980 because of the good work we have done. Yet in a downturn economy where the economy is actually contracted in the first quarter, we seek to force more unnecessary rules that are unvetted by this Congress, this people's House, on the businesses of America and also things like United Nations Agenda 21.

□ 0140

I just feel like those rules and those regulations should come at the vetting of this body instead of by the United Nations. What is good for America should be handled by Americans.

I thank the chairman for his support.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to enforce the Fair Housing Act in a manner that relies upon an allegation of liability under section 100.500 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise today to offer an amendment that stops the Justice Department from using one of the most dangerous and illogical theories of all time, the theory of disparate impact.

In short, disparate impact allows the government to allege discrimination on the basis of race or other factors based solely on statistical analyses that find disproportionate results among different groups of people.

In recent years, the Justice Department has increasingly used this dubious theory in lawsuits against mortgage lenders, insurers, and landlords and has forced these companies to pay multimillion-dollar settlements.

What is wrong with that, one might ask? Under disparate impact, one could never have intentionally discriminated in any way and even have strong antidiscriminatory policies in place and still be found to have discriminated.

For example, if mortgage lenders use a completely objective standard to assess credit risk, such as the debt-to-income ratio, they can still be found to have discriminated if the data show different loan approval rates for different groups of consumers.

To be clear, I have zero tolerance for discrimination in any form; and, if there is intentional discrimination, we must prosecute to the fullest extent of the law. The Justice Department's use of disparate impact, however, tries to fight one injustice with another.

On a more practical level, disparate impact will make it difficult, if not impossible, for lenders to make rational economic decisions about risk. Lenders will feel pressured to weaken their standards to keep their lending statistics in line with whatever the Justice Department's bureaucrats consider nondiscriminatory.

We have seen the damage risky lending can do to our economy. It is truly reckless for our government now to be encouraging those dangerous and shortsighted practices. Ironically, disparate impact forces lenders, insurers, and landlords to constantly take race, ethnicity, gender, and other factors into account or risk running afoul of the Justice Department.

Mr. Chairman, even an accusation of discrimination could have a devastating impact on a small business. Therefore, on balance, disparate impact will make it more difficult and expensive for families to buy a home, and it will result in more discrimination, not less.

For these reasons, both philosophical and practical, I ask my colleagues to

reject this misguided theory by supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, this is obviously an important signal from the majority to Americans of color, whether they be Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, or Native Americans, that the one thing that they don't want is to enforce the fair housing laws and that they don't want to have a circumstance in which, even though the impact of a set of policies means that you are excluded, that somehow there should not be any redress for that.

We went through this debate last year. I am going to ask for a recorded vote on this as I think it is an important indication of the nature of inclusiveness that is being offered to America by the House majority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is an indication of something. It is an indication of whether this House is more concerned about actually filing true intentional discrimination or is just creating fear in this area by saying that we are going after discrimination based upon disparate impact.

It is about whether this House is more concerned about making things easier for all races, for all ethnicities, for all ethnic groups to be able to buy homes and to live and prosper and enjoy a new home or make it more difficult to be able to buy that first home.

Allowing the Justice Department to use disparate impact will do just that. It will make it more difficult for those individuals who now find it difficult to buy a home because lenders will not be able to use the proper risk analysis to make those decisions and, therefore, will be less likely to make those loans.

For those reasons and for the other philosophical and practical reasons I have already stated, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, the gentleman said for practical and other philosophical reasons.

I guess, if you looked at Major League Baseball and if you didn't see anybody of color, you could assume that there was a disparate impact until Jackie Robinson showed up, but American baseball is a lot better, and I think that our country is a lot stronger because of the diversity that exists.

I think the fair housing laws have played an important role in at least the idea that we think that you shouldn't have a circumstance in which, no matter what the set of policies, if you are a different color or ethnic background, you shouldn't apply.

I think it is something that we have rejected as a nation. I hope we reject

this amendment, and I will seek a recorded vote on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Justice's clemency initiative announced on April 23, 2014, or for Clemency Project 2014, or to transfer or temporarily assign employees to the Office of the Pardon Attorney for the purpose of screening clemency applications.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds from this bill from being used to transfer or detail employees to the Office of the Pardon Attorney to support the administration's so-called clemency project.

The President possesses the constitutional authority "to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States." However, in the first 5 years of his administration, President Obama granted fewer pardons and commutations than any of his recent predecessors.

Last year, the Deputy Attorney General took the unprecedented step of asking the defense bar for assistance in recruiting candidates for executive clemency, specifically for Federal drug offenders. The Justice Department intends to beef up its Office of the Pardon Attorney to process applications for commutations of sentence for Federal drug offenders.

The Justice Department is also accepting pro bono legal work from the ACLU and other defense attorney organizations for this initiative. This amendment would prohibit that.

The Constitution gives the President the pardon power, but the fact that the President has chosen to use that power solely on behalf of drug offenders shows that this is little more than a political ploy by the administration to bypass Congress.

This is not, as the Founders intended, an exercise of the power to provide for "exceptions in favor of unfortunate guilt," but the use of the pardon

power to benefit an entire class of offenders duly convicted in a court of law.

□ 0150

It is also just the latest example of the executive overreach by this administration, and I urge support of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. The executive branch, the President of the United States, has the responsibility to review applications for pardons and clemency, and this would interfere with the executive branch's responsibility in that regard. I think that it would also hamper our ability to move this bill to a position of final passage and signature by the President. I am opposed to it.

I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania was able to have an opportunity to offer it and air his point of view, but I think when we have a President perhaps of a different party, there will be less enthusiasm for trying to unnecessarily interfere in the proper role of the executive, which clemencies and pardons are in the purview of the President; and detailing employees of the executive branch, for the Republican Party that is for normally streamlining and making nimble and allowing managers to set priorities and to move personnel around, to suggest that they somehow now are against this, I assume there is some particular reason, and it couldn't be anything other than on the merits I am certain.

I thank the gentleman, and I would stand in opposition to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining, and the other gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I would share with my good friend from Pennsylvania, no matter who is in the White House, Republican or Democrat, my enthusiasm is always at an all-time high, particularly when it comes to following the law.

The President does have the authority to pardon, but not to, as he has done here, zeroed in on a specific class of individuals who broke the law, and that is people who use drugs, sell drugs, made profits from drugs, and were duly found guilty and sentenced. This is just a way for this administration to bypass the drug laws that they don't agree with.

This administration is known for that. If they don't agree with something, they just try to bypass it, as they have done numerous times with Congress. But, fortunately, the United States Supreme Court has slapped this administration down numerous times

because of bypassing Congress and making decisions that are not in its authority.

So let's be realistic about this. This isn't an issue of politics, from my perspective. I do say it is an issue of politics from the administration's perspective.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman, if he needs the time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to express my support for the gentleman's amendment. I am concerned about the efforts of this White House to repeatedly ignore the laws enacted by Congress. If we didn't have this track record from this President who has made a deliberate effort to evade the laws written by Congress and attempted to bypass them at every opportunity—the President has lost a record number of cases before the Supreme Court.

I believe, Mr. MARINO, the Supreme Court has ruled against the President unilaterally on repeated occasions when the White House has attempted to avoid a statute and refused to enforce it, and Mr. MARINO brings to the table tonight experience as a prosecutor, very valid concerns about granting clemency to a whole category of people rather than as in the case of a pardon, which is on an individual basis.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, we have, and it must be just inherent for politicians, selective amnesia. We kind of remember what we want to remember, and we forget what we want to forget.

Now, it has been uttered on the floor of the House that no President has done some broad swath of clemencies or pardons. Well, it was President Ford who offered and President Carter who implemented a clemency or amnesty for hundreds of thousands of people who had evaded the draft during the Vietnam war.

This has nothing to do with the implementation of the laws set by our Congress. This right to the Presidency of pardons and clemency is given in the Constitution. The point here is that it is just another effort, this consistent drumbeat about our President.

This will not be the law at the end of the day when this bill is passed. I oppose it, and there is no President that is going to sign away their executive authority. It would diminish the power of the Presidency. And perhaps for the majority if they were to gain this Presidency again—and I am sure they will on some election—they wouldn't want to diminish the power of the Presidency. I think it is just ill-fated and it is focused at a particular effort at this moment, but it does not represent a historical fact that a President has not provided broad exemption or clemency or pardons in our past.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MARINO. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARINO. I am sure in my remarks my colleague is not referring to any comment that I made that no other President has done something of this nature. I came to Congress in 2011. Really, my concern is what is happening with this administration, not past administrations. I am dwelling on the future and the rule of law.

It is very clear what this administration is doing when it comes to the rule of law or the lack of rule of law. Once again, this administration does not like the drug laws. It has a very difficult time with the criminal laws that are on the books.

I was a prosecutor for 18 years at the State level and the Federal level. I have seen what takes place concerning drugs. I have put people in prison for selling drugs; I have put people in prison for hurting people who they sell drugs to; and I have taken the position where some people did not deserve to go to prison based on several factors. But the individuals that I sent to prison, and I think, overwhelmingly, according to the criteria that this administration has set, they are talking about individuals that have a sentence of 10 years or less, that is quite a sentence to pardon, because those individuals who have been sent to prison, in my experience, for 5 and 6 and 10 years are major drug dealers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to enforce:

1) Amendment 40 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico published in the Federal Register on April 22, 2015 or any other effort of the same substance, or

2) Red Snapper Management Measures published in the Federal Register on May 1, 2015 or any other effort of the same substance that establishes an-4 annual catch limits or annual catch targets for Red Snapper that would result in the commercial fishing for Red Snapper in the federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico lasting longer than five times the number of days recreational fishers are allowed to catch and retain at least two such fish each day in such federal waters.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, first I would like to thank the Parliamentarians for helping us work with this language. I would like to especially thank both the majority and the minority staff for giving me the courtesy of presenting this. I know it is late, and we certainly hoped to close by 2 a.m.

It is the third day of what has been designated as the 10-day red snapper season for a man or woman who simply wants to take their child fishing in the Gulf of Mexico.

□ 0200

The commercial fishermen get to fish 365 days a year. The charter boat anglers get to fish 45 days a year.

What this amendment does is it says that the National Fisheries Service cannot enforce a rule that was adopted that is, quite honestly, probably going to court. And then it says that as they go forward and they pass the rules in the future, the recreational fishermen should receive at least 20 percent of the number of days as the commercial fisherman does with regard to the red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico.

That is effectively what it does. It still allows them to set the seasons. It does have some restriction in that they just can't take from the recreational fishermen. They have to give the recreational not-for-hire and for-hire 20 percent of the number of calendar days that they give the commercial fishermen to fish for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia because I need to ask a question about this.

You say that the commercial catch limits for fishing days are 360 days a year? And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Yes, sir. They can fish year-round for red snapper. It is different for different species. This is tailored specifically to this species.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, we are talking red snapper, right? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. FATTAH. But for the recreational fisherman, taking your sons out to fish for the day, there is a limit of 10 days?

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Yes, sir. This is the third day of the 10-day season for the Federal waters for the recreational fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, in spirit, I support this. I don't know what the unintended consequences are. So I would be prepared to accept it, as long as we can dig into it and make sure there are no unintended circumstances.

I know this is a very parochial matter. I think you should be able to take your kid out fishing. I don't think that profit is the only motivator in the world. I don't know why it would be so arbitrary a cut line.

At this point I would like to work with the chairman on this. I would be prepared to accept it at this time. If we find some major problem with it, we will jump up and down about it then.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I completely agree, and I join my ranking member in accepting this amendment and working with you. If there is something we didn't spot or anticipate, we will work it out. But I think the gentleman has got a good amendment, and I would agree, I would recommend we would accept it.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that as a dad, honestly, I would like to say thank you for doing this. And certainly, if there are unintended consequences, I would look forward to working with you to resolve those unintended consequences.

Again, as a father of a son named Wells and a daughter named Carmen and a lovely wife named Vivien, I just want to say thank you.

Mr. FATTAH. My wife is a fly fisher. We are not doing red snapper. But I understand the spirit of it, and we will take it at that, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. STIVERS, 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. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today until 6:45 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 802. An act to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, June 3, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1672. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, OUSD (AT&L) DPAP/DARS, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Offset Costs (DFARS Case 2015-D028) (RIN: 0750-AI59) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1673. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the twenty-fifth "Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit Card Operations of Depository Institutions", pursuant to Sec. 8 of the Fair Credit and Charge Card Disclosure Act of 1988; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1674. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving Emirates Airlines of Dubai, United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1675. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the "2014 Annual Report to the Congress on the Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Fund", pursuant to Sec. 803A of the Native American Programs Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1676. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received June 1, 2015, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1677. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Local Number Portability Porting Interval and Validation Requirements, Telephone Number Portability, Numbering Resource Optimization [WC Docket No.: 07-244] [CC Docket No.: 95-116] [CC Docket No.: 99-200] received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1678. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Japan, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-35; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1679. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 150511438-5438-01] (RIN: 0694-AG62) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1680. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Revisions and Clarifications for Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine [Docket No.: 150302205-5205-01] (RIN: 0694-AG54) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1681. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1682. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period ending March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Pub. L. 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1683. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Air Force, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1684. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Relations, Corporation For National and Community Service, transmitting the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress along with the Corporation for National and Community Service's Report on Final Action, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Pub. L. 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1685. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress covering the 6-month period that ended March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Pub. L. 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1686. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final report, entitled "U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Met Many Requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 but Did Not Fully Comply for Fiscal Year 2014", pursuant to the Improper Pay-

ments Information Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-300), as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1687. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Section 5(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (Pub. L. 95-452); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1688. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Federal Election Commission Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress during the reporting period of October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1689. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (Pub. L. 95-452); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1690. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the "Administrator's Semiannual Management Report to the Congress" for the period of October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Pub. L. 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1691. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report for October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (Pub. L. 95-452); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1692. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "ANC 7F Did Not Fully Comply with the ANC Act"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1693. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to the appropriate committees of the Congress, for the period October 1, 2014, through March 30, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Pub. L. 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1694. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers who were employed at Grand Junction Facilities site in Grand Junction, Colorado, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 and 42 C.F.R. pt. 83; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1695. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers who were employed at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 and 42 C.F.R. pt. 83; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1696. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the activities of the Department regarding pre-1970 racially motivated homicides, pursuant to the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1697. A letter from the Director, Mitigation Division, FEMA Region V, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a letter regarding the Troy Local Flood Protection Project (Section R1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1698. A letter from the Program Manager, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants for Adaptive Sports Programs for Disabled Veterans and Disabled Members of the Armed Forces (RIN: 2900-AP07) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-136). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H.R. 2602. A bill to enhance enforcement of laws related to cybercrimes against persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2603. A bill to provide for the creation of a safe harbor for defendants in medical malpractice actions who demonstrate adherence to clinical practice guidelines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 2604. A bill to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2605. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the supervision of fiduciaries of veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to discontinue funding for landscaping and scenic enhancement; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr.

MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 2607. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7802 37th Avenue in Jackson Heights, New York, as the “Jeanne and Jules Manford Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow manufacturing businesses to establish tax-free manufacturing reinvestment accounts to assist them in providing for new equipment and facilities and workforce training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 2609. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal the transportation alternatives program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HURD of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. BUCK, Ms. GRAHAM, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 2610. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2611. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide that certain firearms listed as curios or relics may be imported into the United States by a licensed importer without obtaining authorization from the Department of State or the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 2612. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2613. A bill to provide for the development and use of technology for personalized handguns, to require that all handguns manufactured or sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate such technology, 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. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2614. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an expert advisory panel regarding relative value scale process used under the Medicare physician

fee schedule, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2615. A bill to establish the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 2616. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on urban flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 2617. A bill to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to postpone a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2618. A bill to amend the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 to provide an exemption from the protections of that Act with regard to certain prospective employees whose job would include caring for or interacting with children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to Patriot employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 2620. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2621. A bill to impose sanctions against individuals who are nationals of the People's Republic of China who are responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against other individuals in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2622. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a registry of certain veterans who were stationed at Fort McClellan, Alabama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H. Res. 289. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that gun violence is a public health issue and Congress should enact by the end of the 114th Congress comprehensive Federal legislation that protects the Second Amendment and keeps communities safe and healthy, includ-

ing expanding enforceable background checks for all commercial gun sales, improving the mental health system in the United States, and making gun trafficking and straw purchasing a Federal crime; 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. PITTS (for himself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 290. A resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H. Res. 291. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the purchase of the territories known as the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

36. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1019, commending Israel for its cordial and mutually beneficial relationship with the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

37. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial No. 2005, urging the United States Government to immediately and not later than December 31, 2019 dispose of the public lands within Arizona's borders directly to the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

38. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1001, urging the Congress to oppose the designation of the Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument in Northern Arizona; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

39. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 9, urging the President to allow an additional 25,000 refugee visas for displaced Iraqis, with preference for placement in Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

40. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Memorial 1002, urging the Congress to enact legislation that confirms that state law determines the entire scope of R.S. 2477 Right-of-Way; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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 Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.
Article III, Section 1.
Article III, Section 2, Clause 1.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 2605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: “The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To establish Post Offices and post Roads . . .”

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5, of the United States Constitution: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 2615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (Territories Clause)

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 2617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 2618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 2620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (“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”)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (“To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes”)

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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 9: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 156: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 160: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 167: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 213: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 223: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 224: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 232: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 282: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 343: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 425: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 456: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 463: Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MICA, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 465: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 467: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 472: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 484: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 511: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 539: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 546: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 556: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HANNA, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 572: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 581: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 624: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 649: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 662: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 664: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 702: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 703: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 711: Mr. NUNES and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 729: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 762: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 775: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 776: Mr. HANNA and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 800: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 817: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 829: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 835: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 836: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 840: Mr. HINOJOSA and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 845: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 864: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 879: Mr. HANNA and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 893: Mr. BARR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SALMON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 913: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 918: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 928: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 969: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 971: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 986: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 990: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1008: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1062: Mr. HARDY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1111: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1116: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1120: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1150: Mr. DOLD, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1171: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1188: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1190: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1192: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1194: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1197: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1218: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1220: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. AMODEI, Mr.

- HASTINGS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 1258: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 1274: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1284: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 1286: Mr. AGUILAR.
- H.R. 1288: Mr. KILMER and Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 1301: Mr. GROTHMAN.
- H.R. 1321: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1342: Mr. COFFMAN.
- H.R. 1378: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 1388: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 1399: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 1413: Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 1424: Mr. FINCHER.
- H.R. 1434: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TAKAI, and Ms. PLASKETT.
- H.R. 1462: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 1475: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 1482: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 1516: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 1518: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. HARDY.
- H.R. 1550: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 1571: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1586: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 1587: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 1594: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. HARDY.
- H.R. 1595: Mr. ROYCE.
- H.R. 1608: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 1610: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 1632: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 1635: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 1652: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
- H.R. 1654: Mr. HOLDING.
- H.R. 1660: Mr. RIBBLE and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
- H.R. 1661: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
- H.R. 1676: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 1677: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 1706: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 1718: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 1728: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 1734: Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 1736: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
- H.R. 1737: Mr. HANNA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VELA, and Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 1742: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1752: Mr. BOST and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 1769: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LEE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
- H.R. 1786: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 1801: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. RICHMOND.
- H.R. 1804: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 1814: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIND, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 1818: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 1853: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 1854: Mr. JOLLY.
- H.R. 1861: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 1868: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1882: Mrs. BEATTY.
- H.R. 1902: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 1910: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1919: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1933: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 1942: Mr. BEYER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 1948: Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 1961: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1977: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 1986: Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 1989: Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 1994: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 2017: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. WHITFIELD.
- H.R. 2019: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. MCCCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 2025: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2033: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 2043: Mr. STIVERS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 2050: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 2090: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 2096: Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 2124: Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 2128: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 2134: Mr. HURD of Texas.
- H.R. 2152: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 2156: Mr. KATKO, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 2167: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 2191: Mr. BARTON.
- H.R. 2193: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 2205: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2210: Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 2213: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 2242: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 2246: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 2248: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 2254: Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 2258: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BRAT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. JORDAN.
- H.R. 2259: Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COLE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 2275: Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 2290: Mr. LATTA, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. SALMON.
- H.R. 2296: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 2300: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 2302: Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 2309: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. KLINE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
- H.R. 2400: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DOLD, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. REED.
- H.R. 2403: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COOK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 2404: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 2405: Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 2406: Mr. BABIN.
- H.R. 2412: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. GABBARD.
- H.R. 2429: Mr. CONNOLLY.
- H.R. 2441: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 2442: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VARGAS.
- H.R. 2457: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 2488: Mr. JOYCE.
- H.R. 2494: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 2504: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. KNIGHT.
- H.R. 2506: Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 2507: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 2513: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 2514: Mr. WHITFIELD.
- H.R. 2516: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 2520: Mr. BARR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. CHABOT.
- H.R. 2522: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 2536: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2540: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 2560: Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 2576: Mr. HARPER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 2590: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 2591: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.J. Res. 25: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
- H. Res. 28: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BASS.
- H. Res. 54: Ms. BASS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. MCSALLY.
- H. Res. 56: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H. Res. 108: Mr. ROKITA.
- H. Res. 110: Mr. KILMER.
- H. Res. 112: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H. Res. 130: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
- H. Res. 147: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H. Res. 157: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H. Res. 206: Ms. SINEMA.
- H. Res. 210: Mr. RIBBLE.
- H. Res. 233: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MICA, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. BASS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H. Res. 235: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mrs. BEATTY.
- H. Res. 250: Ms. MCSALLY.
- H. Res. 262: Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H. Res. 275: Ms. SPEIER.
- H. Res. 276: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H. Res. 282: Mr. DESAULNIER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative Conaway, or a designee, to H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1994: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

11. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, County of Cape May, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 381-15, urging the President to recognize the plight of American citizens currently unjustly imprisoned and facing death in Iranian governmental custody; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 45, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$288,500,000)".

Page 47, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$689,800,000)".

Page 47, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 47, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 47, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 48, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced to \$0)".

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$978,300,000)".

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 45, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$288,500,000)".

Page 156, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$288,500,000)".

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide rental housing assistance, a direct loan secured by a residence, or insurance or guarantee for a loan or mortgage secured by a residence, to any individual who does not have lawful status in the United States or financial assistance in violation of section 214(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 1436a(d)).

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 53, line 11, strike the colon and all that follows through line 15 and insert a period.

H.R. 2577

OFFERED BY: MR. NEWHOUSE

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue, implement, or enforce any regulation by the Federal Aviation Administration relating to the operation and certification of small unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) that does not make consideration of the use of small UAS for agricultural applications.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. MACARTHUR

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 23, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$750,000)".

Page 38, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$750,000)".

Page 40, line 10, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$750,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 14, lines 1, 18, and 19, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$60,760,000) (increased by \$60,760,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. PITTINGER

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 32, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 72, line 7, after each of the dollar amounts, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 7, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$17,300,000)".

Page 38, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$17,300,000)".

Page 41, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$17,300,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program and

for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities for which funds are made available under this Act as part of the \$125,000,000 for DNA-related and forensic programs and activities, unless such funds are used in accordance with paragraphs (3) and (4) of section (2)(c) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-546; 42 U.S.C. 14135).

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce section 221 of title 13, United States Code, with respect to the survey, conducted by the Secretary of Commerce, commonly referred to as the "American Community Survey".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 17: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of Justice or the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 101(m) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(m)) alter the product or service of the person to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 101(f) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1801(f)) of any user of such product or service.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. CONAWAY

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any rule prohibiting the export of crude oil under section 103 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6212).

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 19: Page 3, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$311,788,000)".

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$311,788,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 20: Page 4 line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,500,000)".

Page 6 line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 15 line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,700,000)".

Page 15, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,700,000)".

Page 15, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,700,000)".

Page 24, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,719,000)".

Page 24, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,423,000)".

Page 26, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$35,000,000)".

Page 28, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$750,000)".

Page 29, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 29, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,200,000)".

Page 30, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 31, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,806,000)”.

Page 32, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$111,199,000)”.

Page 33, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$40,625,000)”.

Page 33, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$49,000,000)”.

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$136,500,000)”.

Page 36, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$124,000,000)”.

Page 38, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$11,060,000)”.

Page 38, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 38, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 41, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$60,000)”.

Page 41, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$70,400,000)”.

Page 43, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$33,000,000)”.

Page 43, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 43, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$35,000,000)”.

Page 46, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,400,000)”.

Page 47, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 49, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 49, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$52,500,000)”.

Page 49, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 60, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$29,000,000)”.

Page 61, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$402,600,000)”.

Page 61, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,650,000)”.

Page 61, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,650,000)”.

Page 61, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,650,000)”.

Page 62, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,650,000)”.

Page 62, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$129,500,000)”.

Page 63, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$9,700,000)”.

Page 64, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,900,000)”.

Page 65, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$400,000)”.

Page 66, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 69, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$730,000)”.

Page 98, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,398,212,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 21: Page 16, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$147 million to fund the construction of an Ocean Survey Vessel)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 22: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commis-

sion of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to compel a person to testify about information or sources that the person states in a motion to quash the subpoena that he has obtained as a journalist or reporter and that he regards as confidential.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCLINTOCK

AMENDMENT NO. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used, with respect to any of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, to prevent any of them from implementing their own laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of marijuana on non-Federal lands within their respective jurisdictions.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. HUDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat any M855 (5.56 mm x 45 mm) or SS109 type ammunition as armor piercing ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

AMENDMENT NO. 26: Page 23, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(decreased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 42, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 44, line 8, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 24, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$13,800,000)”.

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$13,800,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 38, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 47, line 7, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any inspection under section 510 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 880) with respect to narcotic drugs in schedule III, IV, or V of section 202 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 812), or combinations of such drugs, being dispensed pursuant to section 303(g)(2) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)) for maintenance or detoxification treatment.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. CONNOLLY

AMENDMENT NO. 31: Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

Page 42, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 46, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. ROUZER

AMENDMENT NO. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the State of North Carolina to implement any State law or rule that establishes or governs a logbook reporting requirement for fishermen operating under for-hire licenses.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIS

AMENDMENT NO. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to execute a subpoena of tangible things pursuant to section 506 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 876) that does not include the following sentence: “This subpoena limits the collection of any tangible things (including phone numbers dialed, telephone numbers of incoming calls, and the duration of calls) to those tangible things identified by a term that specifically identifies an individual, account, address, or personal device, and that limits, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope of the tangible things sought.”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT NO. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for Federal Prison Systems—Salaries and Expenses, and increasing the amount made available for Office of Justice Programs—Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention, by \$69,515,000.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 12, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$400,000)”.

Page 70, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$400,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 12, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 72, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$104,000,000)”.

Page 61, lines 10 and 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$104,000,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 63, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 39: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available

by this Act for the Department of Justice—Administrative Review and Appeals may be used in contravention of sections 509 and 510 of title 28, United States Code.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 40:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or enter into a trade agreement whose negotiating texts are confidential. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 41:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or enter into a trade agreement that contains an investor-state dispute settlement provision. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.