United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 29, 2014 No. 82

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, May 30, 2014, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 29, 2014

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 29, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO 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 7, 2014, 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.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today to express my disappointment that my colleagues and I were prevented from offering an amendment to the NDAA dealing with the constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war.

Like many Members of Congress, I had the opportunity to speak at events on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday on Memorial Day weekend. Every time I spoke, I mentioned my frustration that the McGovern-Jones amendment was not able to be brought to the floor for debate and a vote. However, I was pleased that ADAM SCHIFF's amendment to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force, which was passed by Congress in 2001, was at least brought up for a debate. However, I was disappointed that the Schiff amendment was defeated, because no President should have the authority to send men and women to war without action from Congress.

According to CRS, the AUMF has been invoked in 30 known instances by Presidents Bush and Obama for the purpose of deploying troops. This represents an abdication of our constitutional responsibility.

Yesterday I had the honor of visiting Walter Reed National Military Medical Center. Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster of a triple amputee. This gentleman gave his arm and both legs for our country. Yesterday at Walter Reed, during my visit, I had the privilege of talking with several of our Nation's heroes who have lost limbs, double amputees and triple amputees.

Mr. Speaker, those lost limbs as well as other injuries, both physical and mental, are why I had veterans approach me at Memorial Day events to say that they agree that Afghanistan is not worth the blood that has been shed there. Furthermore, they agreed with me that Afghanistan is not worth America continuing to borrow money from foreign nations, driving up further the debt of our Nation to fund President Karzai's corrupt government when we have a multitude of problems and needs right here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close my comments by quoting Pat Buchanan, and I believe this describes our situation in Afghanistan: ''Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world so that we can defend the world?'' I am going to repeat that one more time. ''Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world so that we can defend the world?''

Mr. Speaker, we are a debtor nation. We can't even pay our bills without going into the international markets and borrowing money to pay last year's bills. It is time that this Congress understands that we need to come back to America and rebuild America. We need to be smart with our foreign policy. We need to be smart with our men and women in uniform.

And as I look at this poster one more time, Mr. Speaker, when I saw that 23-year-old young man from Camp Lejeune, which is in my district, yesterday and his father, who is probably about 50 or 51, and the young man has both legs gone and an arm, I looked in the eyes of the father, and what I saw was pain; what I saw was worry; what I saw was sorrow.

Printed on recycled paper.

We in this Congress need to follow our constitutional responsibility and never send our young men and women to war unless we debate it and we declare war on the floor of the House.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ARTIST THORNTON DIAL

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor one of America's most prolific and self-taught artists, Mr. Thornton Dial of Bessemer, Alabama.

Today at the age of 86, Thornton Dial has lived, worked, and created art in Alabama for his entire life. From childhood, Dial was creating symbolically dense pieces of art by using castaway objects, anything he could find in his environment: pieces of wire, scrap metal, bones, tree roots. He used his environment to define his environment.

Dial's work provides a forceful and compelling narrative of the most insidious challenges and remarkable triumphs of African American history in the Deep South. His work contains layers of rich history and reflects on race and class struggles that he witnessed in the Deep South.

Dial rose to prominence in the 1990s while in his sixties through his large-scale assemblages, paintings that were made of scrap metal, pipes, very interesting visual interpretation of the history and politics that he saw around him.

Dial is described as having been one of the most amazing art biographies in art history. He is described as being a very quiet man, a listener who dressed impeccably. What he lacked in terms of formal education he more than made up for in his highly visual and historic vocabulary.

Dial's created brilliance is truly illuminating and inspiring. Dial has stayed in Alabama in the heart of the Seventh Congressional District to live and work his entire life. He was born in 1928 in Sumter County, Alabama. He was one of 12 children. And in childhood, he built his own toys because, as he said: We didn't have much.

Thornton began full-time farming at the age of 5. In his early teens, he was sent to live with his aunt in Bessemer, Alabama, where he attended Sloss Mining Camp. His peers made fun of him for his large size and for being ''country.'' His teachers told him that he would never amount to much.

I want you to know that we in the Seventh Congressional District are extremely proud of Thornton Dial because we know that he really interpreted what he saw around him in the Deep South. He interpreted it in a very creative way, and only now is he gaining such preeminence for that form of art.

Dial never really made a living as an artist. He worked for over 30 years at the Pullman Standard factory. Yes, he made boxcars for a living.

''People have fought for freedom all over the world,'' he said. ''I try to show that struggle. It is a war to be fought. We are trying to win it.''

In his time off from the Pullman factory, Dial would escape to his garage or backyard and create masterpieces out of whatever he could find. Out of fear that people would laugh at his art, he would bury his work. Later, he would dig it up and deconstruct it and reuse materials for new masterpieces.

Dial began to dedicate himself to his artwork in 1981. He founded Dial Metal Patterns, a garden furniture business, with his sons in 1983, after the Pullman Factory closed.

Dial's handmade designs were discovered by Lonnie Holley, a neighboring Black artist, in 1987. Holley brought Bill Arnett, an artist himself and a collector of African American art, from Atlanta to see Dial's work. Arnett helped him to get national attention about his art. The two finally, working together, agreed on a price for his first sculpture.

Initially, Dial offered Arnett the piece for $20, and Arnett refused the low price. He said to Mr. Dial that this piece deserves more than $20. They agreed on $200. This was the first transaction that Mr. Dial had as an artist.

Dial's work has been the subject of exhibitions across this country. At the New Museum of contemporary art and the American Folk Art Museum in New York. His work can be found in more than 15 public collections, including those of, among others, the High Museum of Art in Atlanta and the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston. Many, many people now collect his art. An art form that was considered outside art now is considered world-class art. With no formal training and education, Dial's powerful artwork stands out in the world of highly degreed artists.

Dial continues to create art today, and this weekend he will be honored by his hometown of Bessemer, Alabama. He will be honored as a great American hero and a great American artist.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this great, wonderful Alabama treasure, Thornton Dial.

VA SCANDAL

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the outrageous, the almost unimaginable findings from the ongoing VA inspector general's review of the Phoenix Health Care System and now some two dozen other facilities.

The stated VHA goal is a 14-day wait for a first-time primary care appointment—14 days, 2 weeks. It is a little much for some, but it seems appropriate, reasonable for many. That is their goal. Whether I agree with it or not, that is their goal.

However, I am going to read from the executive summary of the inspector general's allegations:

''Allegations at the Phoenix HCS include gross mismanagement of VA resources and criminal misconduct by VA senior hospital leadership, creating systemic patient safety issues and possible wrongful deaths. While our work is not complete, we have substantiated that significant delays in access to care negatively impacted the quality of care at this medical facility.''

Mr. Speaker, that is breathtaking. That is breathtaking. This is our Federal Government.

Falsified data reported last year by Phoenix HCS showed veterans waited, on average, 24 days for their first primary care appointment. Falsified data said that they waited an average of 24 days; however, the recent IG report found that veterans actually waited, on average, 115 days for their first primary care appointment, with approximately 84 percent of those waiting more than 14 days, which was the stated goal.

Mr. Speaker, 115 days for their first appointment. That is the appointment where you go talk to the doctor and you tell him what is wrong or what you think is wrong and he starts making an assessment. That is not treatment. That is just an appointment with the doctor. Mr. Speaker, 115 days.

To put it another way, VA management at Phoenix HCS met 16 percent of its wait time goal, and those folks still received bonuses for that action. The folks that do the work got a bonus for meeting 16 percent of their goal.

When people say to you, as a Representative, there are things wrong with the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, this is what is wrong with the Federal Government. Even after cooking the books, the stated goal of an average 14-day wait time was not met. Even after that.

Now, I was proud to vote for Chairman MILLER's VA Accountability Act last week, but it is a shame—I don't know what it is—that it takes an act of Congress to fire somebody in the Federal Government. If you are the Secretary and you find somebody that has done something wrong—and in these cases, potentially criminal—and you can't fire them, what is going on here?

Now, this is not a new circumstance. We have actually known about it for years. Republicans—and I have been here a year and a half—and, I imagine, Democrats have been complaining for years about this because they see it in their districts. But nothing has been done. And some will say, well, Congress hasn't appropriated the right money. Three times the amount of money since 2001 has gone to the VA for care—for care. Three times it has been increased.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, where the President says he has got a pen and a phone, I beseech you—I beseech him to call up a

veteran in this circumstance. Use the phone. Use your pen for an executive order and fix this. It is not the words, Mr. President—we are all frustrated, and we are all infuriated by this—but it is actions. These are members of the military, men and women who have served, men and women of action. Words are cheap, Mr. Speaker. It is actions that we require.

JFK said in one of his speeches that a nation is revealed by whom it honors. What is revealed by what is happening now, what has been happening, and what hasn't been happening?

Now, just to kind of show where our priorities are, let's talk about what you can get with an access card. This gentleman I am reading about bought a swordfish steak at $18.99 a pound or went to the gourmet coffee section and ground up some roasted fresh beans. I guess it is okay to buy your Halloween candy with an access card. We can provide an access card for that, but we can't find a way to provide for the veterans who took an oath?

Mr. Speaker, they said:

> I will defend this country, I will lay my life down, and I won't question. Mine is not to ask why, mine is to do or die.

Our side of the deal is that we pay, we equip you, and prepare you to fight and win, and after you come home all busted up and changed, we will take care of you.

Oh, that is what we say, but apparently that is not what we do. We can find a way to pay for these things, but not for that obligation.

Mr. Speaker, resignation is fine. But that is not going to fix it. We request the administration to take action and fix it.

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

CONSTITUENTS FACING DEPORTATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, like a lot of Americans, I spent time traveling this past holiday weekend, but I never made it to the beach. Instead, I did what I do on a lot of weekends, which is travel the country building support for comprehensive immigration reform.

I attended immigration events in Orange County and Riverside County in California, and, yesterday, I was in Richmond, Virginia, in the majority leader's backyard, listening to his constituents plead for congressional action.

One young lady told her story perfectly in two languages. She came to the United States when she was 6. Now she has deferred action and temporary protection from deportation but wants a permanent solution for herself and her U.S. citizen sister. Another woman, a mom of two U.S. citizen children, wore a GPS anklet bracelet to the event and asked me how I could help her keep her family together. She has an order of deportation for June 6.

They were pleading with the majority leader—who holds the key to the schedule and the calendar in the House—to please schedule a vote, just a simple vote on immigration reform. So far, he has refused to allow a vote.

The stories from his constituents were heartbreaking: moms whose only wish is to remain here and raise their U.S. children and not fear a deportation date or a knock on the door at dawn. Children want their moms and dads to be here to see them achieve the American Dream.

But I have to say that I had a heavy heart even before I arrived at the State capitol building in Richmond, Virginia, yesterday. The night before, I received a call letting me know that the White House intended to announce yesterday that it wasn't going to take action on Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson's review of deportation policies.

Therefore, for the next several months, the deportations will continue at a rate of 1,100 a day. Moms with U.S. citizen children, women with 25 years in this country and who have committed no crimes will get no relief in the short run.

I have talked extensively with Secretary Johnson and had no illusions that a major policy announcement was in the works. Rather there are, I think, some enforcement adjustments that can be made now that would spare thousands from counterproductive deportations that are doing more harm than good to our Nation.

I am deeply disappointed that the President chose to delay any action, and I know that many of us who have been fighting against the deportations that needlessly break up families and leave communities living in fear are also disappointed.

And as I heard the stories of the constituents of the majority leader who are facing their own deportation or deportation of a loved one, I realized that it would be harder to save them in the coming weeks and months without some kind of policy adjustments revealed by the Secretary's review.

While the Republican majority decides whether or not they will act on immigration reform and solve an important American problem, thousands more will be deported.

But I also understand what the President is trying to do. He is saying that he still has hope that the Republicans are not just playing games with immigration policy. He believes, as I do, that Republicans still could use the last 14 legislative days before July 4 to make a real difference in the lives of moms and kids that I met yesterday in Richmond, Virginia.

The excuse that House Republicans can't trust President Obama to enforce the law and therefore they will not pass immigration reform, that excuse no longer holds water, if it ever did. Yesterday, President Obama expended a great deal of political capital to give House Republicans time and space to come up with an immigration solution. It was a grand gesture on the part of the President. I know that I and a lot of my Democratic colleagues are not happy, and many in organized labor and in the pro-immigrant movement that have fought hard for policies to dial back the deportations are very, very saddened. It is not easy for a President to so fully and boldly stand up against his base, against those of us who have voted for him, loved him, and protected him, but he did it so that House Republicans could use the following weeks to take action on immigration reforms, House Republicans who have shown him nothing but disdain.

In reality, for those families facing deportation and losing their children who live in the majority leader's district, they know that both the majority leader and the President have the power to help keep them in the United States and protected with their children.

The majority leader can schedule a vote, and the President can use his pen and his phone to spare these families from what amounts to a life sentence. And of one thing I am confident: if the majority leader fails to act, the President will, and he will do so boldly.

To my House Republican colleagues, I say, please act. The country will thank you. The children and the moms that live in your districts and fear deportations will thank you, and your voters will thank you. You have 14 days to work this out.

RECOGNIZING RODNEY A. ERICKSON, PRESIDENT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rodney A. Erickson, retiring president of the Pennsylvania State University.

After 37 years at Penn State as an academic and administrator, Rodney Erickson selflessly took the role of president of the university during a troubled time. We thank him for his service, his dedication, and, most of all, his tremendous vision and leadership.

Rodney Erickson became a faculty member at Penn State in the last 1980s, and over the years, he held roles from assistant professor to dean to vice president for research, to provost and president.

At each level of service to the university, he sought new ways of teaching, better forums for learning, and innovative approaches to streamline bureaucracy and keep the university and its individual departments on the cutting edge. At every stage, he has been an inspirational leader to those around him.

A leader of and advocate for the university in countless ways, Erickson leaves behind a legacy of excellence, integrity, pride, and tireless dedication for this community to cherish and build upon for generations to come.

As a proud Penn State alumnus, I want to thank President Rodney Erickson for his commitment and his dedication to Penn State University. I also wish you and your wife, Shari, the very best with future plans for the years ahead.

YOUTH TRAFFIC SAFETY MONTH

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as well, to recognize Youth Traffic Safety Month, which is celebrated each May.

As many are aware, motor vehicle crashes continue to be the leading cause of death for teens. In fact, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, teenagers are involved in three times as many fatal crashes as all other drivers.

An even more disturbing fact is that one-third of fatal teen crashes involve a young driver who had been drinking. Also troubling is that 50 percent of high school students say they text ''at least sometimes'' while driving.

Now, these statistics are a stark reminder of how much more must be done to educate our kids on the privileges and responsibilities of operating a motor vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin the summer season, which is a dangerous time of year on the road for all drivers, let us reflect on these tragic statistics.

While Youth Traffic Safety Month is coming to a conclusion, let us recommit in the coming months, through advocacy, education, and awareness, to promote road safety and reduce the number of vehicle-related fatalities.

NUTRITIOUS SCHOOL MEALS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, providing access to healthy school meals shouldn't be controversial. We all want what is best for our kids because nothing is more important than our children. Yet, for decades, we have seen school food products—both prepared meals and packaged snacks—fail to be as healthy and nutritious as possible. Combined with other factors, we are seeing childhood obesity rates increase over that time. Not surprisingly, we have seen other health problems associated with obesity also increase.

But that began to change because of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, also known as the child nutrition reauthorization bill, which reauthorizes our school meal programs as well as the WIC program. The 2010 bill was especially important because it implemented new health and nutrition standards for schools, including issues like sodium, fruits, vegetables, and whole grains. Today, the House Appropriations Committee will vote on waiving not just these standards, but also basic, reasonable limits on calories, fat, and trans fats.

Now, I was critical of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act not because of the change in nutritional guidelines for school meals, but because the bill cuts SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, in order to pay for these improvements. Sadly, we took food away from hungry people in order to improve the nutritional quality of school meals and improve school meal reimbursements. It was one of the more difficult votes I have taken as a Member of this House, and I am still angry that we robbed Peter to pay Paul instead of using better offsets that were available at the time.

Now, that being said, I strongly support the policies in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. And that is why I am dismayed at the attacks coming from the Republicans in Congress. House and Senate Republicans are trying to roll back many of the guidelines in this important legislation.

Now, I am aware of their concerns. Some food service providers, including in my own State, tell me that these new standards cost too much, that they lead to increased food waste, that healthier products that meet these standards aren't available, and that kids just don't eat these new foods. We should work with local providers to overcome many of those challenges.

But it is important to recognize that USDA has empirical data that shows the law is actually working. Not only that, the Government Accountability Office, or GAO, confirms that the law is working as intended and that participation will get better as kids get accustomed to healthier foods.

Harvard recently documented significant increases in children's consumption of fruits and vegetables because of the Federal school food standards. That is a good thing. Data also shows that the new school meal nutrition standards do not cause schools to lose money after they are initially established.

Most importantly, USDA has the authority to work with schools, school districts, and States to address the issues that may affect participation rates. In other words, schools, school districts, and States can ask USDA for assistance in implementing these new standards at local levels, especially when kids may not be participating locally in ways that USDA either intends or sees in other areas of the country. States and localities should take advantage of this flexibility before seeking permanent changes to the law.

These school meal standards, along with the WIC food package, are science-based. That means that politics was left out of the decision-making process and left up to expert nutritionists. The reason why white potatoes, for example, were left out of the WIC program was because the experts at the Institute of Medicine said that they do not provide the necessary nutritional impact as other foods eligible for the WIC program do. That is another way of saying that white potatoes aren't healthy enough for pregnant mothers and young children.

Yet now the Republicans are trying to scrap these important nutrition standards. And they are doing so under the false pretense that it is what is best for the kids.

Mr. Speaker, look at the facts: House Republicans are supposedly acting on behalf of our kids while they tried to cut $40 billion from SNAP, while they tried to cut hundreds of millions of dollars from WIC, and while they continually ignore nutritional science by changing food packages to benefit specific industries.

The truth is their position will do real harm to our Nation's kids. We can do better. We can and should work with USDA to implement this law in a smart way and not bow down to junk food special interests. We shouldn't play politics with our kids' health just because some people don't like this administration. My Republican friends should get over it.

There is a time and place for politics. But lunch is not that time, and the school cafeteria is not that place. The health of our kids should come first.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD two letters expressing opposition to the rollback of these important nutritional standards. One is from 19 former presidents of the School Nutrition Association, and the other is from Mission Readiness, a group of retired military leaders who believe childhood obesity is a national security issue.

SCHOOL NUTRITION ASSOCIATION,
PAST PRESIDENTS INITIATIVE,
May 27, 2014.

The Honorable (Senate and House Members of Committees on Agriculture Appropriations):

DEAR AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE COMMITTEE: Thank you for passing the Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 that is helping school nutrition programs be part of a strong response to the nation's obesity epidemic. Most schools are having success implementing the HHFKA. However some schools report difficulty meeting the requirements and are requesting waivers.

We the undersigned past presidents of the School Nutrition Association, understand that major change takes time and a commitment to the goal that prompted the change. We believe most communities and schools want school nutrition programs that help children learn to enjoy healthy foods. We are confident that the broad public support for HHFKA and USDA's demonstrated willingness to work with school leaders to solve implementation issues will prevail and create stronger school nutrition programs.

We urge you to reject calls for waivers, maintain strong standards in all schools, and direct USDA to continue working with school leaders and state directors to find ways, including technical assistance, that will ensure all schools can meet the HHFKA standards. Specific concerns regarding whole grains and sodium can be addressed as technical corrections. We must not reverse the progress that was sought by school leaders and is well on its way to success in most schools. Should you need additional information please contact Jane Wynn or Shirley Watkins.

Sincerely,

Shirley Watkins, former USDA Under Secretary FNCS; Katie Wilson, PhD, Executive Director National Food Service Management Institute; Josephine Martin, PhD, former Executive Director National Food Service Management; Institute Dorothy Caldwell, former USDA Deputy Administrator of FNS; Mary Nix former Cobb County, GA School Nutrition Director; Jane Wynn, former Broward County, FL School Nutrition Director; Anne Gennings, former New Hartford, NY School Nutrition Director; Mary Hill, Director of School Nutrition, Jackson, MS; Dora Rivas, Executive Director Food & Child Nutrition Services Dallas ISD, TX; Helen Phillips, Senior Director School Nutrition Norfolk, VA; Elizabeth McPherson, Former Food Service Director Caswell, NC; Phyllis Griffith, Former Child Nutrition Services Director Columbus, OH; Nancy Rice, State Director GA Child Nutrition Programs; Gene White, President Global Child Nutrition Foundation; Marcia Smith, PhD, former Food Service Director, Polk County, FL; Gaye Lynn MacDonald, Consultant & Former Food Service Director Bellingham, WA; Penny McConnell, Director of Food Service Fairfax County, VA; Beverly Lowe, Consultant, Former Food Service Director Hampton, VA; Thelma Becker, Retired Former Food Service Director PA.

MISSION: READINESS,
MILITARY LEADERS FOR KIDS,
Washington, DC, May 28, 2014.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: On behalf of the nearly 450 retired admirals and generals of Mission: Readiness, I write in support of efforts designed to improve the nutritional quality of foods served in schools. As you consider the FY 2015 Agriculture Appropriations bill, we respectfully urge you to:

Support the implementation of heightened school meal standards and refrain from any weakening or delay of science-based guidelines; and

Support the $25 million included for School Meal Equipment Grants.

Mission: Readiness is the national security organization of retired admirals and generals who have mobilized in response to Department of Defense data indicating that 75 percent of all young Americans between the ages of 17 and 24 are unable to join the military because they are medically or physically unfit, are too poorly educated, or have disqualifying criminal records. A shrinking pool of eligible Americans is a threat to our national security.

Overweight and obesity are of particular concern to the military. Excess body fat has become the leading medical disqualifier for military service. Today, more than one in five Americans between the ages of 17 and 24 are too heavy to enlist. As a result, hundreds of potential recruits fail the physical entrance exam every month because they are too overweight. In fact, between 2006 and 2011, the U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command reported that over 62,000 individuals were turned away because of their weight.

Failure to meet weight-height requirements is not just a problem among potential recruits. The data show that excess weight impacts those who have already enlisted as well. Every year, the military discharges over 1,200 first-term enlistees before their contracts are up due to weight problems; the military must then recruit and train their replacements at a cost of $75,000 per person, totaling roughly $90 million annually. This pales in comparison to the estimated $1.1 billion per year that the Department of Defense spends on medical care associated with excess fat and obesity through TRICARE.

American youth spend more time in school than anywhere else outside of their homes. Children consume up to half of their daily calories during school hours, and the childhood years lay the foundation for lifelong eating habits—for better or for worse. As such, the food they receive at school plays a critical role in supporting their long-term health.

Thanks to newly updated U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) nutrition standards, requirements for school meals have been updated to align with current nutrition science. Schools are now serving more fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and low-fat or no-fat dairy options while offering fewer empty calories and high-fat options.

EVIDENCE-BASED NUTRITION STANDARDS

Overall, schools across the country have done a commendable job in moving forward with the implementation of updated school meal standards. Implementation is never an easy process, and there have certainly been challenges, but by and large, schools are on the right track. Recent data shows that more than 90 percent of schools are currently in compliance with science-based standards. Reports also indicate that fruit and vegetable consumption have increased. Schools are capable of serving healthier foods and the vast majority are already doing so. We are at an important juncture. Rather than retreating from science-based standards, we need to continue to advance.

In addition to the progress made on school meals, we are also pleased with updated snack food standards, which closely adhere to recommendations made by the Institute of Medicine. Schools have made great headway in serving healthier food, but to finish the job it is critically important that we move forward in addressing the other half of the school food environment—foods sold in vending machines, snack bars and a la carte lines. Because healthier schools meals are compromised by the over 400 billion calories from junk food being sold in schools each year, revised standards for competitive foods are essential supporting good nutrition habits. Moreover, data shows that improving snack food standards can actually help increase revenues by driving up participation in the school lunch and breakfast programs.

Given the national security implications of child obesity, we respectfully urge members of the Committee to refrain from pursuing any Congressional action that would weaken or delay the implementation of science-based school nutrition standards. Instead, Congress should defer to USDA to provide any needed flexibility for schools, such as the recently announced flexibility for whole grain pasta.

SCHOOL CAFETERIA EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE

Many school kitchens are struggling against outdated facilities to efficiently prepare healthy meals for their students. Although more than 90 percent of schools across the nation are successfully meeting science-based standards, many report that they are forced to make-do with costly and inefficient workarounds. Designed primarily to reheat and hold food, many kitchens need new equipment capable of preparing healthier options. As such, we strongly support additional resources for School Meal Equipment Grants. We were pleased to see $25 million included for these grants in the subcommittee's mark and urge continued support for this important funding stream.

Thank you for your attention to these important issues. Together, we can make sure that America's child obesity crisis does not become a national security crisis.

Very respectfully,

MIRIAM ROLLIN,
Acting National Director.

□ 1030

LET'S ACKNOWLEDGE OBAMACARE DOESN'T WORK

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, recently, some politicians in Washington and even back in my home State of Kentucky have held out Kentucky's online exchange, or Kentucky Kynect, as a model for how the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, can be implemented successfully. They argue that ObamaCare is working in Kentucky.

While it is true that, unlike the billion dollar malfunctioning healthcare.gov Web site, the Kentucky Kynect Web site has appeared to function properly, but that is about all that works well.

ObamaCare is making life harder for most Kentucky families and small businesses, driving up premiums and deductibles, taking away choices of doctors and hospitals, and forcing people to lose the insurance coverage that they liked. The President promised that: if you like your health care plan, you will get to keep it.

But 280,000 of my fellow Kentuckians have lost the health insurance that they had, the health insurance that they liked. The government is taking away choices. Patients, families, and doctors should be in control of their health care, but ObamaCare takes choices away from people.

One insurance broker in Kentucky told me that insurance on the Kentucky Kynect exchange, the replacement for all of those canceled policies, excludes 90 out of 130 hospitals in Kentucky from its network.

Then there is the cost. Premiums and deductibles are skyrocketing. When people are able to get the Web site to work, they are discovering that insurance is not affordable.

As a candidate for President, then-Senator Barack Obama promised to sign a health care law that would cut the cost of a typical family's premium by up to $2,500 a year, but a quietly released report from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services projects that 11 million Americans will face higher premiums because of ObamaCare.

ObamaCare is an especially bad deal for our seniors. A recent report studying the impact of the law's cuts to Medicare Advantage plans concluded that premiums could increase for some Kentucky seniors up to $1,700 per year.

Every day, I hear stories from Kentucky families and small businesses about how they have been hurt by ObamaCare, about how the government is making life harder for them.

Consider Tony Calvert, a truck driver and member of the Teamsters union

who lives in my district. He stood up in my townhall meeting in Winchester, Kentucky, and told me he suffered from aggressive stage 4 mantle cell lymphoma and lost his current health insurance.

The least expensive replacement policy on the Kentucky Kynect exchange was $1,800 more per month. ObamaCare was supposed to fix the problem of preexisting conditions, but for Tony Calvert and for his family, ObamaCare in Kentucky is a personal and financial disaster.

Consider the Blue Grass Stockyards, a beef cattle auction business that employs over 60 full-time employees who have enjoyed the benefits of high-quality, employer-provided health insurance for many years.

In 2010, the company's cost per employee was about $250 each month, and it provided about a $1,500 deductible, good prescription coverage, and $3,000 out-of-pocket maximum.

By 2014, this company faced a 50 percent increase in cost because of ObamaCare and nowhere near the coverage quality that they had been able to provide to their employees in the past.

Moving all of their employees to Kentucky Kynect was no help. The very best scenario they have come up with is to purchase a policy at over a 9 percent increase in premiums, a $5,000 in-network deductible, and a $10,000 out-of-network deductible, and these are narrow networks.

The company told me that they have always taken pride in providing their valued employees with quality coverage, but because of ObamaCare, they can't do that any more.

Then there is Joe and Laura Westbrook. They have been owner-operators of Speedflo and Snapflo, a family printing company in Lexington, Kentucky, since 1976. Their family-owned business has grown to 32 employees—including many working moms—providing good benefits and affordable group health insurance until May 2014, when their renewal rates skyrocketed 101 percent.

To make matters worse, the available post-ObamaCare plans had deductibles that were three times larger than the pre-ObamaCare plans. These increases threatened to make it impossible for them to continue to provide their employees with health insurance, and for the first time, they had to ask their employees to contribute to cover the cost of the new plans.

The VA scandal is a window into the future of ObamaCare. It is a window into what government health care looks like: higher cost, higher premiums, less choices.

Let's get together as a country and acknowledge that this law doesn't work. It is unfortunate that ObamaCare doesn't work. The American people deserve health care reform that actually lowers costs, that provides more choices, and does not put bureaucrats in charge of health care.

EPA RULE WILL BE DEVASTATING FOR COAL COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the EPA is expected to unleash what is essentially a Federal cap-and-trade proposal aimed at our Nation's existing coal-fired power plants.

I will oppose this rule, as it will adversely affect coal miners and coal mining communities throughout West Virginia and the Nation. At stake is our economy and the livelihoods of our coal miners, our steelworkers, electrical workers, those who keep our freight trains running, and families and businesses that rely on affordable energy from coal.

Even though we don't have the details of the rule yet, from everything we know, we can be sure of this: it will be very bad for jobs. The only real question is where, on a scale from devastating to a death blow, the new rule will fall.

I have written to OMB opposing the new source performance standards rule for future power plants and calling upon the Director to return the draft rule to EPA and calling on EPA to go back to the drawing board on their proposal.

I have joined 181 Members of this body in a letter to Administrator McCarthy asking that the normal 60-day comment period be extended to at least 120 additional days.

I have cosponsored and voted for H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), which would block the new source performance rule for future power plants. The House passed the bill on March 16, by a vote of 229–183, and sent it over to the other body.

I have cosponsored, along with my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), H.R. 2127, a resolution of disapproval that would prevent the new source performance standard rule for future power plants from going into effect. If enacted, this would have the same effect as the Whitfield bill, blocking EPA from advancing the rule on existing plants.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, are the effects on our coal miners' health care and pension plans. There are more than 100,000 retirees, their dependents, and surviving spouses who receive health care and/or pensions from the UMWA, United Mine Workers of America, health and retirement funds.

Because these benefits are paid for by contributions made by the coal companies for every hour worked by an active miner, this rule could dramatically undercut the solvency of these funds.

In 2012, for example, a total of $1.2 billion went into coal field communities in pension payments and direct payments to health care providers for retiree health care benefits. That included nearly 400 million into rural West Virginia communities.

This is what keeps the health care systems in these communities open. Doctors, pharmacies, clinics, therapists, and nursing homes all depend on this funding to survive.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say how devastating these proposed rules—although we have not seen the details yet—could be for coal mining communities.

I—and I am sure others who represent coal mining communities across this Nation—will not sit idle in the face of this latest challenge by the EPA to our way of life.

It is about jobs, it is about jobs, and it is about jobs, and I will look at any and all options that will be available to block this proposed rule from being finalized.

NOT ONE MORE TRAGEDY FOLLOWED BY INACTION

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night, my home community was rocked by unspeakable violence. It left six students and their assailant dead and 13 others injured. Friday's rampage in Isla Vista, California, has touched the community in a powerful way.

IV, as it is affectionately called, is a special place where people know their neighbors. Everyone is presumed to be a friend, and bikes are more common than cars.

On Friday, IV joined a growing list of small communities touched by unspeakable violence. Today, we continue to mourn those we lost: George Chen, ''James'' Cheng Yuan Hong, Weihan ''David'' Wang, Katherine Breann Cooper, Christopher Ross Michaels-Martinez, and Veronika Weiss.

We reach out to the injured who need our support as they heal, and we pray for the many others affected, including the families and friends the victims left behind. Our community grieves, and we struggle to make sense of the senseless.

For many in a variety of places, this sadness and grief is also a frustration, frustration that more could have and should have been done to prevent this tragedy from the start.

We think of other places where similar rampages have occurred so recently: Tucson, Carson City, Seal Beach, Atlanta, Oakland, Seattle, Aurora, Oak Creek, Minneapolis, Newtown, Washington Navy Yard, Santa Monica, Fort Hood.

How many more of these mass shootings do we need before we act?

We have all seen how a violent incident can bring public attention to the need for sensible gun safety measures. We know that we must keep these weapons out of the hands of violent individuals; but all too quickly, the attention fades, the drumbeat quiets, and we are left with inaction.

I sincerely hope that this time will be different, but it won't be unless we, as Congress, act.

The American public wants universal background checks. They want limits on high-capacity magazines, increased school safety, and stronger gun-trafficking penalties, and that is the least we can do. We also need to make sure that our systems talk to each other, so that no one falls between the cracks.

It is clear that we need to do more to ensure that our mental health system and our law enforcement can work together to identify potentially dangerous individuals.

We need to ensure that parents who are concerned that their son might be a danger to himself or others have a meaningful way to seek help, and we need to ensure that we use the many new tools available, including social media, so when threats are made on the Internet they are taken seriously.

The American public's message to Congress is clear, and I heard it so poignantly at the University of California Santa Barbara just 2 days ago: not one more, not one more life should be lost, not one more family should have to grieve like ours, not one more community should be added to this list.

Gun safety and the Second Amendment are not mutually exclusive. Law-abiding Americans have the right to own a gun, but each of us deserves to feel safe in our homes and our communities.

Over the next few weeks, I will be meeting with local and national advocates on these issues to identify the gaps and to propose ways we can fix them, but no matter how much bills are researched, supported, and proposed, we need our House leadership to commit to us, to commit to the American people that we will have a vote.

Bills may pass, they may fail, but the American people have the right to know where their elected Representatives stand.

I join in the chorus of those who are rightly frustrated with the system and with this Congress: not one more.

I implore my colleagues to make sure that this phrase has yet another meeting: not one more tragedy followed by inaction. This time can be different, and it is up to us.

IN MEMORY OF REPRESENTATIVE BUTLER DERRICK

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a colleague and friend, Butler Derrick, who passed away earlier this month. I had the privilege of serving with Butler during my first term, which was his last.

Although our service together in this body lasted only 2 years, I had the pleasure of working with him in the years before and the years since. I am honored to say he was a friend, and I know I am not alone in saying that he will be missed.

Butler Carson Derrick, Jr., was born in Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1936. His family soon returned to South Carolina, and he grew up in Florence. He received his undergraduate degree from the University of South Carolina and his law degree from the University of Georgia.

□ 1045

He took up the mantle of leadership at an early age, serving as president of the student body at the University of South Carolina and was a legal student leader at Georgia.

After law school, he settled in Edgefield, South Carolina, where he started his own law firm, Derrick and Byrd. Just 3 years out of law school, he was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives, where he served on the Rules and Ways and Means Committees and as a member of the South Carolina Nuclear Advisory Board. It was during these years that our paths first crossed, while I was serving on the staff of Governor John C. West, and we became fast friends.

In 1974, Butler was elected to this body from the Third Congressional District of South Carolina. He quickly distinguished himself among his large freshman class, becoming the first freshman ever appointed to the Budget Committee, on which he served for 10 years in the House, as well as chairing the Task Force on Budget Process for an additional 2 years.

At the start of his third term, Butler was appointed to the Rules Committee, on which he would serve for the remainder of his tenure in Congress, serving as vice chair from 1989 to 1995.

Butler had a way of bringing people together. The Democratic Caucus in those days was very ideologically diverse, from dyed-in-the-wool Northern liberals to old guard Southern conservatives. Born in Massachusetts and raised in South Carolina, Butler was uniquely able to bridge these divides. In 1986, he was elected to serve as a regional representative to the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee.

In 1992, his ascent in the leadership continued when he was named chief deputy whip, the first time that a South Carolinian had been named to a top leadership post in 130 years. I owe him a debt of gratitude for paving the way for other South Carolinians to follow in his footsteps.

While Butler's service in leadership gave him a role in all the issues affecting the Nation, his focus never left the Third Congressional District. He was a tireless advocate for the textile industry, serving as chair of the Congressional Textile Caucus from 1987 to 1994.

With his district containing the Savannah River Site and Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant, he struck a balance between promoting the economic benefits of the industry and ensuring the health and safety of his constituents. Finding the right balance wasn't always easy, but Butler navigated the issue as he did all issues, with a keen intellect and fierce advocacy.

Butler Derrick was a man who did what he thought was right and let the political chips fall as they may. Scott A. Frisch and Sean Q. Kelly, in their book, ''Jimmy Carter and the Water Wars,'' singled Butler out for a special commendation in this regard when it came to fiscal responsibility and environmental protection. It is worth quoting them at some length:

> Butler's support of the administration's position might be considered surprising. Included in the hit list was the Richard B. Russell lake project which spanned Georgia and South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, Butler's service to South Carolina continued beyond his years in Congress. I close by concurring with the late Speaker Tom Foley, who said, upon Butler's retirement, ''Butler Derrick is a true leader.''

While I miss my friend Butler, I am comforted by the fact that he lived a rich and full life, and he will live on through the impact he made in the lives of those he served. He is a model that we will all do well to emulate.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR AMBITIONS

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned about the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and the status of the current negotiations between P5+1 in Iran.

As Iran has moved off the front pages over the past few months, I fear that the Iranians are becoming increasingly emboldened. With less than 2 months until the current Joint Plan of Action expires, we have yet to see real concessions from the Iranians. In fact, President Rouhani, supposedly a moderate, said just weeks ago that Iran will offer only transparency in a final agreement.

What good is transparency if Iran can continue to spin uranium and charge forward towards a nuclear weapon?

While the administration is responsible for representing the United States with the P5+1, it is important to remember that Congress has a very important role to play in this process. Congress has made it very clear that any final deal with Iran must lead to the dismantlement of Iran's nuclear infrastructure, and we must continue to reiterate this. It is unacceptable for the P5+1 to strike a deal that allows Iran any pathway to a nuclear weapon.

Additionally, Congress must continue to insist that Iran does not extend the negotiations and use them as a stalling tactic to advance its program. If the Joint Plan of Action is extended beyond the July 20 deadline, Iran must make real and meaningful concessions and convince us that it is not simply stalling. If Iran violates the current agreement or if it refuses to negotiate an acceptable final agreement, Congress must move immediately to impose dramatic new sanctions on the regime.

The administration must also remember that the implementation of any agreement will almost definitely require congressional approval. The President cannot unilaterally lift sanctions. It must come back to Congress for that.

So why hasn't the administration kept us apprised of the negotiations? It cannot expect Congress to automatically accept any agreement it comes up with. Congress needs to be an active partner in this process.

I urge the administration to provide Congress with increased transparency and to consult Congress on elements of the deal. It is imperative that Congress plays a critical role throughout this process.

We must continue to insist that any final agreement with Iran ensures the dismantlement of Iran's nuclear infrastructure and that Iran has no pathway to a bomb. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a national security disaster. We must do everything we can to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and that includes a congressional role in the current negotiations.

COMMEMORATING THE VETERANS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE ALLIED LANDINGS AT NORMANDY ON D-DAY

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here today by my colleagues from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the French Caucus so that we may pay tribute to the bravery and sacrifice of the American soldiers who landed at Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944.

This marks the 70th anniversary of D-day. Next week, Members of the House will travel to Normandy to join President Obama and other Allied heads of state to honor and remember the heroism of ''the longest day.''

130,000 soldiers stormed the beaches at Normandy, long stretches with no cover from the enemy, fire that rained down from the hillsides above. Others parachuted or glided into the countryside, while at Pointe du Hoc, situated between Utah and Omaha, the 2nd Rangers climbed straight up the high cliffs, dodging gunfire and grenades and straight into the sights of the enemy cannons. It was a daunting, terrifying battlefield, but our troops answered the call with first-class bravery, and they got the job done as they always do.

The historic victory came at a price. The Allied casualties that June day were tragically high: 1,100 Canadians, 2,700 British, 15,000 to 20,000 Free French, and 6,000 Americans perished. Their bravery, their sacrifice, and their courage changed the very course of world history.

Today marks the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the World War II Memorial. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the key role she played in ensuring it was built.

The memorial provides a place for solemn reflection and gives World War II veterans the chance to share their memories with each other as they participate and Honor Flights from across the country with their sons and daughters and grandchildren. A living piece of history.

The World War II Memorial and the Veterans History Projects are employing every tool possible to catalogue, preserve, and make these firsthand memories for future generations. This effort is very important because there is a story that we must never forget.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, to the sailors, soldiers, marines, and airmen who stormed the beaches, parachuted into the thorny hedgerows, scaled the cliffs, and fought their way inland, America and the world owes you, our Greatest Generation, a debt we can never repay. May God bless each and every one you, and may God bless the United States of America.

MADE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, American manufacturing has always been the engine driving the American economy. While the recent recession has slowed our growth, American manufacturing is poised once again to propel our Nation and to propel our families forward.

My district in Pennsylvania is home to over 700 manufacturing facilities that sustain tens of thousands of good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. The people of Pennsylvania know that when they buy American-made goods, not only are they buying quality products, they are helping businesses and workers in their neighborhoods and across our country.

With that in mind, last summer I introduced the Made in America Act. It is bipartisan legislation that would connect American consumers to American manufacturers like never before by creating a definitive, standardized definition of ''American-made goods.''

Michael Araten, the CEO of the Rodon Group based in my district, correctly notes: ''The keys to the success of American manufacturing are STEM education, abundant energy, and consumers who can easily recognize that products they love are made in the USA.''

By incentivizing manufacturers to meet certain Made in America benchmarks for domestic production and providing consumers with reliable and easy-to-understand information, the Made in America Act can meet two very valuable goals: the reshoring of American businesses and jobs, and increasing American purchases of American-made goods.

''Made in America'' has always stood for quality, value, and ingenuity. With the passage of this commonsense legislation, ''Made in America'' can also mean jobs.

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to the Greatest Generation of American heroes by honoring our courageous veterans of World War II, in particular, those who took part in the Normandy landing on June 6, 1944.

On that historic day, 160,000 Allied troops landed on the 50-mile stretch of beaches along the Normandy coast, commencing the largest amphibious assault ever of continental Europe. Their mission was clear: to gain a foothold from which to fight Nazi Germany and defeat Adolf Hitler.

With more than 5,000 ships and 13,000 aircraft, the Allied forces succeeded, but 9,000 patriots were killed or wounded in battle. The bravery and heroism of those Americans and our Allies when they stormed the French coastline was most definitely the turning point of the war. And they could not have done it without the extraordinary work of the Seabees.

During World War II, around 175,000 Seabees were staged directly through Port Hueneme and Ventura County. The Seabees, who were recruited for their civil construction skills, laid the groundwork for D-day.

□ 1100

On that historic day, the Seabees were among the first to go ashore, as members of the naval combat demolition units. Working with the U.S. Army engineers, they destroyed the steel and concrete barriers that the Germans had built along the Normandy coast to forestall an amphibious landing. Coming under fire at dawn, whole teams of Seabees were wiped out by the Germans, but their fellow servicemen continued their life-threatening task of planting all of their explosive charges. Because of their heroic actions the charges went off as planned, blowing huge holes in the enemy's defense.

But the Seabees' contributions to D-day didn't stop there. After the Allied fleet arrived on the coast of Normandy, Naval Construction Regiment 25—a team of around 10,000 Seabees—moved their pontoon causeways to create a beachhead from which the Allied infantry could land ashore.

Then, after the unheralded yet no less heroic work of the Seabees was complete, our troops and tanks went ashore, took back Normandy, and drove the Germans inland.

We remember and honor those heroes who gave their lives for us, and we thank the brave men and women who

served our country, returned home, and helped the U.S. become the indispensable leader of liberty and freedom.

Many of us have family members who fought in World War II, including my uncle Pete, who served in the Army. Of the 16 million Americans who served in World War II, just over 1 million of them are still alive, with around 93,000 in my home State of California.

Seven decades later, we are rapidly losing this Greatest Generation, so it is of the utmost importance that we continue to show our gratitude and appreciation for their sacrifices by recording their oral histories, with Honor Flights, and by ensuring that they live their final years with dignity and respect—and we shall never forget.

As a Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am committed to ensuring that the 20 million veterans in the United States receive the care and benefits they have earned and deserve—for everyone who donned the uniform, from the World War II generation to the post-9/11 generation.

I thank the World War II veterans in Ventura County and across the country for the sacrifices they and their families made to serve our great Nation, and for protecting our liberty and freedoms, our democracy at home, and our allies abroad.

The example their generation has set for us of coming together as a Nation with a common purpose is one we continue to aspire to today and one my colleagues and I on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee emulate as we seek the best possible care for our veterans.

PECOS, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to continue my journey through the 23rd District of Texas and saddle up and ride along the Butterfield Trail to a place that is truly American, and that is the city of Pecos, Texas, home of the Eagles, the mighty purple and gold.

Pecos is on Forbes' Top 400 Fastest-Growing Small Towns list. Spurred by growth in agriculture, Pecos is the home of the sweetest cantaloupes—Pecos cantaloupes—grown anywhere in the country, and also of incredible growth in oil and gas, as Pecos is part of the Permian Basin.

Pecos can be found sitting quietly in rich tradition just outside the Chihuahuan Desert where the Pecos River flows. The formidable Pecos River was nearly impossible to ford at one time. But being intrepid citizens, Americans using their ingenuity explored and discovered several places of the river where they could cross, and they founded the city of Pecos.

The city of Pecos was established in the late 1800s, and with the arrival of the Texas Pacific Railroad in 1881, Pecos functioned as a transportation hub and created something that was Texas tough, kind of a combination of a cowboy culture and a Hispanic culture that still thrives even today. Many outlaws like Bill Earhart and John Denson met their end in Pecos, messing with the Texas tough values of Pecos.

That combination of cultures encouraged competitiveness. As a result, the dusty air was filled with cowboys contending for bragging rights through friendly rivalries that would eventually lead to the first ever rodeo on July 4, 1883, in Pecos, Texas. The winner of many Pecos rodeos was that mythical person Pecos Bill, a man who legend says was raised by coyotes and can be found in many movies and many books.

Today, Pecos continues that longest-running annual rodeo. If you are lucky, perhaps you can catch a glimpse of Pecos Bill still carrying on that rich tradition of accomplishment, perhaps eating a cantaloupe—as I said, one of the fruits that that area is famous for.

I invite all to visit Pecos, to learn more about the culture, the beauty, the traditions of the 23rd District. I am certain you won't regret your visit to west Texas.

OAKLAND BENEFITS OFFICE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as the secret waiting lists in veterans health care come to light more and more, I implore my colleagues to include the benefits administration in the VA as part of this investigation. I echo Chairman MILLER's statement from yesterday's hearing, where he told the witnesses: ''Until VA understands that we are deadly serious, you can expect us to be looking over your shoulder every single day.'' Count on it.

I want the Oakland Regional Office to know that I, too, am serious and will continue to spend my time and that of my staff to correct the claims disaster crushing the veterans in my district. With the help of an ever-growing group of whistleblowers at the Oakland VA, we absolutely will be looking over their shoulder every single day.

Claim dates are concurrently being manipulated by the Oakland VA to improve their backlog statistics. This is a flagrant disregard of VA rules and contrary to the training received by every employee. Because of practices like these, thousands of veterans in my district are not even eligible for the secret health care waiting lists that we hear about, such as in Arizona. Their claims are still pending or summarily denied on technicalities prior to full consideration.

Many of these veterans have more than one claim unanswered. One man in my district has a 36-year-old claim, and a secondary claim appears to have been deliberately sidelined now for 212 days. Despite these facts, the Oakland VA boasts that they have no claims over 125 days old. I meet veterans just like this man every day with claims that have gone on for years.

Thanks to a handful of dedicated VA employees working with my office, we have learned that these delays are an engineered disaster designed to control the VA budget in Oakland. By reducing the claim expenditures, Oakland's management has become eligible for bonuses, and received them. Withholding benefits for personal gain is perhaps the most despicable aspect of the VA scandals.

Veterans benefits are supposed to be a non-adversarial system. How can that be when employees have financial incentive not to process claims? Doesn't that explain the endless veteran claims with missing records and the staggering delays in processing? It is time to restore the VA to a veteran-centered system with real accountability.

Last Thursday, I made public the statements of whistleblowers regarding some 14,000 unprocessed claims at the Oakland office dating back to the '90s, as depicted in this poster. We have since heard that Oakland VA responded by sending a large number of these claims on a swift trip to Manila for ''scanning.'' That is Manila, the Philippines. We don't know how many they have sent, and we don't really have an accountability for if they were actually sent at all.

After sitting untouched for years, the fastest process we have is scanning these files in the Philippines? How many of these veterans have given up on their claims or even died during this period? Were these veterans contacted to say their claims have been located?

Indeed, we hear that the budgeting in Oakland has actually gone for new desks, new furniture, and I have even heard spiffing up the director's suite with an ungraded or new restroom. We don't have money in the budget to buy a scanner so that the claims can be processed locally, we have to ship them out of the country? This is the response we get for some cases, almost 20-year-old claims sitting on a desk in a hallway at the Oakland VA. That is appalling.

On Tuesday morning, urgent phone calls came pouring into my office from Oakland employees who had been working with us who were unable to verify these files had actually been shipped. They feared that many of them had been destroyed or perhaps hidden once again in a janitor's closet or an elevator shaft somewhere.

I made repeated calls to the Oakland office that afternoon to check on this situation. Multiple calls to the interim director, Mr. Hackney, have gone unanswered, and we have yet, that I know of, to receive a response.

Every American should be appalled at this broken system. Mr. Speaker, it is time to expand our inquiries to the Veterans Administration as well to attack these problems from the bottom

up while we have the opportunity. Remember, without a benefits rating, our veterans aren't even eligible to get on the secret waiting list at the veterans hospitals.

This isn't just about Arizona. It is almost everywhere within the system. This administration has known about this situation for at least a year, yet we hear what we hear. Only now are we really getting to the depths of the problem at the VA nationwide.

With an important national day of remembrance just behind us here in Memorial Day, and now we are coming upon the 70th anniversary of D-day, the invasion of Normandy, where our heroic troops really started the assault on taking back Europe from a regime that was evil, why can't we, the way they marshaled those resources to do that huge, huge invasion, marshal the resources in this country now to help our veterans, in honor of them just past Memorial Day and the upcoming of D-day, with missing files? Instead, let's process them.

THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am honored to join with my colleagues from that committee to mark the 70th anniversary of D-day.

Nevada's heroes have played a critical role in our country's armed services throughout history, from the Air Force pilots that have been deployed from Nellis Air Force Base to our National Guard's 1st Squadron, 221st Cavalry Unit that has served in Iraq and Afghanistan. For generations, our democracy has been defended by those who have given so much.

Next week marks the 70th anniversary of the invasion of Normandy. At no other time in history has an amphibious assault occurred on that scale. On June 6, 1944, 156,000 Allied troops landed on the beaches of Normandy knowing that they may not survive, and many didn't. They were bombarded by bullets and shells and bombs, but without hesitation they marched on. In that one day, the United States lost 6,603 brave soldiers.

Nevada Senator Howard Cannon was one of the American heroes who risked his life on that fateful day. He piloted the chief troop-carrier airplane, leading 44 others from Exeter, England, across the English Channel to France. In the middle of a hot June night, at 11:50 p.m. on June 5, he took off, the plane departed, the Stoy Hora, carrying paratroopers who jumped into France just a little while later.

A few days after that, on June 17, Senator Cannon was shot down over the Netherlands and survived 42 days behind enemy lines. He is one of the heroes whose story is told in the book and movie ''A Bridge Too Far.''

I am fortunate that I was able to serve as Senator Cannon's faculty intern here in 1982. Every day in my district office, I have the unique privilege of sitting behind Senator Cannon's desk. It is a constant reminder of the many different forms that heroism takes. From the foot soldier at Normandy struggling against the waves to gain the beach to the switch operator back in the United States ensuring that the communications went through; from the admirals to the privates; from the artillerymen to the spies, there were many heroes who showed up on that day that changed history.

These brave men and women have been called ''the Greatest Generation'' by Tom Brokaw for a reason. Like many of you, I have family members who fought in World War II: an uncle, a father-in-law, two of my husband's uncles. Their valor and courage stand as an example to all of us as we continue to battle injustice today.

So, to all of those who risked their lives on those beaches in Normandy and beyond and to the families of those who perished on those foreign shores, fighting for democracy and freedom, I say a heartfelt thank you, and our grateful Nation owes you a debt that it can never repay.

□ 1115

LET'S STAND WITH OUR NATION'S HEROES

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's veterans, the men and women who have put their lives on the line in service to our country.

I was honored to have the opportunity to spend Memorial Day with our troops stationed in Afghanistan. Sharing this most solemn holiday with members of our armed services, who go above and beyond every day, was truly a humbling experience.

It was an experience that reinforced my belief that one of the best ways Americans can pay tribute to the brave men and women who risk their lives fighting for us is to recommit ourselves to our duty to care for them when they return home. That is why I will be introducing three bills to help our troops and veterans.

Too often, we hear that our Nation's heroes, after fighting for our country, come home only to have to fight to get the care, support, and respect they so deserve. We must make sure that the brave men and women who have risked everything for our country are never forgotten or ignored, that we fight for them as they have fought for us.

For one thing, this means fully settling benefit claims in an efficient and timely manner and making sure that those veterans receive the proper care and compensation.

Currently, the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans' Claims, or CAVC, is the court that veterans must appeal to if they were unfairly denied benefits, but it does not allow veterans access to the same judicial tools available in other Federal courts.

This court is terribly overburdened, with an appeal taking around a year on average, and that is on top of the nearly 4 years that a veteran has already waited by then. That is indefensible.

On the heels of damning reports about the VA's failing our veterans with wait lists that have even led to deaths while veterans wait for service, we must find ways to reduce the backlog and speed up the process.

That is why I have introduced a bill that would allow groups of veterans with similar claims to band together in their appeals. This would be highly efficient for both the VA and veterans by cutting costs, reducing decision times, and providing effective counsel, which many veterans lack under the current system.

This act would allow veterans to have their appeals heard in a class action, as was successfully used by veterans impacted by Agent Orange prior to the creation of the CAVC. For veterans facing disability due to the exposure to burn pits in Afghanistan, this could be an invaluable tool.

Another way to serve our Nation's heroes is by expanding educational opportunities. Veterans deserve the best training, so they don't have to fight for a job after fighting for our country.

Today, I am proposing to improve the post-9/11 GI Bill by expanding eligible expenses to include applications to college, graduate school, and law school, as well as technical and vocational schools. Applications to schools can be as high as $300 to $500 in out-of-pocket expenses for veterans returning from overseas.

Let's make it easier for our returning troops to pursue their educational and career goals by allowing our veterans to use the GI Bill to get reimbursed for expenses from applying to school.

Our veterans have tremendous discipline, responsibility, and leadership ability to offer businesses. By having access to educational opportunities, veterans will have the means to keep their job skills up to date and to stay competitive in today's evolving job market.

Finally, families are also impacted when their loved ones are deployed. Military spouses take on much of the burden and deserve great assistance. Currently, the Military Spouse Career Advancement Accounts program provides up to a $4,000 educational benefit while the spouse is overseas on active duty.

While we agree that this is a worthwhile benefit, it doesn't even get the

average person through a single semester. The average tour lasts about 10 months, long enough to complete a full year of school. An average year of tuition at a public university in the United States is almost $9,000.

Let's bump up the benefit, so it actually covers the cost of tuition. The families of our servicemembers are the backbone of our military.

The bills I have introduced are commonsense solutions to do just that. This is National Military Appreciation Month. Let's stand with our Nation's servicemembers and veterans. Let's express our gratitude for their service by recognizing the struggles they face and make sure we are there for them and recognize the sacrifices they have made.

I urge my colleagues to support these bills, so that our veterans, troops, and military families get the care, benefits, and support they deserve.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Stephen Roth, Congregation Eitz Chaim, Passaic, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we ask that You bestow Your blessings on the Members of this House of Representatives so that their deliberations be just and with wisdom to benefit the people they represent. Guide them with Your kindness, and shower them with Your love.

This past week, we observed Memorial Day, a day set aside to remember those who gave their lives in defense of our great land and the freedoms that we enjoy. Let us remember that there are many people in the world that still do not enjoy these freedoms. We ask that these as yet oppressed people be granted the same freedoms we enjoy as a free nation, speedily in our time.

We pray for peace, not only for the citizens of this great land, but for peace among nations. May we soon see the day as prophesied by Isaiah: ''No nation shall lift their swords against another, and may we learn of war no more.''

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DAINES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI STEPHEN ROTH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank my friend, Rabbi Stephen Roth, a resident of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, for offering the opening prayer before the House of Representatives.

Rabbi Roth hails from Brooklyn, New York City, and was ordained in 1972 by the Brooklyn Rabbinical Seminary. For 20 years, he served as the founding rabbi of Congregation Eitz Chaim in Passaic, New Jersey, inspiring and guiding countless members of his congregation.

In addition to his work as a teacher, mentor, and counselor in his community, Rabbi Roth also served as the softball coach for the Torah Academy of Bergen County, as well as the Kushner Yeshiva High School. Rabbi Roth has, no doubt, served his community so well, thanks to the loving support of his wife of nearly 35 years, Fern, who is with us today, as well as his three children and 13 grandchildren.

So on behalf of the United States Congress and my constituents in New Jersey, I want to thank my friend Rabbi Roth for serving as guest chaplain in the House of Representatives today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN IS DETERMINED TO HAVE NUKES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a changing world full of danger, the greatest threat to the United States and the rest of the world remains the same—the Iranian regime.

This was once again demonstrated through the words of Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. In a speech recently, he said that the Iranians who wish to negotiate with the United States are committing treason. He made it clear that the jihad battle will continue endlessly until they ''get rid of the oppressors'' with ''America at the head of it.''

Mr. Speaker, the Iranian regime believes their battle will not be over until America is destroyed. The blissful, unrealistic, and naive hope to the contrary, Iran has no plans to stop its development of nukes. The Supreme Leader said: ''The accelerated scientific advancement of the last 12 years cannot stop under any circumstances.''

Iran has time and time again lied about its nuclear weapons capability and development. America should realize that the ruler of Iran wants to destroy us in the name of religion by any means necessary. The United States should tighten sanctions against Iran, not relax them.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 70 foster youth here today on Capitol Hill recognizing National Foster Care Month and to advocate for positive reforms that will better serve our Nation's kids.

I applaud my friend from California, Congresswoman BASS, who, when she was speaker of the assembly, led the effort in California to extend the foster care age to 21 and is now leading the charge here in Congress to help strengthen the foster care system.

Today, Joel, a 22-year-old student from Wilmington, California, who spent 3 years in the California foster care system, is spending the day with me to share his experience in foster care.

Due to unfortunate circumstances, Joel was separated from his parents and found himself living on the streets of Los Angeles before being placed in a foster home. Joel didn't let these challenges keep him from completing high school at Banning High School and attending college at Cal Poly Pomona.

Today, Joel is an inspiring young political science student and a testament to the importance of investing in foster youth programs. But we must do more. There are nearly 400,000 youth in the foster care system like Joel. These are all of our children, and we must take care of them.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF LANCE CORPORAL STEVEN HANCOCK OF GOOSE LAKE, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Lance Corporal Steven Hancock of Goose Lake, Illinois, who faithfully served our Nation in the United States Marine Corps. He was a member of the Second Marine Aircraft Wing and died while participating in a training exercise on an MV–22B Osprey aircraft on May 19, 2014.

Lance Corporal Hancock was one of three children and attended Coal City High School. He was known as a quiet leader and earned the distinguished rank of Eagle Scout as a member of Scout Troop 466. His family, friends, and colleagues will always remember his constant smile, cheerfulness, and strong faith in Jesus Christ.

Lance Corporal Hancock joined the Marine Corps on March 5, 2012, and was the crew chief of the Osprey aircraft on which he served. His sense of duty and willingness to voluntarily serve our country demonstrates what makes our Nation exceptional. He will be sorely missed, and I am extremely grateful for his service.

It is because of people like him who are willing to defend our country that we are allowed to stand here and deliberate on behalf of the American people.

God bless Lance Corporal Hancock, and God bless his family.

THANKING CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER STAFF

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Capitol Visitor Center employees for their hard work during this popular tourist season at the United States Capitol. I recognize the great effort, organization, and knowledge it takes not only to lead tours of the United States Capitol, but to help visitors navigate this sometimes confusing building.

In addition, CVC staff is instrumental in assisting congressional offices, such as mine, with coordinating staff-led tours through the Capitol. My constituents enjoy visiting this historic building not only to learn about United States history, but to see where their legislators work each and every day. The staff of the United States Capitol Visitor Center make their visits more enjoyable, informative, and help to ensure history comes alive here at the Capitol.

The Capitol Visitor Center has welcomed approximately 2.2 million visitors since the Visitor Center opened its doors in December of 2008. In March of this year, the Capitol Visitor Center assisted over 155,000 visitors on Capitol tours. In April, despite construction of the rotunda on the second floor of the Capitol Building, the Visitor Center assisted over 209,000 visitors.

Today, I recognize their hard work and thank each and every one of them for what they do for my constituents in the Eighth District and throughout this country.

THE MEDAL OF HONOR PRIORITY CARE ACT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced bipartisan legislation to honor our Congressional Medal of Honor recipients. H.R. 4720, the Medal of Honor Priority Care Act, would place Medal of Honor recipients in the VA's highest priority group to make certain they receive timely access to their health benefits.

Medal of Honor recipients have gone above and beyond the call of duty by putting themselves in harm's way to protect their position and fellow soldiers in combat. Currently, there are 78 living recipients of the Medal of Honor, including two from Michigan—Corporal Duane E. Dewey and Private First Class Robert E. Simanek—who both received the decoration for their heroic actions in the Korean war.

These heroes should have access to the VA when they need it, and the Medal of Honor Priority Care Act will ensure that this select group of individuals is guaranteed the highest level of care.

MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as Chicago's Museum of Science and Industry commemorates the 70th anniversary of the capture of the U–505 submarine, I recognize the museum for offering world-class experiences that inspire children to achieve their full potential in science, technology, medicine, and engineering.

The U–505 German submarine terrorized the Atlantic Ocean as part of a massive U-boat campaign that almost altered the outcome of World War II. On June 4, 1944, it was brought to the ocean's surface with a depth charge attack from the USS *Chatelain*, after which crew from the USS *Pillsbury* boarded the sub and helped Allied forces gain valuable defense intelligence that forever changed the course of world events.

The U–505 exhibition is not only a memorial to the sailors who gave up their lives on the high seas, it is a reminder of the role that science and technology plays in keeping the world safe and changing history for the better. I thank the Museum of Science and Industry for molding the minds of the future while celebrating America's innovative past.

In closing, I want to salute the students watching from the museum.

IN HONOR OF THE BOBBY RAY DETACHMENT

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I rise today to honor the Marine Corps League's Bobby Ray Detachment of McMinnville in the Fourth Congressional District.

For the past 238 years, the Marine Corps has stood as a symbol of America's strength and valor. The level of commitment, honor, discipline, and courage exemplified by the Corps is unparalleled. By banding together both Active Duty and retired marines, the Marine Corps League preserves these same values and proves true the motto, ''Once a Marine, Always a Marine.''

Members of the Marine Corps League play an important role in our communities. Whether offering assistant service to members, commemorating historical occasions, or organizing fundraisers for local charities, these individuals embody the principle of ''ductus exemplo,'' or ''lead by example.''

Next month, the Bobby Ray Detachment will host the Marine Corps League State Convention. It is an honor to recognize these patriots as they bond together to promote the ideals of freedom and democracy.

I, along with the grateful citizens of Tennessee's Fourth District, extend to these marines a heartfelt thanks for the sacrifices made and the services rendered to our country.

2014 SCIENCE FAIR AND STEM EDUCATION

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, the White House hosted high school students from across the country for its 2014 Science Fair.

San Diego high school student Eric Chen was among the attendees and was praised by President Obama for his award-winning research into combating influenza. I rise to congratulate Eric and celebrate all students across the country who eagerly pursue scientific research.

We must continue to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their excitement and their mastery in science, technology, engineering, and math. Soon we will depend on these same students to tackle our biggest challenges; and at times, they will inherit problems that seem daunting: climate change, antibiotic-resistant bacteria, drought, food scarcity, the list goes on.

We are at a critical crossroads in so many areas and cannot afford to lose our technological edge. We must provide students with the tools necessary for success by further investing in STEM education. It begins by heavily recruiting teachers who go beyond the traditional role of educators, teachers that become mentors and explorers and visionaries with their students; and we need teachers who inspire our best and

brightest young minds to do more than the generation before them ever could imagine.

STEM education is an issue that we can all rally around, and I urge my colleagues to do so when supporting this important initiative.

□ 1215

THE ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, coal is vital to our way of life in Montana. It provides thousands of jobs, affordable electricity for families, and millions of dollars that fund our schools and our parks. So when Montanans hear about new coal regulations from the EPA, we get a bit nervous.

A new study predicts that President Obama's rules will effectively ban new coal generation—killing jobs and causing energy prices to skyrocket.

The House passed the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, a bill I cosponsored, to halt these job-killing regulations. I urge the Senate to also take action to stop President Obama and protect Montana families who rely on coal for affordable energy and whose livelihoods are supported by Montana's coal industry.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I want to honor Helen Ho Kim and the entire staff of the Asian American Legal Advocacy Center of Georgia.

Based in the city of Norcross, part of which I represent, the center is dedicated to promoting the rights of Asian Americans in the Southeast. They protect and promote the civil, social, and economic rights of Asian Americans through policy, community organizing, leadership development, and legal education. The center strives towards individuals who are fully empowered, active in civic life, and working together to promote equity and fair treatment for all.

The center is also proof that Asian and Pacific Islanders are part of every community in this country. As this month comes to a close, I encourage all Americans to take pride in the diversity of our country and to consider the contributions of Asian and Pacific Islanders in their communities.

RECOGNIZING MURRAY WISE

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great friend of mine and a great friend of agriculture, Murray Wise.

Farming and agriculture have always played an integral role in Murray's life. He grew up on his parents' grain and livestock farm and even acquired his first farm before attending college.

After graduating early from Iowa State University, Murray continued to show his commitment to agriculture through his first job with Allied Mills, Incorporated, and his second with The Sandage Companies. And, now, years later, Murray is the chairman and CEO of Murray Wise Associates, a leading authority on land marketing based in Champaign, Illinois.

In 2 weeks, Murray will be honored as Parkland College's V. Dale Cozad Entrepreneur of the Year. I can't think of a more deserving individual than Murray to receive this prestigious award.

Murray is recognized not only for his years of hard work and education but also for his innovative ideas and position as a national leader in agriculture.

Congratulations, Murray, on this incredible achievement, and I look forward to working with you for years to come on behalf of the agricultural communities in central Illinois. Congrats again, Murray.

CONGRATULATING BRANDIN COOKS OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA, FOR MAKING THE NFL ROSTER

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Brandin Cooks, a native of Stockton, California, who was selected by the New Orleans Saints in the first round of the NFL draft.

Our region is proud to see one of its own achieve his childhood dream. While there are many young men who set the goal of becoming an NFL athlete, it is an incredibly difficult task to make it to that level. According to the NFL's Players Association:

> Of the 100,000 high school seniors who play football every year, only 215 will ever make an NFL roster. That is a mere 0.2 percent.

Since he was a child, Brandin loved football and worked hard to develop his skills. He started playing for the North Stockton Bengals youth football program, then Lincoln High School and Oregon State.

Brandin earned the Biletnikoff Award his junior year as the Nation's top receiver and made history at Oregon State. This past February at the NFL Combine, he ran the fastest 40-yard dash—in 4.33 seconds.

Brandin credits his mother, Andrea Cooks, as his inspiration for becoming one of the Nation's elite college receivers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Brandin Cooks and wish him a long and successful career in the NFL..

HONORING ILLINOIS' FALLEN BROTHERS G. EARLE AND CHARLES MARCUS ELDREDGE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two brothers, G. Earle and Charles Marcus Eldredge, who fell in the line of duty a century ago.

After serving the community for 7 years as an officer in the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Earle's own gun was used against him while he investigated a report of poaching on McHenry County soil in 1907.

Charles was a successful attorney until his brother's murder pushed him to join the department as well. He served the State for the next decades, enforcing conservation law and pursuing his brother's killer. Sadly, Charles was also shot down in 1931, near where his brother fell.

To date, the two heroes are the only department officers murdered in the line of duty. Both served their county and their State with honor and bravery, and I support local efforts to honor their lives of devotion to our community.

MEMORIAL DAY IN FOREST HILL, TEXAS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the citizens of Forest Hill, Texas, for their recent Memorial Day celebration to honor the military service contributions of the men and women of our Armed Forces as well as our public safety officers who have lost their lives in that city in the line of duty.

I was proud to attend the ceremony, which included 375 names of men and women who have proudly served the city of Forest Hill and lived there and have lost their lives in the line of duty.

Also at the park is the Court of Honor, where the names of prisoners of war and the missing in action serve as a solemn reminder of the sacrifices for freedom.

We must remember—perhaps now more than ever—that our debt of gratitude for veterans that have served us can never be repaid in full, but we owe it to them to keep our commitments to them as a country.

I would like to thank the citizens of Forest Hill for their display of thanks and respect.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE D-DAY LANDINGS ON THE BEACHES OF NORMANDY

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th anniversary of the D-day landings on the beaches of Normandy, France.

On June 6, 1944, combined Allied forces began the opening phase of Operation Overlord in an effort to break the Nazi stranglehold on Western Europe. The initial assault included over 156,000 troops, along with 11,590 aircraft and 6,939 naval vessels. In that first day alone, approximately 10,000 Allied personnel were either wounded or killed, including 6,000 Americans.

The D-day landing was the largest single amphibious assault in history, and soldiers of six divisions—three American, two British, and one Canadian—stormed upon five different beach landings in Normandy. Just hours before that, U.S., British, and Canadian airborne troops dropped into France to support the landing.

The world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the Greatest Generation who assumed the task of freeing the world from Nazism and fascism and restoring freedom to millions in Europe.

Next week, as we commemorate this important day, I ask everyone to remember the importance of this 70th anniversary of the D-day landings on the beaches of Normandy, France.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 2 months since the Senate acted to extend unemployment compensation to millions of Americans. It is a bill that was passed in a bipartisan fashion, the way folks back home want us to do things; a bill that was paid for, as was requested; a bill that will not increase the deficit one penny; and a bill that would extend unemployment benefits and help preserve the American way of life for 2.8 million Americans who are at risk of losing everything that they have worked for.

And so what the American public asks me—I know what the folks back home ask—is, Why won't the House act? We know that there is bipartisan support for this legislation even in this body.

The bill that I introduced, H.R. 4415, right after the Senate acted with the precise same language, has bipartisan cosponsorship. So the question is, Why? Why won't Congress act? Is it because this question is too complex? No. This one is really simple. We have a bill that would extend unemployment compensation that is paid for, and it would prevent families from losing their house. Every day that passes that we don't act, a family loses their home. Every day that passes, a family loses hope. It is on our watch that we are allowing this to happen.

I call upon Congress to act.

THE WORST DAY EVER FOR THE HOUSTON FIRE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, every day that I leave home to fly here, I pass the Southwest Inn, the site of the worst day the Houston Fire Department has ever had. One year ago this Saturday, four brave firefighters were killed when the inn's roof collapsed upon them without warning.

Matthew Renaud, Robert Garner, Robert Bebee, and Anne Sullivan all lost their lives on that day. They never came back to their stations.

Anne's mother, Mary, works at the middle school that both my kids have attended. We shared tears over Anne's loss at a local restaurant. I know the pain of losing her Anne will never leave my friend. But I hope she remembers what her father told her sister from Heaven on that day. Her father said: ''It is okay. I have got her. It is okay. I have got her.'' And He has them all.

RENEWING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, it has been 52 days now since the United States Senate passed bipartisan legislation to renew unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployed. For 52 days, Speaker BOEHNER has been the only thing standing in the way of renewing this vital lifeline for millions of Americans.

In less than 3 days, the Senate bill will expire, and if Speaker BOEHNER gets his way, the House will leave town yet again without acting—delivering another devastating blow to the more than 2½ million Americans who have been cut off from this critical safety net.

We can't let Speaker BOEHNER run out the clock on the Senate bill. Every week that goes by, more and more members of our communities lose their unemployment benefits, and if the House does not act, then it is back to the drawing board for millions of Americans who are depending on us.

It is time for this body to act. The situation is not going to go away. It is only getting worse every week. If Congress does not act, nearly 5 million Americans will be without this lifeline by the end of the year.

I urge the Speaker to walk by my office and see the faces and read the stories of the people we have left behind. They are living on the edge, and without this critical lifeline, many of them lose everything.

The faces of the unemployed should not be invisible. I urge the Speaker to bring the Senate bill to the floor before it is too late. We deserve a vote.

HURRICANE SEASON PREPARATION

(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, next week is June 1, and it marks the beginning of hurricane season. My constituents and Americans across the country in coastal regions are susceptible to these devastating storms. Disasters can strike at any time, often with little warning. It is important to have a plan in place.

Make sure the plan includes a supply kit filled with potentially lifesaving items like flashlights, radios, and batteries. It is also crucial to follow local weather forecasts and heed any emergency warnings during hurricanes or other extreme weather.

Hurricane season is starting. The best way to guarantee that you and your family are safe, you have to be prepared. My Web site, bilirakis.house.gov, as well as fema.gov, both have important resources available to you. This year, be sure you are ready and safe.

□ 1230

CONGRESS OWES THE AMERICAN PEOPLE GUN SAFETY REFORM

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, shame on us. Twenty kids killed in Newtown, Connecticut. You can see their faces here.

Six college kids killed this week in Santa Barbara. Guns kill more young people in America than cancer, yet we can't pass universal background checks, an assault weapons ban, or limits on massacre magazines.

Shame on us. We even have a gag order on any publicly funded health research into gun violence. As Edmund Burke said:

> There is no issue that is so controversial that it cannot be debated.

I would add that there is no issue that is so controversial that it cannot be researched, especially if such research could save lives.

Congress is failing the American people, and it is time to stop. Let's pass the Thompson amendment today. We owe it to the families who have lost loved ones to gun violence, and we owe it to the families whose loved ones could be saved by real gun safety reforms.

KENTUCKY NATIONAL MODEL FOR AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky has been a national model for the Affordable Care Act. In the first 6

months of Kentucky Kynect, the State exchange created by the law, we enrolled nearly 415,000 Kentuckians in new health coverage.

That is one in 10 Kentuckians and nearly half our previously uninsured population; but rather than help inform his constituents of life-saving options now available to them, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL has spent the past 4 years working to repeal that coverage while misleading Kentuckians about the law.

Now, he is suggesting Kynect's overwhelming success can remain, even if he succeeds in repealing the law that created it. That couldn't be more disconnected from the truth.

If the Affordable Care Act is repealed, more than 300,000 Kentuckians covered through the law's expansion of Medicaid would lose their coverage. Insurers would no longer be required to cover preexisting conditions, and private plans through Kynect would become unaffordable for most Kentucky families.

Mr. Speaker, health reform has been so successful in Kentucky that MITCH MCCONNELL now says we should keep Kynect, but his claim that we can keep Kynect and still repeal the Affordable Care Act is as absurd as it is disingenuous, and our constituents deserve to know that.

IMPROVING VA MEDICAL CENTERS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, President Obama announced his plans to withdraw our troops from Afghanistan. As we prepare to welcome these men and women home, we must ensure that the VA medical centers are well-equipped to meet the needs of these returning heroes, in addition to those who are currently receiving care.

Like all of my colleagues here, I am outraged by the deaths and medical errors at VA medical centers around the country, including those in Memphis. As soon as the VA inspector general issued a report about preventable deaths at the Memphis VA, I wrote Secretary Shinseki expressing my concerns about the Memphis facility. I invited him to visit the center to assess what resources it needs to improve care for the nearly 200,000 veterans served by that facility.

I have been in close communication with the director at the Memphis medical center to discuss quality of care improvements for our veterans. I am committed to making sure that our VA medical centers have the resources that they need to deliver quality care to our Nation's veterans.

This is a serious matter, and it will become more critical as more heroes return home. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this issue.

NORTH KOREA SANCTIONS ACT

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the House Foreign Affairs Committee for adopting the North Korea Sanctions Act of 2014. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of that legislation and was very pleased the committee unanimously adopted an amendment of mine to strengthen the legislation even further.

This is an Orwellian regime. In fact, it is so much so that I think it would make George Orwell blush that he had not the imagination for the kind of suppression, oppression, and degradation that occurs in the North Korean regime today.

Mr. Speaker, 200,000 North Koreans are in gulags throughout the country—freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and freedom of political practice all repressed; and the terrible, terrible suffering, preventing the reunification of Korean families even to visit, the complete lack of humanitarian regard by this brutal regime is something we Americans cannot ignore, and we here in Congress have an obligation to address.

I commend the House Foreign Affairs Committee today for adopting unanimously this important piece of legislation and eagerly look forward to supporting it when it comes here to the floor.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 29, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: In light of my recent appointment to chair the ''House Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi,'' I hereby resign my position on the House Education and Workforce Committee.

I thank my committee colleagues, the committee staff, and especially Chairman John Kline for their tireless work. The issues within the jurisdiction of the Committee are vitally important to our country. Chairman Kline has shown extraordinary leadership, and I am grateful for his stewardship and friendship.

Sincerely,

TREY GOWDY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 603) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 603

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, to rank immediately after Mr. Heck of Nevada.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Duffy.

Mr. WOLF (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 4660, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 585 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. 4660.

Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1244

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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1245

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 25, line 2.

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 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $8,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to bolster an important program in the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act. This an amendment is fully paid for by cutting wasteful spending, and specifically takes $8 million from the office space for the Department of Justice bureaucrats in order to bolster the prescription drug monitoring activities. This program is the HAROLD ROGERS Prescription Drug Monitoring Program.

The gentleman, Mr. ROGERS, is the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and he has spent years on the issue of combating prescription drug abuse in our great country. The problem is truly plaguing our streets, our youth, and our communities. Prescription drug abuse is contributing to addiction, health deterioration, and even untimely death amongst many of our friends and loved ones.

Prescription drug abuse also fuels demand for other illicit drugs such as cocaine, methamphetamines, ectasy, and heroine, much of which flows over our southwest border and into my home State of Arizona, along with human trafficking, gunrunning, and murder. I have seen drug abuse all over my State, and I know I am not the only Member who has been affected by the rampant drug abuse in my community.

As a dentist of 25 years, I am well aware of how easy it is and can be for doctors and patients to abuse the prescription drug system. With a background in chemistry and biology, I know how easy it can be for people, both young and old, to become addicted to these substances.

The primary purpose of the HAROLD ROGERS Prescription Drug Monitoring Program is to enhance the capability, 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 prescription drug monitoring programs can collect and analyze prescription data much more efficiently than States where the collection of the prescription information requires the 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. We must decide which programs should have their funding increased, which should be reduced, and which should have theirs zeroed out. It is not an easy job, but it is a job that each of us was elected to do.

The Prescription Drug Monitoring Program has shown promising results, but we must not give up on it. It is easy to overlook these issues, but I think our families, our friends, and our future generations deserve it. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I accept the amendment and 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.

The Acting CHAIR. 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 $7,833,000, 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 $100,000,000 in fiscal year 2015), 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 2015, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $62,246,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental and cooperative agreements, $1,970,000,000: *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 United States Attorney-led 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, $225,908,000 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 2015, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2015 appropriation from the Fund estimated at $0.

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 $11,000,000 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.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, $12,000,000: *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.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by subparagraphs (B), (F), and (G) of section 524(c)(1) of title 28, United States Code, $20,514,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service, $1,199,000,000, 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, $9,800,000, 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, $1,595,307,000, 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

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the National Security Division, $94,800,000, 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, $515,000,000, 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, $8,356,857,000, of which not less than $8,500,000 shall be for the National Gang and Human Trafficking Intelligence Center, and 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: *Provided further*, That up to $1,000,000 shall be for a comprehensive review of the implementation of the recommendations related to the Federal Bureau of Investigation that were proposed in the report issued by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States.

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; $110,982,000, 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, $2,053,320,000; 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. I rise, Mr. Chairman, to greet my fellow Tennessean, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, first, I would like to express my appreciation for the career of Chairman WOLF, in particular, his cochairmanship of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. He has done tremendous work during his time in Congress on human rights issues that are of great import, and chairing that commission named for our great colleague Tom Lantos is impressive, and I thank you for that.

The amendment I have before us would increase by $5 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 in the first place, but this evidence does us no good if it remains untested and sits on the shelf in a lab somewhere. Despite progress over the last few years, the number of untested rape kits continues to number in the hundreds of thousands in our Nation. That is hundreds of thousands of victims whose assailants have never been brought to justice, left to prey on yet more women.

A recent article in the Memphis Commercial Appeal highlighted the need to end this backlog once and for all. It described a serial rapist who was finally caught by the police in 2012. He could have been stopped nearly a decade earlier if only his first victim's rape kit had been tested. It was not, and instead he was able to and did 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 their assailants roam free while critical evidence goes untested.

Sadly, I must say the city of Memphis leads the country in untested rape kits, with a backlog of over 12,000 built up over decades. The mayor and our city leadership have committed to addressing this problem and have devoted significant resources to eliminating the backlog, but they need our help. The estimates are that it would cost at least $6.5 million to test each rape kit, far beyond the means of a city forced to tighten its belt in these difficult times and deal with our economic problems. This makes the Federal assistance essential.

I appreciate the chairman's commitment to eliminating the backlog, and the funds in this bill are an important start. They put in $36 million, $1 million more than I think the President recommended. It is merely a drop in the bucket compared to what is needed.

This amendment would take $5 million from the Drug Enforcement Administration, which is a $2 billion agency that receives a $35 million increase in this bill, even though their work product will go down because of the lack of need to enforce marijuana laws in States where it has been legalized or medical marijuana has been legalized. With the growing number of States in that category, DEA can and will shift its resources from marijuana and still have plenty of money to prevent prescription drug abuse, stop major heroin and cocaine traffickers and the other drug trade that they should make as their priority.

DEA would barely notice these funds, but for a small investment we can make an even more significant cut in the rape kit backlog at law enforcement agencies. Women will be spared being raped, and justice will be served.

I think the choice should be clear. We should stand with the victims of this most heinous crime that we know in this Nation and ensure their assailants are brought to justice.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I have no objection to the amendment, and 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. This is an extraordinary and important amendment, and the issue is important not just in Tennessee, but throughout the country. So I also support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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. COHEN

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $18,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, this amendment which I offer with Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois, who is a champion of equal access to justice, would restore the bill's cuts, devastating cuts, to the Legal Services Corporation.

This Nation is justifiably proud of its legal system. In fact, when we visit with foreign folks or travel in foreign lands, the thing I hear most about America that they appreciate is our legal system. It can be impossibly complex, with a language all its own, unfamiliar to many people with its laws and procedures. It can be a bewildering maze even for highly educated people, even for lawyers.

Now imagine that you are poor, uneducated, scared, and trying to navigate the legal system by yourself. Without legal representation, too many people are simply unable to vindicate their rights under the law. Think about victims of domestic violence who need protective orders from abusive partners, homeowners facing foreclosure—and indeed we have had too much of that in the last few years—or seniors who have been victimized by fraudulent lenders. Legal assistance is vital to ensure that these parties are treated fairly and made aware of their rights. That is why I have been a champion of Legal Services, which helps fund legal aid programs throughout the country.

Unfortunately, this bill cuts $15 million from Legal Services Corporation, which will mean untold numbers of Americans will go unrepresented in court and unable to pursue justice. Even if this amendment passes and the funding is restored to the $365 million level, it will be a far cry from what is really needed.

Consider this statistic, Mr. Chair. In 1995, the Legal Services Corporation was funded at a $400 million level. That is higher than it was last year and higher than it would be if this amendment passes, by $35 million. In today's dollars, that $400 million figure would be $600 million, and all we are asking is to get it to $365 million.

Unfortunately, we have cut our commitment to this program, and it is having serious consequences. Nationally, nearly 50 percent of all eligible potential clients are turned away because of lack of funding. In the Memphis area, Legal Services lost 5 percent of its funding due to sequestration. When you add in State and local funds lost over recent years because of budget cuts, its funding was reduced by more than $300,000, and its staff was reduced from 50 to 38.

The attorneys do heroic work, but to further reduce its funding will have serious consequences for their ability to serve those in need. The rights we are guaranteed under the law mean nothing if they can't go to court to enforce those rights. With no money to hire a lawyer, no ability to navigate this system on their own, too many people are left without justice. Unless we ensure legal assistance, we effectively shut the courthouse doors to Americans who rely on attorneys to protect their rights.

This amendment would increase funding for LSC by reducing funds for the Drug Enforcement Administration, a $2 billion agency that receives a $35 million increase in this bill. This does not intend to stop DEA's important work to prevent prescription drug abuse or go after heroin and cocaine traffickers, but they can do their work with the funds that will be in this bill after this money is given to Legal Services.

□ 1300

DEA would barely notice this loss of funds, but in the hands of Legal Services it would change the lives of thousands of people who need legal representation.

We are still coming out of the Great Recession, and the disparity and wealth is greater than ever. So those people in the middle class, and those people who are poor particularly, which are greater than ever, have more and more and more need for Legal Services. It should not be cut at this time.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for cosponsoring this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. The gentleman's amendment would cut the DEA by $18 million to pay for a $15 million increase for LSC.

The DEA primarily targets high-level drug trafficking organizations, disrupting and dismantling them, attacking the economic basis of the drug trade and contributing to counterterrorism activities tied to and financed by drugs. It does not focus on low-level criminals nor on users.

It has seen a huge challenge not only internationally but from the cartels. Every drug area in the Nation now is controlled pretty much by the Mexican cartels.

Also, our funding level for LSC is $50 million above last year's House level. It is above the FY12 enacted level. The bill also includes an additional $43 million under the Violence Against Women program specifically for legal assistance for domestic violence victims. This amount is nearly 50 percent above the enacted level.

Lastly, later today, we will likely consider amendments that significantly reduce or eliminate LSC. I plan to oppose those amendments that are going to cut Legal Services. I oppose this amendment, and I ask for a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the Cohen amendment. Legal aid programs are Federal, State, and private partnerships.

In Oregon and around the country, legal aid offices work hard to diversify funding, but cuts from a number of sources, including Federal cuts in recent years, have severely impacted their ability to serve low-income families.

Legal Services Corporation funds legal aid around the country, and they make a real difference for low-income and elderly Oregonians and Americans. Legal aid serves people with the most critical legal needs: food, shelter, medical care, income maintenance, and physical safety.

In my State of Oregon, about 40 percent of the cases handled by legal aid attorneys involve helping victims of domestic violence and their families, protecting them from abuse. About 80 percent of legal aid's clients are women, most with children to support.

Under current levels, legal aid is able to assist only a fraction of the eligible population. In Oregon, legal aid serves only about 20 percent of the civil legal needs of eligible Oregonians.

I was proud to work at legal aid. Early in my career I spent many years there, and I will never forget the people we were able to help. They desperately need legal assistance at a time in their lives when they can least afford it.

Not low-income by choice—and that was the most poignant message about helping low-income people—most had unexpected medical bills, had lost a job, or lost a spouse. Legal aid helps real people.

Today, I am here for people like Beth, who thought she had escaped her son's abusive father, only to have him turn up, kick in the door, and threaten her, all while she was pregnant. Legal aid was able to help her get a restraining order and custody of her son, who has asthma and only one kidney. Now Beth and her son are building safe and stable lives free from abuse.

I am here for people like Jennifer, a stage IV cancer survivor and Oregon Health Plan member, who got a bill from a medical center for a procedure performed years earlier. They threatened to shut her off from seeing her doctor, and took actions clearly illegal under Oregon law. Legal aid stepped in, and she was able to continue her followup visits with her doctor without collection agency harassment.

I am here for people like Natalie and her son, Zach, who has severe gastrointestinal disorder. When he was 3 years old, he was finally able to take food orally, but then Social Security cut off his disability benefits. Natalie tried to hire a lawyer but she couldn't afford the fees. Legal aid stepped in

and got those benefits restored, giving Zach a better chance at a normal, active life.

And today, I am here for people like Michael. He and his family lost everything in Hurricane Katrina and they came to Oregon to start over. Then the IRS penalized him for unpaid taxes. Legal aid helped him amend his tax return to fully account for his losses from Katrina, and instead of penalties, he was able to receive a refund.

These are the faces of legal aid. They are real people who have real needs who need real help. They need access to justice.

Low-income people can't just open up a phone book and pick out an attorney to take a case. These are not cases that lawyers take on a contingency fee basis. Lawyers don't help tenants who are wrongfully evicted on a contingency fee.

The President has asked for $80 million more than what this bill provides for. This amendment asks for just $15 million in addition. It is the least we can do.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Cohen amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, to establish justice, the Founders had embraced at the earliest moments the notion that access to our court system was a critically important, indispensable right of citizenship in our country. We had a Republican President, President Nixon, who created the Legal Services Corporation to provide access to our courts, notwithstanding the economic circumstances of Americans.

Legal Services operates in each of our States, and we have a responsibility as we consider this bill to think about where the gaps in justice exist. The chairman has been extraordinarily helpful in trying to focus on this question. However, I think that in terms of the numbers as presented, I side more with the author of the amendment inasmuch as that DEA we are funding—and it is critically important in a city like my own and in communities all across our country—but we are funding DEA at $35 million above the request. That is after OMB, after DEA walked through their numbers, looked at the budget, ascertained what was needed. The committee's mark at the moment, the chairman's mark, would provide more than what was requested, whereas, when we look at Legal Services, it is $80 million shy of what was requested.

So I think that if we are trying to balance the scales of justice here, the idea that thousands of active service military personnel have relied on Legal Services to protect their homes from foreclosure, to deal with other types of issues, that we have veterans who depend on access to community Legal Services or Legal Services as provided under this program, that the House at this moment should consider the author of the amendment and his point, which is that we should provide an additional—it is less than $20 million—is it $15 million?—for the Legal Services Corporation; and that in terms of the DEA we would still be funding it higher than the requested level, but we would be making sure that not only citizens could have access to the courts, but that Active Duty military and our veterans would have access to lawyers that they otherwise could not afford to protect their legal rights, given the fact that they wear or have worn the uniform to protect our due process rights.

I stand in support of this amendment, and I hope that the House would vote in favor of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me take this moment to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WOLF, for his longstanding service and commitment to so many issues that so many of us have worked on for such a very long period of time, helping the most vulnerable and helping those who often cannot help themselves.

Let me associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the author of this amendment, and also the ranking member, Mr. FATTAH, who spoke to the question of justice.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the reiterations of the Legal Services Corporation in my own community way before coming to the United States Congress.

I am reminded of the early words of the Constitution that said that we organize to create a more perfect union. Then I matched that with our Bill of Rights that so many people, if they cannot recite all of them, they know issues like due process, right to a trial by jury, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of access and movement. All of those things are deprived to persons in many instances who cannot access the courts.

I remember, in particular, my Gulfcoast Legal Services Corporation, which worked extensively on issues dealing with housing, for good hardworking people sometimes come up against a brick wall, a hard wall, where they have done everything they could but they are facing eviction, they have come upon difficulty. There is relief for that eviction if they can get to the courthouse either to explain to their landlord or find some relief. Many have experienced housing discrimination, but they do not have access to the courts or to resources necessary to provide them with a lawyer to be able to address their injustice or their indignity.

I too am a strong supporter of the DEA. I sit on the House Judiciary Committee. I was hoping that we could find some pathway to move forward in recognizing that the numbers of those needing Legal Services Corporation dollars is mounting.

Lawyers in law firms have come to me who are members of the State Bar of Texas, the American Bar Association, and begged for the funding of the Legal Services Corporation. I believe that all of us on this floor have good intentions, and I know that we have a respect for the Legal Services Corporation.

I am hoping we can find a way to work with the gentleman's amendment and support it because I am, in essence, providing the documentation that I have seen firsthand, where people have stood under the scales of justice emptyhanded. They were not balanced, they did not receive support, because they could not access the courthouse, a vital and important part of democracy in America.

With 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 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.

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:

Amendment by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment by Mr. BRIDENSTINE of Oklahoma.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 129, noes 280, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

AYES—129

Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Byrne
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Paulsen
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—280

Aderholt
Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Bera (CA)
Campbell
Capito
Cleaver
Dingell
Edwards
Esty
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Thompson (MS)
Waters

□ 1344

Mr. LUCAS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Messrs. FLEISCHMANN, TIERNEY, RUSH, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. GIBBS, AMODEI, CAMP, RICHMOND, and CRAMER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BURGESS, ROONEY, FLORES, ROYCE, ISSA, YOUNG of Indiana, and ROTHFUS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO LOST THEIR LIVES ON THE BEACHES OF NORMANDY DURING THE ALLIED INVASION OF JUNE 6, 1944

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHAUD was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman JEFF MILLER and I rise to ask that the House pause to remember the courageous sacrifice that our men and women went through when they lost their lives on the beaches of Normandy, France, during the Allied invasion of June 6, 1944.

We request a moment of silence in honor of the brave Americans who were lost 70 years ago on D-day and the families who mourn their loss.

The Acting CHAIR. Will all Members rise for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) 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 306, noes 106, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

AYES—306

Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn

Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—106

Aderholt
Amash
Bachus
Barton
Bentivolio
Blumenauer
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Byrne
Cantor
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clay
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cummings
DeSantis
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Farenthold
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Gardner
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grijalva
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hurt
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
McKeon
Meadows
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Pompeo
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Velázquez
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
Capito
Cleaver
Dingell
Esty
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1353

Messrs. COLE, WESTMORELAND, PITTENGER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. LAMALFA and MCCAUL 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. BRIDENSTINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) 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 340, noes 71, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—340

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—71

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Castro (TX)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Deutch
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Farenthold
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garrett
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Holt
Hoyer
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kelly (IL)
Kind
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Levin
Long
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Payne
Rangel
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Smith (WA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Bilirakis
Campbell
Capito
Cleaver
Dingell
Esty
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

□ 1359

Messrs. ADERHOLT, SHERMAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM 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. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 193, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

AYES—218

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—193

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Capito
Cleaver
Dingell
Esty
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1405

Mr. SHERMAN and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 282, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

AYES—127

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gibson
Grayson
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Massie
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—282

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham

Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Holt
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell
Capito
Cleaver
Dingell
Esty
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1409

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 238, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

AYES—173

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Grayson
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoder

NOES—238

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Capito
Cleaver
Dingell
Esty
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

□ 1415

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1415

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman WOLF, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

NOAA's habitat restoration programs yield substantial, long-term economic value and help create jobs, not only along the Jersey Shore, but among all coastal areas throughout this Nation. It is my understanding that the fiscal year 2015 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill provides $25 million for habitat conservation and restoration, including sustainable habitat management, but it appears that no funding is specifically designated for the fisheries habitat restoration.

As you move forward with this bill, I ask that you try to fund NOAA's fisheries habitat restoration programs and thereby allow NOAA to continue supporting community-based restoration and provide expertise to the natural resource damage assessment restoration efforts. Fisheries habitat restoration directly supports the volunteer rebuilding of sustainable fisheries and recovery of these federally listed species.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LoBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and also the gentleman from Virginia for addressing this important matter. I agree with my colleagues that habitat restoration programs are vital to coastal areas, including Massachusetts, and elsewhere throughout this country. In March, I led a letter with over 70 cosigners to the Appropriations Committee supporting funding for this important program.

NOAA's coastal programs serve as the front lines of defense in the fight to keep our communities resilient, create domestic jobs, and promote local economies while benefiting fish and wildlife and improving coastal ecosystems.

Further, each public-private partnership directly creates jobs and benefits local and regional coastal economies that generate more than half the Nation's GDP. These projects are improving lands that will benefit and be able to filter pollutants from storm water runoff, control flooding after storm events, provide vital nursery habitat for fish and shellfish, and create nesting and foraging habitat for coastal birds. The resulting clean water and more abundant habitats will benefit local economies by improving land values, supporting commercial fishing, improving tourism, and creating new business, and they also do beneficial work to enhance recreational opportunities.

I stand with my colleague from New Jersey in urging for adequate funding for NOAA's fisheries habitat restoration programs in order to allow NOAA to continue supporting community-based restoration programs that create jobs and help protect fragile communities like the ones in my district.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LoBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentlemen from New Jersey and Massachusetts. I recognize the importance of NOAA's restoration programs, especially the community-based restoration program, and we will work to address your concerns as the bill moves forward toward conference with the Senate.

Mr. LoBIONDO. I thank the chairman. I thank Mr. KEATING.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, this is extraordinarily important, and I want to share that I also am interested in seeing what we can do. Our support of these coastal communities is vitally important. Woods Hole and its work in your great State, and the work of NOAA, have made a vital difference, and I share the chairman's concern on this matter, and we will work together on this issue.

Mr. LoBIONDO. I thank the chairman, I thank my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 32, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $35,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleague from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) to offer this bipartisan and commonsense amendment.

The underlying CJS appropriations bill provides $2.42 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration's salaries and expenses. That is $35 million above last year's—fiscal year 2014—enacted level and above the President's budget request.

The report says the increase will ''help DEA offset its necessary pay and non-pay base costs'' and will also ''support DEA's growing enforcement workload.''

Again, a mysterious $35 million above and beyond what the agency requested that Congress is adding without any description of where it is even going that means anything besides bureaucratic gobbledygook, as if we have all the money in the world to hand out to every agency above and beyond what they want at a time of deficits, Mr. Chairman, when this body, like the American people, needs to tighten our belts and where we can try to save money. And here is an opportunity to save $35 million.

I have noticed that this same $35 million has been targeted by other Members of this body for their project that is important to their district. Why don't we just add it to the deficit reduction account? What has the DEA done to deserve a $35 million raise when many Americans are not getting raises? At a time when agencies across the board are being asked to tighten their belt, why are we singling out the DEA for receiving funds above what the DEA itself requested in the President's budget?

The DEA has demonstrated time and time again that it can't efficiently manage the resources that it already has. It is diverting funds to ridiculous things like impounding industrial hemp seeds which have no narcotic content, intimidating legal marijuana businesses in States like mine, and wasting money on marijuana infractions that are legal in States where they occur.

If they simply refocus those resources, frankly, Mr. Chairman, we should be talking about cutting their budget to better meet their limited scope. Instead, we are giving them a raise?

Although legal under federal law, the DEA recently seized and impounded harmless, non-narcotic industrial hemp seeds in Kentucky. To be clear, industrial hemp is an agricultural commodity, not a drug. Don't they know this?

In testimony before a committee of this body, DEA Administrator Michele Leonhart refused to acknowledge that drugs like heroin and cocaine are worse or more addictive than marijuana. This is the head of our chief Drug Enforcement Agency? This is the type of thinking that leads to this kind of continued misappropriation of tax dollars.

Examples like these demonstrate that the DEA doesn't have a growing enforcement workload—other than in their own minds—but rather the DEA has simply allocated its enforcement workload in pursuit of misguided priorities. When they should be focused on prescription drug abuses, and on the rising heroin problem, they continue to focus on harmless seeds that have no narcotic content to the point of actually impounding them. Is that what they are using this over $35 million more of taxpayer money for?

This amendment will ensure that DEA will have to tighten their belt just like agencies from DOD to the Department of Education. They have the money they need to complete their mission. We don't need to increase our deficit to fund misguided and misinformed priorities.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this simple, commonsense amendment that simply strikes $35 million from the DEA's budget, returns the DEA budget to the same funding levels as 2014 and the same funding levels as the President's budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. The reason the numbers are what they are, there was an indiscriminate cut by the administration of $75 million. Secondly—and I know the gentleman from Colorado didn't mean this—but you kind of just blew off the DEA agents. A number of DEA agents have died—a number of DEA agents died in Afghanistan. A number of DEA agents have risked their lives for us here.

The head of the DEA is a career civil servant who was a city of Baltimore police officer who has given her life to law enforcement for the last 30 years. So I don't think you meant it, but if I were a DEA agent somewhere back in some remote area maybe watching C–SPAN in Afghanistan, where there is a number of DEA agents who are risking their lives when we are in a very safe community surrounded by policemen, but maybe they are in Kabul right now where there were just some killings the other day—

So, I oppose the amendment. DEA is striving to cope with significant challenges. There is surging heroin. We have increased heroin. Members of Congress have come up, the committee has tried to address their needs—heroin Midwest, heroin Virginia, heroin all over, heroin, heroin. The DEA is dealing with that. The trafficking of prescription drugs, we just increased money for prescription drug abuse because it has the number one impact on young people.

DEA is the line of defense. DEA is the one that is fighting the Mexican drug cartels. Every community in the United States, the drug operations are impacted by the Mexican cartels, and it is the DEA that is doing this. This bill tries to help.

Also, it helps DEA out of the impact that they will hit with regard to sequester. So, I urge a ''no'' vote for the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

The DEA folks on the ground in Afghanistan deal with opium and heroin production, not marijuana. My remarks were with regard to marijuana.

In addition, with regard to the head of the DEA, she may, in fact, have been a fine line officer and cop on this beat, but she is a terrible agency head, and she has repeatedly embarrassed her agency before this body in committee.

Mr. WOLF. Let me say she has not embarrassed herself before the body. If this institution is going to go criticizing people who have served us that way, I think she has done an honorable job. I think she has represented the DEA well.

Also, I think there has been an effort by some in the administration to attack her in a way, it almost reminds me of the Nixon administration. I was in the Nixon administration. They had policies whereby they would go after civil servants and career people—I think some of the things that have been done against her. So I think this is a very bad amendment.

If you want to allow the cartels to come in—you can't just take $35 million and say it has no impact on the agents that are working and giving their life and sacrificing their life in Afghanistan. This is a bad amendment, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

□ 1430

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 is said that you need to be able to hold opposing, competing views all at once, so here we go.

First of all, I think that the DEA is one of our extraordinary law enforcement agencies under DOJ. I think the Attorney General has done a great job, and I definitely believe that the administrator of DEA has done a great job rounding up cartel members and doing all kinds of work, interfacing with Interpol in its efforts.

So on one level, I disagree with my colleague in his characterization. However, I also agree that the $35 million plus-up over the requested amount is too large, which is why I supported and will support the notion that some percentage of those dollars should go into legal services versus going to an agency that didn't need it or request it, so I don't think we should be plussing it up by $35 million, notwithstanding the fact that I don't agree with the gentleman, in terms of their performance, per se, on a host of issues.

Now, I think that the gentleman is really concerned about the underlying question about his home State and States similarly situated, and I agree with him there that the State has made a different decision and that there should not be unnecessary harassment relative thereto, but if we are going to repeal prohibition every 100 years or so—we did alcohol in 1933—maybe we are at the moment where we are going to do something similar on marijuana.

It does not mean, however, that we think every illegal narcotic in the world should be available without penalty or punishment for every single person who might desire it. So the country is trying to make some decisions, and we have to kind of parse through this as we work forward.

So I rise to say that I don't support the amendment in which we would take this $35 million and put it into what is called deficit reduction. I suggest that the 41,000 veterans who are able to fight off foreclosure and other challenges by using legal services last year, those dollars should go to legal services, so that our veterans can have the legal services that they need in order to interface with our civil court system and to have the rights that they fought for protected.

So I think the House will be able to work its will. I hope that we vote against this amendment and that we support the effort to put these dollars into legal services and that we continue to hold high the great courage and sacrifice of our law enforcement agencies as they fight crime here and abroad.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to read, just briefly to the House, some of the names that are on the Wall of Honor of DEA agents who have given their life for our country, and I will put the whole list in the RECORD:

Special Agent James Terry Watson, June 21, 2013; Special Agent Michael E. Weston, October 26, 2009; Special Agent Chad L. Michael, October 26, 2009; Special Agent Forrest N. Leamon, October 26, 2009; FBI Special Agent Samuel S. Hicks, November 19, 2008; Special Agent Thomas J. Byrne, August 30, 2008; Task Force Officer Jay Balchunas, November 5, 2004; Special Agent Donald C. Ware, October 12, 2004; Special Agent Terry Loftus, May 28, 2004; Telecomm Specialist Elton Lee Armstead, March 18, 2003; Diversion Investigator Alice Faye Hall-Walton, March 1, 2001; Special Agent Royce D. Tramel, August 28, 2000; Pilot Instructor Larry Steilen, September 25, 1998; Special Agent Shaun E. Curl, December 12, 1997; Special Agent Kenneth G. McCullough, April 19, 1995; Carrie A. Lenz, April 19, 1995; Office Assistant Carrol J. Fields, April 19, 1995; Rona L. Chafey, April 19, 1995; Shelly Bland, April 19, 1995; Special Agent Frank S. Wallace, Jr., August 27, 1994; Special Agent Juan Vars, August 27, 1994; Special Agent Meredith Thompson, August 27, 1994; Special Agent Jay W. Seale, August 27, 1994; Special Agent Frank Fernandez, Jr., August 27, 1994; Special Agent Richard E. Fass, June 30, 1994; Detective Stephen J. Strehl, November 19, 1993; Special Agent Becky Dwojeski, October 21, 1993; Special Agent George D. Althouse, May 28, 1992; Special Agent Alan H. Winn, August 13, 1991; Special Agent Eugene T. McCarthy, February 2, 1991; Investigator Wallie Howard, Jr., October 30, 1990, and the list goes on.

I will put the whole list in the RECORD. This is to make up for what happened in sequestration. These people are literally giving their lives. We will also insert into the RECORD with regard to the helicopter crash that took the lives of those agents. For those reasons, I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Reclaiming my time, I join the chairman in strong opposition to this amendment. The last

thing we need to do is take resources away from our men and women in uniform on the front line defending us, enforcing our laws.

The date that the chairman mentioned, April 19, 1995, it is important to remember that was the Oklahoma City bombing, when a lot of law enforcement officers lost their lives in Oklahoma City. I urge all Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting discussion. I want to join Chairman WOLF in commending the DEA agents who have lost their lives, most of which I am sure lost their lives way before sequestration and whose lives would have been lost—they are good men and women, but it is not because we didn't give them enough money.

When we are cutting other areas of the government and we just saw legal services getting cut by $15 million, why are we giving DEA $35 million more?

They just did a book here, ''The Dangers and Consequences of Marijuana Abuse.'' I don't know how many of these were published, but it is almost a comic book when you read it.

They go so far as to have a section—and I love pets, I miss my cat, and I miss my dog—but they have a section that pets are also at risk. More dogs are being poisoned by marijuana.

They are really going to the bottom line, to try to find some rationalization for their work that they are protecting pets, and these pets are in areas where marijuana is not legal.

They also have a section in here about other consequences of marijuana use, and that is where they get the pet section. Then they have this section here, and they have this whole area about somebody breaking in and stealing cash from a marijuana dispensary and saying it is a problem.

Well, sure, it is a problem, just like people break into liquor stores and rob them. The reason they do is because there is a lot of cash money there, and the Federal Government hasn't allowed the marijuana dispensaries to use credit cards. Because of the fact that they have to use cash, they attract robbers and burglars.

That is not something that the marijuana causes. That is something that the government causes by requiring there to be a lot of cash there, and that is independent of the fact that it is marijuana. That is listed under other consequences of marijuana use.

That is not a consequence of marijuana use. That is a consequence of the government not allowing those people to use credit cards and, instead, having large amounts of cash on hand.

The director there has embarrassed herself time after time after time. She is the last supporter of the failed war on drugs. She refuses to accept the fact that President Obama said that alcohol has more damage to consumers than marijuana. She questioned the President on that, and she is wrong.

She also questioned mandatory minimums and thinks mandatory minimums are still the right thing to do. I think most all of us know mandatory minimums are a colossal failure and waste of time. It is $30,000 a year to put people in jail.

She criticized MITCH MCCONNELL. Senator MITCH MCCONNELL criticized her because they went and confiscated hemp seeds in Kentucky that were there for study. They are out of control, and the $35 million additional that we are intending to give them is throwing money away. It is not going to have anything to do with DEA agents being killed. In fact, it might save some.

The fact is that we have to prioritize where we spend our moneys, and this is not a spot. If we want to put that money into education, if we want to put it into health care, if we want to put it into other areas that are important—and probably the $35 million should go to the National Institutes of Health where we could find a cure for cancer or diabetes, find treatments for stroke or illnesses that deal with heart disease, AIDS, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, that is where money needs to go.

That is money that saves American people's lives, and giving money to DEA is not going to save a DEA agent, and more DEA agents are going to die from heart disease and cancer and diabetes and Parkinson's and AIDS than die because they have been shot, and that money would be better spent to save them by putting it into NIH in Bethesda, Maryland, and finding treatments and cures for the diseases that will kill us all, but we are not doing NIH, we are doing DEA. That is a mistake.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I was going to submit an amendment today regarding surveys on the red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, but instead, I rise to engage Chairman WOLF in a colloquy.

I am pleased that the committee has recognized in its committee report the shortcomings of current methods used by NOAA fisheries to conduct stock assessments, specifically affirming the inadequacy of generated data, infrequency of surveys, and the insufficient use of independent research in developing these stock assessments.

However, I am inclined to stress that further efforts must be taken to address the agency's faulty data. In the Gulf of Mexico, for example, stock assessments meant to provide data for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's Reef Fish Management Plan, which includes the red snapper, do not include data retrieved from reef structures on which these fish live and thrive, nor do they acknowledge that reef structures, both natural and artificial, are even relevant to conducting stock assessments.

I have personally spent time with scientists from the Gulf Coast, including scientists from the University of South Alabama and the Dauphin Island Sea Lab and have seen for myself the overabundance of fish which live on these reefs, of which there are 17,000 off the coast of Alabama alone.

Last Friday, Congressman SCALISE and I went out and fished in the Gulf of Mexico. It took us 45 minutes to go out. We fished for 15 minutes and caught our limit, and it took 45 minutes to go back. Those reefs are absolutely filled with fish.

Today, stock assessment data provided by NOAA fisheries has proven unreliable, and it has helped result in a broken management system. Just in March of this year, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia found that the NOAA survey process and the data is totally insufficient. That was a finding of a court in a court case.

In my district, we will experience, as a result of that, a 9-day red snapper season this year, starting June 1 and ending June 9, despite the fact that these fish are so abundant it is difficult to catch anything else.

In short, current stock assessments generated by NOAA fisheries lack the ability to adequately determine whether overfishing has occurred or to inform fishery managers how to prevent overfishing from occurring in the future.

I join the committee in calling for greater accountability over NOAA fishery stock assessments. It is simply insufficient, and they are not being responsive to the needs of the fisheries.

If NOAA fisheries are to receive a Federal appropriation at all for scientific data collection, it must prove that it will vastly improve the methods with which it conducts stock assessments, including taking into account the relevant habitats and biological features of the stock in question, and produce a stock assessment that can truly account for our fishery resources.

□ 1445

I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this matter, and I thank him for his time.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and we will continue to work on this. I thank the gentleman for his comments. We will work on this in an appropriate way for the people of your region.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FATTAH. I also will work on behalf of the red snapper.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, first I would like to register my concern and support over the issues raised by Mr. POLIS. The question on the amendment that he offers has not to do with much of the policy, but the fact that we have to make budget decisions that are based on priorities. I think he is correct to raise the question as to whether a $35 million plus-up is the proper priority when compared to the other competing interests that we are all trying to facilitate.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chair, very clearly there are two issues here. Why are we plussing up an agency above their own request level for a vague bureaucratic purpose—that is question number one—when other agencies are being cut? That is what this amendment addressed. However, there has been a lot of discussion on the floor about some of the wasted efforts in DIA. I wanted to address the very moving testimony that my colleague from Virginia gave with regard to names of the brave agents of the Drug Enforcement Agency that have given their lives in service to this Nation.

I would like to inquire of him: How many of those whose names he read, who gave their lives, would be alive today, with their families today, if it weren't for the failed Federal policy of prohibition with regard to marijuana?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia if he has an answer.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan controls the time.

Mr. POLIS. I am happy to further yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

How many of those agents would be alive today with their families?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan controls the time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I would like to know if anybody in this body can answer the question and tell the surviving husband, the surviving wife, a 10-year-old child who lost their father to a failed Federal policy, how many of those agents would be alive today if it were not for the failed Federal policy on prohibition.

Does anybody have an answer?

I thought that might be the case, Mr. Chair.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. I would like to speak on the amendment, and I yield to the chairman.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

Four agents have died since 2009. Four agents have died since 2009.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I would like to submit the full list of DEA agents who gave their lives to keep our communities safe.

Agent Stafford E. Beckett, March 22, 1921; Agent Charles Archie Wood, March 22, 1921; Agent Joseph W. Floyd, May 17, 1922; Agent Bert S. Gregory, October 25, 1922; Agent James T. Williams, October 16, 1924; Agent Louis L. Marks, October 24, 1924; Agent James E. Brown, June 7, 1928; Agent James R. Kerrigan, December 27, 1928; Agent John W. Crozier, November 16, 1934; Agent Spencer Stafford, February 7, 1935; Agent Andrew P. Sanderson, September 23, 1944; Agent Anker M. Bangs, September 24, 1950; Agent Wilson M. Shee, December 12, 1957; Agent Mansel R. Burrell, December 19, 1967; Agent Hector Jordan, October 14, 1970; Officer Gene A. Clifton, November 19, 1971; Special Agent Frank Tummillo, October 12, 1972; Special Agent George F. White, March 25, 1973; Special Agent Richard Heath, Jr., April 1, 1973; Special Agent Emir Benitez, August 9, 1973.

Detective Gerald Sawyer, November 6, 1973; Investigator Leslie S. Grosso, May 21, 1974; Special Agent Nickolas Fragos, August 5, 1974; Secretary Mary Keehan, August 5, 1974; Special Agent Charles H. Mann, August 5, 1974; Secretary Anna Mounger, August 5, 1974; Fiscal Assistant Anna Pope, August 5, 1974; Spvr Clerk-Typist Martha Skeels, August 5, 1974; Clerk-Typist Mary Sullivan, August 5, 1974; Special Agent Larry D. Wallace, December 19, 1975; Special Agent James T. Lunn, May 14, 1976; Special Agent Ralph N. Shaw, May 14, 1976; Special Agent Octavio Gonzalez, December 13, 1976; Office Assistant Susan Hoefler, August 16, 1986; Special Agent William Ramos, December 31, 1986; Special Agent Raymond J. Stastny, January 26, 1987; Special Agent Arthur L. Cash, August 25, 1987; Detective Terry W. McNett, February 2, 1988; Special Agent George M. Montoya, February 5, 1988; Special Agent Paul S. Seema, February 6, 1988.

Special Agent Everett E. Hatcher, February 28, 1989; Special Agent Rickie C. Finley, May 20, 1989; Investigator Joseph T. Aversa, March 5, 1990; Investigator Wallie Howard Jr., October 30, 1990; Special Agent Eugene T. McCarthy, February 2, 1991; Special Agent Alan H. Winn, August 13, 1991; Special Agent George D. Althouse, May 28, 1992; Special Agent Becky L. Dwojeski, October 21, 1993; Detective Stephen J. Strehl, November 19, 1993; Special Agent Richard E. Fass, June 30, 1994; Special Agent Frank Fernandez, Jr., August 27, 1994; Special Agent Jay W. Seale, August 27, 1994; Special Agent Meredith Thompson, August 27, 1994; Special Agent Juan C. Vars, August 27, 1994; Special Agent Frank S. Wallace, Jr., August 27, 1994; Shelly D. Bland, April 19, 1995; Rona L. Chafey, April 19, 1995; Office Assistant Carrol J. Fields, April 19, 1995; Carrie A. Lenz, April 19, 1995; Special Agent Kenneth G. McCullough, April 19, 1995.

Special Agent Shaun E. Curl, December 12, 1997; Pilot Instructor Larry Steilen, September 25, 1998; Special Agent Royce D. Tramel, August 28, 2000; Diversion Investigator Alice Faye Hall-Walton, March 1, 2001; Telecomm. Specialist Elton Lee Armstead, March 18, 2003; Special Agent Terry Loftus, May 28, 2004; Special Agent Francis J. Miller, March 5, 1977; Special Agent Robert C. Lightfoot, November 23, 1977; Special Agent Thomas J. Devine, September 25, 1982; Special Agent Larry N. Carwell, January 9, 1984; Detective Marcellus Ward, December 3, 1984; Special Agent Enrique S. Camarena, March 5, 1985; Deputy Sheriff James A. Avant, July 24, 1986; Investigator Charles M. Bassing, July 24, 1986; Investigator Kevin L. Brosch, July 24, 1986; Special Agent Donald C. Ware, October 12, 2004; Task Force Officer Jay Balchunas, November 5, 2004; Special Agent Thomas J. Byrne, August 30, 2008; FBI Special Agent Samuel S. Hicks, November 19, 2008; Special Agent Forrest N. Leamon, October 26, 2009; Special Agent Chad L. Michael, October 26, 2009; Special Agent Michael E. Weston, October 26, 2009; Special Agent James Terry Watson, June 21, 2013.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I rise to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Chair, there is a situation right now that you and I have discussed several times already involving a former U.S. marine imprisoned in Mexico for making a wrong turn at the U.S.-Mexican border while in possession of three legally owned firearms.

Andrew Tahmooressi endured two combat tours in Afghanistan. He was meritoriously promoted to sergeant on the battlefield, a high honor for any serviceperson; and he, like others returning from war, has been diagnosed with posttraumatic stress. That is why he was in San Diego, so he could seek therapy at the high-level institutions we have for that disorder in San Diego.

For 2 months now, Andrew has been in jail in Mexico. He has been mistreated. We found out yesterday he had been beaten. He had been chained to the wall and beaten by his Mexican imprisoners. He has been threatened; and he has been looking for a way out since that night he was pulled over in secondary screening, he acknowledged his mistake and disclosed his firearms and wanted to come back to America. That was not good enough for Mexican authorities, and the legal proceedings in Andrew's case are only just beginning.

My problem, Mr. Chair, is that the State Department, beyond the consulate in Tijuana, has done nothing. Our Justice Department has done nothing, despite numerous appeals from me and a growing list of others, including yourself.

Mr. Chair, I know that we agree that Andrew served with honor and distinction, and an all-hands-on-deck approach is owed to him in return. I hope we can continue working together to ensure this Federal Government is doing all it can for Andrew. I hope you

can weigh in also with the Department of Justice, encourage their coordination with the Department of State and urge greater action to support Andrew's legal defense.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his efforts on this. I want to personally tell you that I appreciate it.

I also appreciate the fact that Greta Van Susteren was down there. I watched one of the interviews. It is painful to watch, to see how a United States citizen—I appreciate the gentleman's service, too, in the Marine Corps. I know you were in Fallujah. Your dad was very proud of what you had done. I know you have to have a feeling for this, but why we cannot get someone out.

We will do everything we can to work with you, to help you. We will call the Attorney General's Office tomorrow. I will try to talk to Mr. Holder, who I know will be very sympathetic and help to see what we can possibly do to get the gentleman out. I thank the gentleman. We will do anything you ask us to do.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FATTAH. I also would like to join in in whatever we can do from our side to help in this matter so they can come to a positive resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, my initial intention was to offer an amendment today, but after consultation with both the offices of the chair and the ranking member, I now rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with Chairman WOLF and with Ranking Member FATTAH.

Seven years ago when the House considered reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act, I offered an amendment at that time with my colleagues, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords and Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, to correct a longstanding inequity at the National Science Foundation.

Unlike their counterparts of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Tribal Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have not benefited from a specific program at the NSF to provide them with the grants for research, curriculum, and infrastructure development. The amendment corrected this inequity, requiring the NSF to create a separate program for HSIs. It was adopted and it became law at that time. To this day, the NSF has not implemented the programs as codified in law and funding has yet to be provided.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions serve the majority of nearly 2 million Latino students enrolled in college today. My district alone has about 10,000 students attending Hispanic-Serving Institutions offering degrees in the field of science.

Without access to targeted grants, HSIs have difficulty increasing the ranks of Latinos in the STEM fields, where they have been historically underrepresented. We must ensure the Latinos, the youngest and fastest-growing ethnic group in our Nation, are prepared with the knowledge and skills that will contribute to our Nation's future, economic strength, security, and global leadership.

I would like to work with Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member FATTAH to aim for a dedicated stream of funding at the NSF to support STEM education programs at Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

At this time, I would be pleased to yield to Ranking Member FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the gentleman from the great State of New York, and I pledge to him that I would be more than willing to work with him to increase the number of Latino or Hispanic students who pursue STEM education and in support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions through the National Science Foundation.

I pledge to work with you on this matter.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you, Mr. FATTAH.

I would also like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Thank you.

I want to thank Mr. CROWLEY for raising this issue. Mr. SERRANO, I think, also raised it at one of the hearings, and also Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I will do everything I can to work with you and see if we can deal with this.

Thank you for raising the issue.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the chair and the ranking member for agreeing to work towards this funding stream, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. 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, $1,200,000,000, 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: *Provided further*, That the Federal Building at 99 New York Avenue, NE, Washington, DC, headquarters of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Ariel Rios Federal Building.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

Mr. KILDEE. 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 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $23,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment. I represent Flint, Michigan, and Saginaw, Michigan, two cities that have dealt with significant violence. There are cities across the country that are plagued with extreme violence and are unable themselves, these communities, to deal with the challenges, simply having the resources to deal with the sorts of crime that they are seeing every day.

On occasion, the ATF has been able to provide support to these communities through their Violent Crime Reduction Partnership program, so-called ''surge.'' What my amendment would do would be to provide an additional $15 million to the ATF's budget to conduct additional surge operations in America's most violent communities.

As I said, there is a high correlation between communities experiencing serious violence, high rates of murder and other violent crime, and cities that are experiencing enormous problems, significant financial stress, such that they simply don't have the resources to deal with the tidal wave of violence and in fact, in many cases, see the loss of police and prosecutorial capacity. This amendment would address that by allowing ATF to utilize the additional funding to support those communities, those most violent communities. It makes a difference. It pays off.

In 2012, when a surge was executed in my hometown of Flint, the murder rate, the homicide rate, was cut in half for that period. In Oakland, California, we saw violent crime go down, in just a 4-month period, by 14 percent.

These programs do work, because what they do is that they support those local law enforcement officials, local prosecutors to make cases against the most violent offenders. It is really an important thing.

The offset—and I know this will rankle some. I know the chairman is particularly concerned about this, as is

the ranking member. I completely understand it. The offset comes from the NASA exploration fund.

I understand and I support the work—don't get me wrong—and the important priority that this Congress places on the work that NASA is doing in this regard. From my perspective, I think it is important that we keep, for this conversation, a sense of priority and proportion.

In the case of NASA's budget for exploration, we see a $191 million increase over what was requested.

□ 1500

I understand if we could do that, and if we could do that and still deal with the other priorities I would be all for it. But when I see my hometown and other cities like it literally seeing their kids die because we don't have adequate resources to deal with the violence, it seems to me reasonable to take a small portion of a very large increase in funding to an important program—don't get me wrong, a very important program—but to take a small portion of an increase in order to support this kind of work that the ATF is doing when, if I could turn to the ATF and say: use your increased budget to fund this, I would certainly be willing to say that.

But in this case, what we see is the ATF with a modest reduction over what was being proposed, what was requested, and the budget within NASA that I am addressing seeing $191 million added. It is a question of competing important priorities, I understand.

Where I live and where I come from, it is very difficult for me to find a higher priority than getting resources to help make cases against the bad guys who are killing kids on the streets of America's most violent cities.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises a good point. I am going to oppose the amendment—and I will get into it—but we will be glad to work with them to see what we could. Because I think when you have—and Mr. FATTAH knows—when we have had different areas, we will be glad to meet with you and ATF to get them to do this.

The budget really hasn't been cut. It is flat. I think they are $1 million off. This is the only agency that didn't get a big hit in sequestration.

But the reason I oppose the amendment—and I will get to your issue at the end—is it would take a reduction from NASA's commercial crew. You have seen the stories where Putin said, and the head of their space program, their general, said: If we want to get their space station, we are going to have to use a trampoline.

Funds for this program are critical to allow NASA to name the development schedule and to end our reliance on the Russians so we can get up there. Right now we pay them roughly $60 million a ticket almost to get up there.

Less funding would mean fewer development testing activities being carried out, which in turn will put pressure on the overall program.

So for that reason, I oppose the amendment and ask for a ''no'' vote. But I would say, let's talk after this and we can have a meeting with you and Mr. FATTAH and myself with the ATF and see if we can get them, as we have in some communities, to kind of focus like a laser beam on your community because, rightly so, your people ought to know they can live in safe areas. We will be glad to do that no matter what the outcome of the amendment is.

But I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment because of where he takes it from and what the impact would have on the commercial crew.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, early one morning, I went over and visited the ATF and met with Todd Jones, the administrator, and met a large number of his critical leaders there at the agency. They are doing an extraordinary job under difficult circumstances.

The chairman points out that they have had success where they have been able to focus. I would be willing to work with the gentleman on his area of concern to try to get some focus.

But to deal with his broader point, it is true that we need to be doing more to make the lives of Americans safer. We have 1,000 marines off the coast of Libya today because we are going to evacuate Americans. We have had eight or so hearings, and we have a new investigation, over the tragic attack that took place that took the lives of our Ambassador and three others in Libya.

But we saw a shooting right here in America over the weekend in California, and you won't see a big clamor here for us to have hearings or to do a lot. And we do need to rebalance these issues. We need to be doing more. It is our responsibility to do more to protect the American people not just when they are abroad but here at home. The ATF and these other agencies play a critical role.

This amendment, its offset is problematic. I would hope, as the chairman said, that we can work with you on this so that we can try to provide more resources to ATF and not necessarily take it away from this particular activity in terms of what we have to do in terms of a commercial crew.

I hope that the gentleman will find a way to work with us on this rather than proceed forward with a vote. He would have my pledge that we would work with him and the chairman as we go forward into conference.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was rejected.

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 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $6,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stand with veterans throughout the country and offer a simple amendment that seeks to bolster funds in this act for the Veterans Treatment Court initiative.

My amendment pays for this modest increase for this critical initiative by reducing funds for salaries and expenses from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives by $6 million. The Bureau's salaries and expenses were increased by $21 million from fiscal year 2014 levels, with a proposed appropriation of $1.2 billion overall on this bill for the agency.

My amendment redirects funds from the bureaucrats in the mismanaged Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives agency of to a worthy treatment program for our Nation's veterans.

Veterans Court promotes sobriety and recovery through coordinated local partnerships among community corrections agencies, drug treatment providers, the judiciary, and other important 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 number of veterans appearing before the court who 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 funding the Veterans Treatment Court initiative is jail. I think we would all agree that providing treatment for our veterans through a community partnership at the local level is a far better option.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the passage of my commonsense amendment and this worthwhile program.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment, and 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. Mr. Chairman, I want the House to take note that we have increased this account already in last night's action, so this would be duplicative. Plus, it would take away funds from the agency that we were just referring to, that is Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. It doesn't make sense for us to take money away from this agency at a time when we need to be providing more resources to it.

Therefore, I will stand in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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, $6,865,000,000: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary for direct expenditures by that Administration 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, 2016: *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.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 34, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 38, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, again, let me offer my appreciation to Mr. WOLF and Mr. FATTAH for leading this appropriations legislation.

Commerce, Justice, Science—Commerce, Justice, Science—the reason I say it in that way is because many of us are on the authorizing committee that is impacted greatly by the appropriators. I sit on the Judiciary Committee and have sat on the Foreign Affairs Committee and now sit on Homeland Security, which has a very, very important commitment to fighting human trafficking.

Just a few weeks ago, on March 20, in Houston, Texas, we held a field hearing on human trafficking. Interestingly, the day before, 115 people were found in a stash house, women and children, all compounded, living in dire and devastating conditions. The witness testimony was overwhelming.

I know the leadership that both the chairman and ranking member have given to this issue. I want to thank them for their funding of the Violence Against Women Act, as it has grown to provide more resources for those who are impacted by domestic violence, but also by human trafficking.

My amendment is very straightforward. In the testimony given to us by law enforcement officers, one of the local law enforcement officers—in fact, local sheriff—indicated the importance of providing local law enforcement officers the training needed to ensure that these victims who are traumatized will be willing to testify against a perpetrator, and the perpetrators are vile, they are vile. This has become one of the largest businesses in this Nation, billions of dollars, human trafficking and sex trafficking. It is an ugly thing to say, but in sex trafficking the product can be used over and over again, as interpreted by the person who has the business.

Houston has been known to be called the epicenter of human trafficking, sex trafficking. But it is a scourge on this Nation.

My amendment strengthens the ability by providing a half a million dollars to the Violence Against Women Act. It strengthens the ability of State and local law enforcement to identify, apprehend, and prosecute domestic child traffickers by requiring the Attorney General to make available the training and education that will empower them to gain the cooperation and active assistance of victims of human trafficking, who would otherwise refuse for fear of reprisal.

This, in fact, as I indicated, was clear in all testimony that was given and explained by those who were victims who were witnesses in this hearing and others.

Just recently, in the Border Security markup, I added an amendment to address the question of human trafficking resources in another agency, Department of Homeland Security. But trafficking in humans, and especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society. In fact, it has been called ''modern day slavery.''

Those who engage in this illicit trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. We need the cooperation of victims. Sometimes they are scared. There are various resources, such as visas for nonimmigrant persons who are fearful of their present condition.

That means we need to ensure that State and local law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and the training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in children and young persons.

I think it is important that Commerce, Justice, Science is involved in this particular area and covers this particular area. As I said, my amendment would cover the education on the availability of certain nonimmigrant visas for victims trafficked who cooperate in the investigation or the prosecution of the crime which the individual was a victim of.

So, in essence, this helps the victims. It gives them time, it gives them the ability to understand. It starts sometimes with local law enforcement. In the instance of these 115 persons in Houston, the arrest came, the notice came, or the call came to the local law enforcement, who later called ICE and others.

I would hope that this amendment would be passed because it, again, adds to our commitment to eliminate human trafficking, and it commits us to recognizing the vileness of child trafficking and sexual abuse of these individuals who come and the repetitiveness of this. In the instance of Houston, 99 were men; 16 were women, one of whom was pregnant; and 19 were juveniles. This happens over and over again.

The Jackson Lee amendment does strengthen the idea of making sure we are linked to local law enforcement, and that we are committed not only in the Federal system but we are committed in the system that we are in locally.

Let me conclude, Mr. Chairman, by indicating that I hope that my colleagues will support this amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, let me offer my appreciation and thanks to Ranking Member FATTAH and to Chairman WOLF for their work on this legislation and decades long commitment and advocacy on behalf of victims of crime, especially child victims, who are the most vulnerable and innocent victims.

Trafficking in humans, and especially domestic child trafficking, has no place in a civilized society. Those who engage in this illicit

trade should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

That means we need to ensure that state and local law enforcement agencies have the tools, resources, and training necessary to identify, apprehend, and prosecute criminals who ruthlessly traffic in children and young persons.

And one of the most effective resources in bringing criminals to justice is the cooperation and assistance of their victims.

Perpetrators of crime know that they are more likely to evade detection and punishment when their victims refuse to assist or cooperate with law enforcement. That is why they make it a point to instill fear in their victims—for their own safety or that of family and loved ones.

My amendment strengthens and complements the bill by providing another tool in law enforcement's arsenal to tip the balance in favor of victims.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help ensure that: The U.S. Attorney General shall provide training for State and local law enforcement agencies on the immigration law that may be useful for the investigation and prosecution of crimes related to trafficking in persons, including education on the availability of certain nonimmigrant visas for victims of trafficking who cooperate in the investigation or prosecution of the crime of which the individual was a victim.

In 2007, Congress passed the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (VTVPA), which created the T–Visa, and reserved it for those who are or have been victims of human trafficking.

The Nonimmigrant Status (''T–Visa'') protects victims of human trafficking and helps law enforcement by allowing victims to remain in the United States to assist in the investigation or prosecution of human traffickers.

Unfortunately, many victims of crime and victims of human trafficking are unaware of the existence and availability of this temporary relief.

And that is in part because many local and state law enforcement officers are not fully aware of the legal requirements governing this relief.

The Jackson Lee Amendment is intended to help fill this information gap by providing the informational resources to local law enforcement who will be able in turn to share that information with the victims.

On March 20, the Homeland Security Committee, of which I am a senior member, held a field hearing in my home city of Houston on ''Combating Human Trafficking in Our Major Cities.''

It was a fitting venue because, regrettably, Houston is the human trafficking capital of the United States.

Ninety-nine were men, 16 were women, one of whom was pregnant, and 19 were juveniles.

All of them had been kidnapped or smuggled into the United States.

Who knows what those women and children may have faced had they not been rescued and the perpetrators caught?

The Jackson Lee Amendment strengthens the bill by strengthening the hand of state and local law enforcement in combating the scourge of human trafficking.

By helping them, we will catch more human trafficking criminals. And we help rescue and save children from becoming victims.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1515

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady makes a very powerful case, and I think she is absolutely right. I support the amendment. I will accept it.

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. I enthusiastically support the chairman's decision to accept it.

I thank the gentlelady from Texas, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELANEY

Mr. DELANEY. 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 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 49, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases funding for Pay for Success within the existing evidence-based Justice program account by a modest $1 million.

While it is a modest number, it does increase the account by 5 percent, which we think is important, and we think it is important for two reasons—first, as it relates to the merits of the program; but, secondly, as we think the government should be embracing the Pay for Success framework across all aspects of government services. We believe this for three reasons.

First, the Pay for Success model has been proven—and we believe it will continue to prove out—that it delivers a better service to our citizens. It does that by encouraging innovation and best practices within government.

The method it uses to do that is a unique partnership model within which the government partners with the private sector or with the philanthropic sector in developing specific programs that are designed to have better outcomes at lower costs. That is the first reason we like the Pay for Success model.

The second reason we like the Pay for Success model is that the model encourages the development of better metrics and of the better tracking of outcomes, which encourages creativity and the advancement of best practices within the government sector.

The third reason that we like the Pay for Success model is that it is very taxpayer friendly. By definition, under a Pay for Success framework, the government is only paying when certain predetermined outcomes are, in fact, delivered.

In addition to putting the government in a position in which it is only paying when outcomes are, in fact, met, it also encourages, through the process of the development, not only more effective methods, but more cost-effective methods.

For all of these reasons, we encourage Pay for Success generally across government services. In this particular program, we think the additional $1 million, while modest, will encourage the development of innovative programs that are designed to reduce the burdens on our prisons. I encourage the passing of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I have no objection to the amendment, and I support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague Congressman DELANEY.

This amendment would increase funding for Pay for Success programs within the Department of Justice to reduce recidivism and improve reentry services for individuals returning to their communities after incarceration. It shifts funds from the federal prison system to support these programs because if we can reduce recidivism, we will reduce the number of people in our criminal justice system.

The Pay for Success model allows the government to use limited resources wisely. We can invest in innovative social programs intended to improve lives while only paying for those that actually make a difference.

The United States releases 700,000 prisoners every year. Most of these individuals struggle to find a job or a place to stay. Within three years, two-thirds of them are back in prison. We need to do more to help them turn their lives around and stop this vicious cycle, but we also need to ensure that our efforts are effective. This amendment will help us do both.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $115,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $25,000,000 shall be available only for costs related to construction of new facilities, of which not less than $76,000,000 shall be available only for modernization, maintenance and repair, and of which not to exceed $14,000,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

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 35, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,200,000)''.

Page 35, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,200,000)''.

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I want to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member FATTAH and their staffs for working with me and my staff and with other Members on a bipartisan basis to support this and similar amendments.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funding for Veterans Treatment Courts by $1 million. It does not cut the Census Bureau, however, to do it. With the additional funds provided by the amendment, a total of $6 million would be available for Veterans Treatment Courts in fiscal year 2015.

Our Nation's heroes are returning home from more than a decade of war, including from the longest war in American history, in Afghanistan. Upon their return, they bear the visible and the invisible wounds of deployment.

Substance abuse, posttraumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury—various disabilities—and various mental health disabilities can lead our returning heroes often down a difficult and lonely road in their attempts to transition to civilian life.

Twenty percent of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder or from major depression. One in six battles 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 the civilian population.

Fortunately, specialized Veterans Treatment Courts are being developed across the country to assist veterans who do find themselves in the justice system and who suffer from substance addiction or mental health disorders, so that they can alter their courses and find the assistance they deserve. The first such court was established in Buffalo, New York, in 2008.

Virginia, which is my home State and that of the distinguished manager of the bill, is home to the six largest veterans' populations in the United States, with nearly 850,000 veterans, a large number of whom live in my district and in that of Mr. WOLF's, the distinguished manager.

I am pleased that, locally, our State and local leaders in Fairfax County have had preliminary conversations about creating their own Veterans Treatment docket, and that is great. We have 76 veterans in our local detention centers today—that is just in Fairfax County—more than half of whom are there for nonviolent violations. Of course, those are just the veterans who have self-identified themselves as veterans.

Clearly, we need to look at our intake process to ensure we are identifying these veterans who are in need of assistance. By bringing veterans service organizations, State veterans services departments, and volunteer mentors into the courtroom, Veterans Treatment Courts promote community collaboration and can connect veterans with the programs and benefits they have not only earned, but 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 the camaraderie to which he or she became accustomed in the military itself.

We know this model works, and it is our hope that this amendment provides Veterans Treatment Courts with some of the resources they are going to need in order to help veterans who fall into the justice system get back on the right track and transition back into the society they swore to defend, as we swore to protect them when they came home.

Mr. Chairman, finally, let me take a moment of personal privilege to congratulate my friend and colleague, FRANK WOLF, on shepherding what is probably his last appropriations bill in the Congress.

Frank has been a leader on gang prevention in our community, on transportation—the Silver Line going to Dulles Airport—and on human rights all across the world.

Our community and Congress are very grateful for his service and especially for the integrity he brings to this institution. I am proud to call him a colleague. I am even prouder to call him my friend. I will miss him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

As he stated better than I could, as more veterans return from combat, we are seeing their increased involvement in the justice system. The committee established the Veterans court program in fiscal year 2013, and it has increased its funding.

I thank the gentleman for offering an amendment. I urge an ''aye'' vote for 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.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

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, $425,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That except as otherwise provided by law, not to exceed 5 percent of funds made available under this heading may be used for expenses related to evaluation, training, and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided—

(1) $195,000,000 is for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act;

(2) $25,000,000 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) $3,000,000 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 ''Research, Evaluation and Statistics'' for administration by the Office of Justice Programs;

(4) $10,000,000 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) $50,000,000 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) $29,500,000 is for sexual assault victims assistance, as authorized by section 41601 of the 1994 Act;

(7) $31,000,000 is for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, including as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act;

(8) $11,500,000 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) $4,250,000 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) $5,750,000 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 ''Research, Evaluation and Statistics'' for administration by the Office of Justice Programs; and

(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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert: ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

On page 39, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert: ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

On page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert: ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

On page 45, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert: ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. I, too, want to start by thanking Chairman WOLF for his service and by wishing him the best of luck on his next steps after retirement.

I would also like to take a moment to thank Representative JOHN CULBERSON and Representative CORY GARDNER for their help on this amendment and for making this effort bipartisan.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to add additional revenue to the Rural Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking Assistance Program. It is a rural program that enhances the safety of children, youth, and adults who are victims of domestic violence or who are victims of stalking or of dating violence or of sexual assault.

Frankly, in rural areas across the 23rd District and in much of the country, domestic violence shelters survive on grant programs of various kinds, and money like this is the lifeblood of many of these shelters.

This amendment provides additional revenue to keep those shelters open and operating and protecting these victims of crimes, victims who so desperately need protection.

It also adds additional revenue to the Violence Against Women prevention and prosecution programs, which are programs that also help to assist the victims of crime. In addition to that, it helps to make sure that we put these people behind bars.

I have had a long history of being involved with the criminal justice movement, and I have had the opportunity in the Texas legislature to serve as chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over crime victims and crime victims' rights, and I can think of no better way to spend revenue than to make sure that victims are protected and taken care of, particularly the victims who are children, who are so in need of our assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be adopted.

Again, I thank my colleagues, Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. GARDNER and Chairman WOLF and our ranking member as well for their help in drafting the amendment and in making sure that all of the i's were dotted and the t's were crossed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for the amendment. I think it helps those who need help, particularly in the rural areas. I accept the amendment.

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. Mr. Chairman, in rural areas, a lot of times, these challenges go without the same notice that they might bring in a large, metropolitan area. I think it is so useful that the gentleman has brought this matter to our attention, and I am glad that we were able to work through this.

I indicate our support for this amendment, and I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment to H.R. 4660.

This amendment transfers $2.5 million to the Office on Violence Against Women. The amendment provides additional resources for domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants.

My colleague from Texas and I each represent significantly rural and large geographic districts. In fact, my district is the size of South Carolina.

I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to bring this bill to the floor today, and I ask for its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

RESEARCH, EVALUATION AND STATISTICS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''); the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647); the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199); the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–473); the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248) (''the Adam Walsh Act''); the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–401); subtitle D of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) (''the 2002 Act''); the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–180); the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4) (''the 2013 Act''); and other programs, $124,250,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) $47,250,000 is for criminal justice statistics programs, and other activities, as authorized by part C of title I of the 1968 Act:

Provided, That beginning not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, as part of each National Crime Victimization Survey, the Attorney General shall include statistics relating to honor violence;

(2) $42,000,000 is for research, development, and evaluation programs, and other activities as authorized by part B of title I of the 1968 Act and subtitle D of title II of the 2002 Act; and

(3) $35,000,000 is for regional information sharing activities, as authorized by part M of title I of the 1968 Act.

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 42, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,250,000)''.

Page 42, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,250,000)''.

Page 42, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,250,000)''.

Page 44, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $4,250,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to bolster a critical law enforcement program within the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. That program is the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, also known as Byrne-JAG.

My amendment is fully paid for by cutting unnecessary spending elsewhere in the bill. Specifically, the Office of Justice Programs, Research, Evaluation, and Statistics budget was increased by $4.25 million from the FY14 levels. This amendment takes that increase and redirects those funds to the Byrne-JAG Grant Program to bolster law enforcement nationwide.

As we all know, one of the Federal Government's core responsibilities is to secure the peace.

The government establishes a National Guard and a standing military for security purposes, but it can also assist local law enforcement with funding, critical information, and joint efforts between local, State, and Federal officials, or any of these combined.

My home State of Arizona, in particular, has some serious issues and needs when it comes to law enforcement. Being that Arizona shares an international border with Mexico, we have seen increased amounts of illegal trafficking operations—from noncitizens to illicit drugs to illegal firearms.

I believe the Federal Government, in conjunction with State and local law enforcement, has a duty to uphold the rule of law and to combat these activities in the best ways possible.

My State of Arizona uses multijurisdictional task forces, or MJTFs.

It also funds probation-based drug monitoring programs and other probation-related services, including drug courts, pro bono defense services, and other metrics-based programs aimed at curbing drug abuse.

In the 2010 fiscal year, Byrne-JAG contributed to 58 worthwhile Arizona programs. This local investment assisted Arizona's 16 multijurisdictional drug task forces with arresting over 6,000 drug offenders. These same drug task forces seized over 847,000 grams of cocaine, nearly 50,000 grams of heroin, more than 200,000 grams of methamphetamine, over 300,000 pounds of marijuana, and more than 40,000 marijuana plants.

Finally, and perhaps most satisfying, the combined efforts of these drug task forces and tandem prosecution resulted in over $23 million in forfeited assets.

These Byrne-JAG programs nationwide have proven themselves worthy of sustained Federal resources.

As a member of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I will strive to keep American homes and communities safe by providing important resources to worthwhile law enforcement programs that protect local communities.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my commonsense amendment.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I have no objection to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my fame

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. I rise to object to the amendment, not because of the purpose thereof, but because of the offset.

The Byrne-JAG Grant Program has enjoyed a great deal of support in the chairman's mark, and obviously we need to do more, if we could. But the gentleman seeks to take money away from the research efforts at DOJ, and I want to make a point about this.

The notion that we should continue to do what we have been doing as a country flies in the face of all the facts. We imprison more people than any other country on the face of the Earth on a per capita basis. We have created a circumstance in which we have violent crimes at levels that are not seen in any other developed country on Earth.

We need to be thinking anew about this. That is what the Criminal Justice Task Force that the chairman and I have worked on has been created to do. That is why we moved to evidence-based justice investment activities, so that we can measure safety of communities based on what is being done.

The idea that being tough on crime is going to make our families safer hasn't worked out all that well. What we need to do is to be smart on crime.

So the idea that we want to take money away from researching and understanding what works and what doesn't work works against—normally—the position of the other team. The other team usually is here on the floor saying that we should fund those things that work and not fund those things that don't work.

The research efforts at DOJ are designed exactly for that purpose. They are designed to determine what is actually working.

I met with the heads of court systems and criminal justice efforts throughout our country, Democrat and Republicans alike. They say that this research effort has enabled them to focus in on what can make communities safer in terms of policing in criminal justice and prison-related activities.

So I support his goal, but I reject his offset. I would ask for 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 Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $1,235,615,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $376,000,000 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, $2,500,000 is for an initiative to improve the quality of juvenile indigent defense services, $15,000,000 is for a Preventing Violence Against Law Enforcement Officer Resilience and Survivability Initiative (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, and $3,000,000 is for competitive

grants to distribute firearm safety materials and gun locks;

(2) $210,000,000 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) $8,000,000 for competitive grants to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system, to prevent or combat juvenile delinquency, and to assist victims of crime (other than compensation);

(4) $45,365,000 for victim services programs for victims of trafficking, as authorized by section 107(b)(2) of Public Law 106–386, and for programs authorized under Public Law 109–164;

(5) $41,000,000 for Drug Courts, as authorized by section 1001(a)(25)(A) of title I of the 1968 Act;

(6) $9,000,000 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);

(7) $12,000,000 for grants for Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners, as authorized by part S of title I of the 1968 Act;

(8) $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;

(9) $10,000,000 for economic, high technology and Internet crime prevention grants, including as authorized by section 401 of Public Law 110–403;

(10) $21,000,000 for sex offender management assistance, as authorized by the Adam Walsh Act, and related activities, of which $1,000,000 is for the National Sex Offender Public Website;

(11) $22,250,000 for the matching grant program for law enforcement armor vests, as authorized by section 2501 of title I of the 1968 Act;

(12) $58,500,000 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);

(13) $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;

(14) $36,000,000 for grants to address backlogs of sexual assault kits at law enforcement agencies;

(15) $6,000,000 for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 217 of the 1990 Act;

(16) $35,000,000 for assistance to Indian tribes;

(17) $62,500,000 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;

(18) $5,000,000 for a veterans treatment courts program;

(19) $1,000,000 for the purposes described in the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program (section 240001 of the 1994 Act);

(20) $8,000,000 for a program to monitor prescription drugs and scheduled listed chemical products;

(21) $15,000,000 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);

(22) $2,000,000 to operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety;

(23) $30,000,000 for a justice reinvestment initiative, for activities related to criminal justice reform and recidivism reduction, of which not less than $1,000,000 is for a task force on Federal corrections;

(24) $75,000,000 for the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative, described in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided*, That section 213 of this Act shall not apply with respect to the amount made available in this paragraph; and

(25) $20,000,000 for existing evidence-based criminal justice programs as described in the report accompanying this Act:

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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $8,500,000)''

Page 66, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $8,500,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by acknowledging the extraordinary leadership of Chairman WOLF, who, as I was recounting earlier, I remember as a young law student arriving in Washington, and hearing about his work.

So much of his work has been longstanding. I particularly want to acknowledge his work on gang violence and gang violence reduction. I know this will be his last appropriations bill, so I thank him for his many years of service to our country.

I also want to thank and recognize our ranking member, Congressman FATTAH, for his great work.

I rise today to offer an amendment that will invest in making our communities safe from gangs and gun violence.

This amendment restores $8.5 million in funding for the Violent Gang and Gun Crime Reduction Program, also known as Project Safe Neighborhoods. It provides the same level of funding that was provided for this critical program in fiscal year 2014.

Project Safe Neighborhoods is a proven, effective program for intervening in communities in order to enhance public safety and combat gang violence.

Today, this competitive grant program invests in partnerships led by U.S. attorneys and allows local and State law enforcement, community leaders, and prosecutors to collaborate together on efforts to fight gang crime and reduce gun violence—and to do it in a strategically thoughtful way and to bring resources to this important work.

Project Safe Neighborhoods provides communities across the country with the resources they need to coordinate effectively and to prevent violence. Most importantly, this program employs a multifaceted approach to address the ongoing problem of gang and gun violence. Many communities use this funding for both prevention and enforcement efforts.

Stakeholders have used fund from Project Safe Neighborhoods to scale up efforts related to prosecuting and investigating gang activity. They have also used these resources to engage at-risk populations with innovative outreach and intervention strategies.

The positive results of this initiative have been very well documented. A 2009 National Institute of Justice evaluation demonstrated that communities receiving Project Safe Neighborhoods funding saw a four times greater decline in crime than those in cities that did not receive funding.

When I was mayor of Providence, I saw firsthand the importance of this approach to prevent and stop gang crime and gun violence.

Together, we targeted gangs by both prosecuting criminals and also dispatching street outreach workers through community leaders like the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence. These street workers could successfully convince our young people to end the cycle of violence. This is a program that has a proven record of saving lives by preventing gun violence and proactively working in the community to prevent violence.

Importantly, this has always been a bipartisan experience. I know my colleagues, many of whom are former prosecutors, community activists, and local and State-elected officials, have seen the tremendous benefit of Project Safe Neighborhoods.

In fiscal year 2013, 16 communities from Nebraska and Tennessee to Rhode Island and Maine received funding. Since its inception in 2001, dozens of other communities have also relied on funding from Project Safe Neighborhoods to make communities safer and to reduce gun violence.

So I am asking my colleagues to support this proven program. This is literally about saving the lives of young people in this country. I urge my colleagues to support the critical investments in this very collaborative public safety approach led by our U.S. attorneys and to support funding for Project

Safe Neighborhoods. The safety of our communities and our ability to help reduce gun violence and gang violence depends on it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I do appreciate what the gentleman said. As we move on and we get to conference, there may be something we can do. I know Mr. FATTAH feels the same way with regard to gang violence in the inner city.

The underlining bill has already reduced NASA's construction budget by $69 million. Further reductions—which this would do—would negatively impact NASA's ability to meet mission critical construction needs for the human spaceflight program, address urgent safety-related repairs at centers around the country—which certainly need them—and discharge legal requirements to remediate environmental damage.

Construction projects are, by definition, long lead items that must be started early in order to be ready. By cutting these funds now, we will create a programmatic ripple effect that will be felt in our high-priority space program for the years to come.

So for these reasons—and where the money is taken from—I urge a ''no'' vote.

With that, 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. There is no one in this House that has been more focused on the problems of gangs and has talked about it more than Chairman WOLF. So when he says that this is a matter he is concerned about, he has shown that over the years.

This is an important effort. It is a program that, if we can find a way to fund it, we should.

My colleague, who served as mayor of one of America's great cities and is now a Member of the Congress, is right to point this out. I look for an opportunity where, perhaps as we move to complete this bill in conference, we can see if there are other resources available.

I think in the offset there probably is some wiggle room, but we need to pay a little bit closer attention to it.

So I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, but I may have some concerns about the offset. And whatever the result of the amendment, you have heard the chairman say—and I join in—that we would be glad to work with you on this effort.

Thank you for offering the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. 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 Rhode Island will be postponed.

□ 1545

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me, again, express my appreciation for this appropriation and make a statement regarding some of the jurisdiction that comes under Commerce and Justice that is not particularly being discussed at this moment, but I thought it was appropriate because we do have discussions regarding civil rights.

I wanted to mention that, over the last couple of months, we have had some unfortunate discussions around the National Basketball Association regarding issues of discriminatory conversations that were not responsible to the vastness of the NBA or its regulatory scheme.

We regulate, on Judiciary, the National Basketball Association, the NFL, and Major League Baseball and many other sports. Over the years, we have had the opportunity to raise questions about diversity and about the outreach into minority communities.

Today, in Houston, Major League Baseball is having what they call the civil rights weekend. I will be looking forward to calling in Major League Baseball to address some of the questions of diversity and race in their particular support.

It is interesting that they are having an event in Houston now, with not one local elected official present, or respected or asked to be present. To me, that raises the question of whether or not Major League Baseball even gets it.

We are delighted that they have chosen to honor some icons, and I honor them as well and will, hopefully, have the opportunity to recognize them by way of my office tomorrow.

Again, as we talk about justice questions, as I sit on the Judiciary Committee, over the years, have dealt with players' associations and antitrust issues, questions of discrimination that cross the gamut of sports organizations, it is really disturbing that we come to the 21st century and 2014 and have these same issues being raised again.

Just as I turn, for a moment, to the NBA, I just want to make the point that, as there is a decision to look at options for the Clippers, I am not from the area, but I would hope that, as there are options to look at a purchase of the Clippers, that it is not done without opportunities for minority purchasers to be involved—investors.

We are not where we need to be, and, again, the Justice Department deals with civil rights, and Major League Baseball is not where it needs to be when it comes to a city, has an event on civil rights, and has no local elected officials that are engaged, no outreach programs that are extensive the way they need to be.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to raise this point regarding the question of civil rights that falls under the jurisdiction of this committee, the funding of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, but also, under my authorizing committee, and raise a concern that we have work to do, not only in this Congress, but we have work to do into these major sports organizations that represent diversity, but they don't really have diversity.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 46, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. We are just looking at the amendment, so, in order to protect the time, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funding for the Economic High-Tech and Cyber Crime Prevention grant program by $2 million.

In my home State of Washington, we develop some of the Nation's most advanced software and aircraft and tools for our men and women in uniform. We need to be ready to help our private sector partners protect their intellectual property, competitive edge, and the capabilities of our warfighters.

The Economic High-Tech and Cyber Crime Prevention program is one of the best opportunities for the Federal Government to assist State and local law enforcement entities to address cyber crimes through the funding of training and technical assistance projects.

Specifically, the program was designed to leverage State and local support to help national agencies involved in protecting our homeland security through the prevention of law enforcement against cyber crimes.

Cyber crime is not new, but it is becoming an even greater threat to our

families, our businesses, and to our national security. As far back as 2012, the Federal Bureau of Investigation made headlines for arresting dozens of cyber criminals worldwide who were involved in a complicated scheme.

Recently, the Director of the FBI testified before the other Chamber that state-sponsored cyber crime is ''an enormous challenge,'' noting the Department of Justice recently issued a 31-count indictment against hackers backed by the Chinese Government.

As a member of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities, I know that we need to double down on protecting our intellectual property from electronic theft and intrusion.

We cannot have innovation stifled out of fear of protection, loss of intellectual property, and future profits. After all, innovation is the engine behind our economy and our national defense. It is what keeps small businesses and large conglomerates devising the next tools to protect our servicepeople and keep shipping lanes open.

This amendment would help State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies with technical assistance, training, and outreach activities. It would provide training in the investigation and prosecution of cyber crimes, increasing the odds that those that seek to do harm are brought to justice.

Moreover, it gives the Federal Government a greater opportunity to leverage their counterparts' abilities to attain our national goals.

One month ago, I was privileged to join representatives of local utilities, the Washington State Military Department, academia, and law enforcement to discuss ways to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure from cyber attacks.

This summit provided an opportunity for us to bring all of the stakeholders into a room and discuss known vulnerabilities and how we can help each other.

One of the most important outcomes of that summit was the need to work together at the local, State, and Federal level, hand in hand with our private sector partners to fully address this threat. That is what this amendment does. It would provide Federal assistance to complement such efforts and would increase our security.

With my brief time remaining, I would just like to thank the ranking member and echo the good words of the previous speakers thanking the gentleman, the chairman, for his excellent work and partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I think we have—we never saw the amendment, and it is really pretty tough to really—but just looking at it quickly, I think we are at a record level for cyber, ever, in the history of this great body.

The gentleman has a good point. He takes away from aeronautics, and aeronautics is our number one export, if we were not exporting even aircraft from the gentleman's home State, our balance of payment, so to take away from aeronautics, when we have plussed up aeronautics, so America can continue to be number one, and put it in an area that is ill-defined.

Secondly, we have given more for cyber than any other time—cyber money in NIST, cyber money in the FBI, national security business, cyber money in the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Criminal Division; so, because of that, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

Cyber is important. Every major company in this country has been hit by the Chinese Government. Law firms in this town are being hit by the Chinese Government. Seventeen Members of Congress had their computers stripped by the Chinese Government. A committee had their computers stripped by the Chinese Government.

So I think we should focus the cyber where we have it and not go after aeronautics. Because of that, I think the gentleman is well-intentioned. Obviously, Boeing has been hit, but Boeing is better served by what we are doing with regard to aiding the FBI to deal with this and the U.S. attorney.

I commend and did a letter to the Attorney General last week, thanking him and thanking the FBI for their cyber cases that they are bringing against the People's Liberation Army.

In light of where we are, I would oppose the amendment. I think it is bad to take it from aeronautics, and I think we should focus on the cyber the way that we have done in the bill with the FBI, the National Security Division, the U.S. attorneys.

Again, I want to thank the Justice Department and the FBI for the great work they have done with regard to the People's Liberation Army and that we expect them to do in the future.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 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, when you listen to our highest law enforcement officials in the country and our national security officials, they join the Chairman's very early point.

When he was saying it, no one was paying attention, I think, that cyber attacks are the greatest threat in terms of our economic infrastructure and some of our national military infrastructure is challenged by cyber attacks also.

There is an account in DOJ that is the target of affection for this amendment; that is cyber and high economic crimes. This is a very important area.

We remember the fiasco with the retailers being attacked by cyber attacks, mainly centered from Ukraine, and the disaster that occurred over the holiday shopping season.

This is a very important area. I would be glad to work with the gentleman to see whether we can do something to make sure that this account has the resources it needs.

Aeronautics, on the other hand, we are well above $100 million or so than the requested level, but it is a very important area, and I join with the chairman in prioritizing it.

I went out to Washington State. I visited Everett, a plant of almost 100 acres under one roof, the largest and widest building anywhere in the country, and saw them constructing these Dreamliners, tens of thousands of Americans working every day.

We don't want those secrets stolen either, however, through cyber attacks; so we need to find a happy medium that meets the country's interests.

I don't know that we want to cut that account. The chairman is right. Our balance of trade in aeronautics is well over $200 billion. It is our most significant export on the manufacturing side, so we have to be careful as we proceed.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment, and whatever the result of the amendment, I think that the chairman and I want to work to make sure that we are doing everything we can do to protect against cyber attacks.

In the economic atmosphere that the country is in and the competition that we face, we don't need to be innovative and then have our innovation stolen by others.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, line 24, strike ''$3,000,000'' and insert ''$6,000,000''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase from $3 million to $6 million the amount of funds appropriated for competitive grants to distribute firearm safety materials and gun locks under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program. The Edward Byrne program is funded at $376 million total, as recently amended up to $380 in this appropriations bill. The $3 million increase that I am seeking is less than 1

percent of the total allocation of the program and has received a budget-neutral score from the Congressional Budget Office.

I think that increasing the level of gun safety in America is a priority, and I hope that my colleagues would agree. Nothing in this amendment would restrict any American citizen's Second Amendment rights. The only thing that this amendment seeks to do is to achieve greater gun literacy, safety, and avoid accidents.

This amendment makes good sense, it will save lives, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I have no objection to the amendment and 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.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''); the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647) (''the 1990 Act''); the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–248) (''the Adam Walsh Act''); the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–401); the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4) (''the 2013 Act''); and other juvenile justice programs, $223,500,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $45,000,000 for programs authorized by section 221 of the 1974 Act;

(2) $90,000,000 for youth mentoring grants;

(3) $19,000,000 for programs authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990;

(4) $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

(5) $1,500,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act:

Provided, That not more than 10 percent of each amount may be used for research, evaluation, and statistics activities designed to benefit the programs or activities authorized: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of the amounts designated under paragraphs (1) through (3) and (5) may be used for training and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the two preceding provisos shall not apply to grants and projects authorized by sections 261 and 262 of the 1974 Act and to missing and exploited children programs.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER BENEFITS

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

For activities authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); and the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162) (''the 2005 Act''), $96,500,000, to remain 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: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this heading—

(1) $10,000,000 is for anti-methamphetamine-related activities, which shall be transferred to the Drug Enforcement Administration upon enactment of this Act;

(2) $16,500,000 is for improving tribal law enforcement, including hiring, equipment, training, and anti-methamphetamine activities; and

(3) $70,000,000 is for grants under section 1701 of title I of the 1968 Act (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) for the hiring and rehiring of additional career law enforcement officers under part Q of such title notwithstanding subsection (i) of such section: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding section 1704(c) of such title (42 U.S.C. 3796dd–3(c)), funding for hiring or rehiring a career law enforcement officer may not exceed $125,000 unless the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services grants a waiver from this limitation: *Provided further*, That within the amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $16,500,000 shall be transferred to the Tribal Resources Grant Program: *Provided further*, That within the amounts appropriated under this paragraph, $10,000,000 is for regional anti-gang task forces.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, line 22, after the period insert: ''Provided further, That no less than $5,000,000 is allocated to establish and implement innovative programs to increase and enhance proactive crime control and prevention programs involving law enforcement officers and young persons in the community (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)(11)).''

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, let me first just thank the chairman and the ranking member for their tremendous effort in connection with this bill. As well, I thank the chairman for his distinguished service and work as it relates to the issue of gun violence prevention, to which this amendment relates.

In order to address the growing problem of youth gang violence, this amendment sets a minimum allocation amount with respect to funds issued under the Department of Justice's authority to make public safety and community policing grants. It would do so by requiring that no less than $5 million of funding for COPS grants be used ''to establish and implement innovative programs to increase and enhance proactive crime control and prevention programs involving law enforcement officers and young persons in the community.''

This category is presently one of 17 uses of grant amounts authorized under law. However, there is no funding minimum set in law to ensure that these program grants are being allocated to address youth violence. With the growing amount of gang activity that involves young people throughout our country, funding in this particular area is essential.

There are currently at least 1.4 million criminal street gang members and 33,000 street gangs in the United States. This represents a 40 percent increase since 2009. Much of this rapid expansion of criminal street gang activity is caused by the active recruitment of juveniles. According to the FBI, almost 40 percent of gang members presently are young people under the age of 18.

In a report issued by the National Gang Threat Assessment report, criminal street gangs cause 48 percent of violent crime in most jurisdictions. Consequently, there are neighborhoods throughout our country, including many in New York City, that continue to be plagued by violence attributed to rising street gang activity. This, of course, has led to increased drug trafficking, gun violence, human trafficking, and the prostitution of minors, as well as school-based assaults, robberies, and thefts.

The COPS grant program has been a tremendous success, but more must now be done in the area of gang-related youth violence. This issue presents a discreet problem that requires targeted law enforcement solutions. Accordingly, this amendment is designed to ensure that additional funding under the COPS program is allocated to proactive law enforcement programs targeted at the reduction of criminal street gang activity and youth violence.

By setting a funding floor of $5 million in total grants connected to a category already authorized under law, we can take an additional step toward providing State and local law enforcement with the resources needed to protect communities throughout America. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan objective by voting in favor of this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part:

''An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

Madam Chair, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for a program that has not been reauthorized. It was last authorized in 2009. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FATTAH. I would like to be heard, Madam Chair, if the gentleman would reserve his point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Out of courtesy to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will reserve my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, this program has not been reauthorized by the Congress. So let's go back to that.

This is a program that was created to provide support to local communities to be able to hire 1 million additional police officers nationwide, and it was put into place. It has operated well, and ever since this became the law of the land in the Clinton administration, the crime rate nationwide has gone down.

We have not reauthorized it, but we have funded it each and every year because it is the right thing to do. On one level, the American public is paying taxes, and safety, to them, is having police officers in their communities and that when they dial 911, there is someone there to respond.

At the same time that we have had this back and forth about the COPS program, we have provided well over $6 billion of the American taxpayers' money for police officers and training in Iraq and in places like Afghanistan to provide police officers in communities in countries far away from the streets of the gentleman's city, New York City, or my hometown of Philadelphia.

Now, it is true that the Congress has not done its work. We haven't reauthorized the transportation bill or the education bill or the COPS program. There is a whole line of bills that we have not found the ability to come together around, and there are a host of programs in these appropriations bills that are being funded, even though the authorization has lapsed.

So I think that in this particular instance, even though the point of order is correct and proper, it moves aside what should be the primary concern, which is to have cops on the street and connecting young people up with cops, which is the point of this amendment, to say that law enforcement officers are paid for under this grant program.

I want to let every Member know that when this bill is finished, when it comes out of conference, there will be money for the COPS program. The only thing that this amendment seeks to say is that some of those cops should have, as their primary responsibility, interacting and intervening in the development of youth gangs because we know that if we can grab ahold of these young people while the concrete has not yet hardened, we can prevent them from taking on a life of criminal or antisocial activity.

So I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment. I think it is correctly on point, and I appreciate the chairman reserving his point of order so that I can make the point that, even though unauthorized, we have the authority to appropriate this money—and we will, as we did last year and the year before and the year before that. Because at the end of the day, cops on the street, when someone dials 911, they are not dialing in the hopes of help. They are dialing because they really need help, and we need to have police officers who can respond.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, before I make a point of order, I do want to say that I do share what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) said.

I would like to tell the gentleman from New York, it isn't only the law enforcement. We had a similar problem. We had MS–13 and violent gangs. It is law enforcement. It is also the mentoring that Mr. FATTAH mentioned. It is after-school programs.

So, if we were to just go after the gang issue as a law enforcement issue, you will never solve the problem. It has to be law enforcement. The schools have to be involved. There have to be after-school programs. It is almost like a three-legged stool.

But as we move ahead, we can look to see because I think everyone who lives in these areas that have been impacted by gangs, that is as much of terrorism for them as it is for somebody that is faced with terrorism from al Qaeda.

Having said that, I do agree with what Mr. FATTAH said.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I now make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Clause 2 of rule XXI states, in pertinent part:

''An appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.''

Madam Chair, the amendment proposes to appropriate funds for a program that has not been reauthorized. And I agree with the gentleman; it probably should have been reauthorized. It was last authorized in 2009. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member seek to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained argument on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law.

The Chair is, therefore, constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

□ 1615

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. 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:

Page 54, line 8, after the word ''rape'' add ''or incest''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I wish to reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, I would like to state at the outset of offering this particular perfecting amendment that I really wish that this section 202 of this bill located on page 54 didn't appear in it. It reads as follows:

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.

Again, I disagree with this section of the bill and its limiting principle, but I feel that we should, at the very least, perfect it in the manner that also includes the words ''or incest.''

In short, there is an allowance here for abortions in the case of endangering the mother, and there is an allowance in the case of rape, but somehow or other this bill forbids abortions in the case of incest.

Throughout the U.S. Code, whether it be in 10 U.S.C. 1093 pertaining to abortions for armed services personnel, 42 U.S.C. 1397ee or jj, dealing with exceptions to abortion limitations within the State Children's Health Insurance Program, known as SCHIP, or 42 U.S.C. 18023, a section containing provisions of the Affordable Care Act, Federal law is clear: abortion exceptions consistently include protections to the life of the mother in cases of rape and cases of incest.

Were one to examine comprehensively the statutes and regulations of this Nation, there are numerous similar occasions referred to colloquially as the Hyde Amendment. I think that this amendment itself is explanatory. I believe it is perfecting in nature. I think it is quite possible that the drafters inadvertently omitted ''incest'' from this bill, and I think that it carries the protection necessary for all American women, whether incarcerated or not.

I don't think that the purpose of this bill was inadvertently or through silence to narrow the protections that are afforded to women under our Constitution. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I recognize that there may be a point of order to be raised here. I would specifically urge my colleague to think twice before raising that point of order. We are talking here about incest, a vile crime. Even if there is a point of order to be raised here, it is optional. I would hope that my colleagues would recognize that it is optional and that a higher important principle is involved here.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the Grayson amendment on the ground that it constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The amendment does seek to change existing statutory law in a bill designed to appropriate money by amending an existing provision, adding the word ''or incest'' to the list of exceptions contained in the statute.

Making a determination whether incest has occurred is not currently required by this statutory provision and would result in a requirement that the new determination be made. So, therefore, the amendment falls outside of the standard of ''merely perfecting'' precisely because it requires a new determination that is not required under the current provision.

The amendment expands the universe of exceptions, Madam Chairman, provided for in this section, and the existing determinations of whether the life of the mother is in danger or there has been a rape do not provide the information that would allow the determination that incest has occurred.

As a result, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI which states:

''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FATTAH. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania seek recognition?

Mr. FATTAH. If the gentleman would reserve his point of order.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, I would be glad to reserve the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. In every single instance and when we deal with this question in law, we provide an exception for incest, and for some reason in the language, that is missing in this instance. So I thank the gentleman for pointing that out.

I do realize that we are probably not on the right side of the point of order, but I do think that it is an important point and that none of us would want to create a circumstance where someone's choices were limited if they were the victim of incest. So, hopefully, we will find a way to deal with this notwithstanding the point of order. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I do insist on the point of order and ask the Chair for a ruling.

Mr. GRAYSON. I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas insists on the point of order that he argued earlier. The gentleman from Florida is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, laws have consequences. The scenario that we are describing here is one where a female prisoner is the victim of incest. If this law passes as currently written that female prisoner will be forced to carry to term the child of an incestuous relationship. I regard this as absolutely indefensible.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CULBERSON. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CULBERSON. If I could ask the gentleman to confine his remarks to whether or not his amendment changes existing law.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds Members to reserve their remarks to the point of order.

Mr. GRAYSON. I would ask the gentleman to consider the consequences of his action and withdraw the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Are there any other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Under settled precedent, where legislative language is permitted to remain in a general appropriation bill, a germane amendment merely perfecting that language and not adding further language is in order, but an amendment effecting further legislation is not in order.

The Chair finds that section 202 of the bill contains a legislative limitation on the use of funds in the bill for abortion. Section 202 exempts from the limitation on funds those abortions involving rape and those involving endangerment of the life of the mother were the fetus carried to term. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida seeks to expand the exemptions to include cases of incest.

The Chair finds the ruling of July 16, 1998, instructive. On that date, the Committee considered a general appropriation bill prescribing legislative exceptions to a limitation on certain funding for abortion. Those legislative exceptions included rape, incest, and the life of the mother. In response to a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI, the exceptions were ruled out as requiring new determinations not required by existing law.

While the exceptions in section 202 require certain determinations by the agencies funded in the bill, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida requires an additional determination, to wit: whether the pregnancy to be terminated by abortion was the result of incest.

As such, the amendment does not merely perfect the legislative limitation in section 202.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, 2015, 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 the Bureau of Prisons or 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 ''Research, Evaluation and Statistics'', ''State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'', and ''Juvenile Justice 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) up to 2 percent of 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, shall 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.

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 Act, 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 individual 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 2015.

(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 2015, 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) Not to exceed $10,000,000 of the excess unobligated balances available under section 524(c)(8)(E) of title 28, United States Code, shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2015, and any use, obligation, transfer or allocation of such funds 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 2015, $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.

(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 2015.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2015''.

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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 100, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chairman, this amendment would reduce the Office of Science and Technology Policy by $1 million and apply that amount to the spending reduction account.

As chairman of the House Science Oversight Subcommittee, it has come to my attention that there is, or at least was, an Affordable Care Act Information Technology Exchanges Steering Committee, chaired by White House officials and established in May 2012, almost a year and a half before the rollout of healthcare.gov.

That White House Steering Committee's charter explicitly directed the formulation of working groups, including one on security. It also turns out that a cochairman of this ObamaCare Web site Steering Committee is the U.S. Chief Technology Officer in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Mr. Todd Park.

Upon learning this, I, as chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee, along with full committee Chairman SMITH, and Research and Technology Subcommittee Chairman Dr. BUCSHON, sent a December 20, 2013, letter to the White House requesting that Mr. Park make himself available to the committee to answer questions regarding the security issues with healthcare.gov by January 10.

As we stand here today, OSTP has ignored the committee's request for Mr. Park to testify and has done so three times. Don't the American people deserve answers from those who are in charge of overseeing the implementation of the ObamaCare Web site's security protocol? After all, Mr. Park is a deputy to OSTP Director Holdren.

But when asked at a March 26, 2014, hearing before the Science Committee about Mr. Park's refusal to testify, Director Holdren stated that Todd Park ''doesn't report to me. I can't compel him to come and testify.''

Well, if he does not report to the OSTP director, why are he and his Office of the Chief Technology Officer an

official part of the Office of Science and Technology Policy that the OSTP director supposedly directs, manages, and supports?

If Mr. Todd Park does not, in fact, report to OSTP, then his office should not be funded by OSTP, and I seek now, through this amendment to make that correction immediately.

I offered a similar amendment, which passed by a voice vote, during the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology markup of H.R. 4186, the FIRST Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I would hope that we can work it out. If you wanted to offer a different amendment with regard to the health care issue, I will support it, if we can find a way, but the concern I have is OSTP is a small office.

This is roughly cutting 20 percent of their entire budget. In the last 2 years alone—and I agree with what the gentleman said on the health care aspect—our subcommittee has tasked OSTP with coordinating a major interagency effort on neuroscience, overseeing the implementation of policy across the government on public access to Federally funded research results, cochairing an effort to streamline and prioritize Federal STEM education and spending, and assessing the American supply chain vulnerability stemming from the lack of domestic access to rare earth elements, which is another problem that we are beginning to have with China.

If we reduce the OSTP by 20 percent and if the gentleman would offer another amendment to reduce it by, you know, $50,000, I would accept the amendment or take the amendment, I can't speak for the other side, but to cut it by 20 percent, that is just too much.

So until there is a different amendment that would meet the gentleman's need, as I agree with him on health care, we would accept it, but to take 20 percent out, particularly since—and I know Mr. FATTAH has been working with the whole issue of neuroscience and the brain, I would oppose the amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work this out. Of course, we don't have time to come back with another amendment. I suspect, as soon as we finish with this one, we will move forward, but I would like to work with you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the ranking member, to try to find something.

Mr. Holdren says Mr. Park doesn't answer to him, and supposedly, this guy is a member of the OSTP staff, and he has refused to come before our Oversight Committee. We just have to find some way. If he is not part of OSTP, why should we fund anything dealing with what he is doing there? That is the point of this.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I completely agree. What I will do is we will call the OSTP and ask Mr. Holdren to come up with the gentleman and get him, and you can come to the meeting, too.

Quite frankly, if he doesn't come, I will offer, when we go to conference, to take a chunk out of this to make sure that you get answers. We would like to bring Mr. Holdren up so that Chairman BROUN will have an opportunity to talk to the individual. I will help him get the individual up.

It will be in your office, not in mine. We will ask Holdren to come up the week we come back in.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Would you agree to a $150,000 cut?

Mr. WOLF. Yes. If he doesn't come up, I would. If he does not come up, I would. I will.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, OSTP is doing enormously important work on behalf of our country, and Congress also has an oversight role, and if the chairman of the Oversight Committee is having difficulty getting an answer to a question, I would be glad to try to help facilitate that and work with the chairman.

We do have some arcane rules here in Washington about advisers to the President not being in a position to be able to talk directly to Congress, but the head of the agency, as the chairman said, could be brought up with his subordinate, Mr. Park, to answer whatever questions there may be.

I kind of think that we are closing the door on that particular issue relative to the Affordable Care Act, but you deserve answers, no matter what, on this question, but when we talk about the budget of this agency, when there are 50 million Americans suffering from brain-related diseases, when China has almost an absolute monopoly on rare earth elements that we need to find our way around for national security and other reasons, OSTP is doing some vitally important work, and we can't take 20 percent of their budget, but we can get to the point where you can get the answers that you desire and rightfully.

You are the anchor of the Thursday prayer group, and you are someone who is a responsible Member of Congress, and we want to make sure that you get your answers. I will work with the chairman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate that. The question we have—we have asked Mr. Park to come three times, and then we had Mr. Holdren come to the full committee, and Mr. Park is in OSTP, and Mr. Holdren is chairman of OSTP, and he said Mr. Park doesn't work for him.

So if he doesn't work for him, then why should we be paying salary and expenses and things like that? That is the point.

Mr. FATTAH. What the chairman offered—he said $150,000 if we can't get you Holdren or someone to give you a satisfactory answer to your question. There are some rules about executive branch agents, individuals, and advisers to the President not being compelled to testify, but when you have line staff people running an agency, Holdren is available, and we can have him come with his staff and answer these questions.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the offer of both gentlemen to work with me. It is our responsibility in Congress to have oversight. I am the chairman of the Oversight Committee on Science, Space and Technology. We have had tremendous problems with not only this department, but many others, in getting people to come and just tell us what is going on, to testify before our committee.

We have been rebuffed and rebuffed time and time again, ignored time and time again by this administration. This is the only way I see to get at these people.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, let me say: Let's work through it. We can work together.

The chairman has given you his assurances that he will work with you, but there is no possibility that we can afford to cut this agency by 20 percent. I need to oppose this amendment.

We would love to work with you to get you the answers because you are not trying to punish OSTP, you are trying to get legitimate answers to legitimate questions, and we want to help you and facilitate that.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate that.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I think we have resolved this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, 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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING AMENDMENT DEBATE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4660, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4660 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 585:

(1) each amendment (other than pro forma amendments addressed in this order) shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

(2) each amendment shall not be subject to amendment except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations (or a respective designee) each may offer one pro forma amendment to an amendment for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies thereof may offer pro forma amendments to the bill at any point in the reading for the purposes of debate but that no other pro forma amendments to the bill will be in order.

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

There was no objection.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 585 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. 4660.

Will the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1641

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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK (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 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 60, line 22.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $5,193,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *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 $100,000,000 shall be for pre-formulation and/or formulation activities for a mission that meets the science goals outlined for the Jupiter Europa mission in the most recent planetary science decadal survey.

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, $666,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space research and technology 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, $620,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

Page 64, line 22, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to shift $7 million in funding from the NASA space operations account to NASA's space technology mission. I strongly support and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I strongly support the improvements to the overall NASA budget, but I am concerned that we are missing a critical opportunity in the space technology account.

The space technology mission supports game-changing research and development that enhances our current missions and expands the opportunity for future missions.

For example, at NASA Glenn in Ohio, space technology research supports the Solar Electric Propulsion project, developing critical energy technologies to enable cost-effective trips to Mars and across the inner solar system to enrich a variety of next-generation journeys and to do so more energy effectively and efficiently.

□ 1645

This transformative work advances not only our space exploration program, but our economy and our national well-being, with spin-off benefits to advanced manufacturing, our commercial energy sector, defense, automotive, and commercial aviation industries and countless other applications.

The Space Technology Mission Directorate's focus on partnerships and strategic integration promotes technology transfer and commercialization within private sector companies, sprouting new businesses and the important jobs that accompany the future. This exciting work challenges our brightest minds, including many of our young people, to excel and create a pipeline of innovation driving our economy into the future.

I understand limitations of the constrained budget we are working with and want to thank Ranking Member FATTAH and our esteemed chairman, FRANK WOLF, to better fund NASA's Space Technology Program and other critical research and development efforts.

My amendment merely shifts $7 million in funding to the space technology account from the space operations account. It is a small but important step in the right direction, and space operations has been given quite a substantial increase. In addition, my amendment would actually reduce outlays by $2 million for fiscal year 2015.

So I think it is a win-win-win on all fronts. I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman and the ranking member and our colleagues as the bill moves forward in the Senate and further address the needs of this important program.

I would urge support of the Kaptur amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in very, very, very strong support of the amendment and will increase the funding and work with you to do what we possibly can. I appreciate the gentlewoman's interest and advocacy for space technology, as well as her cooperation in working with us to find a way to dedicate more resources to it.

I have no objection, and I ask for a strong ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman so very much.

This is my moment also to add my voice to the other Members here who have celebrated and expressed gratitude to Chairman WOLF for his years of service to the people of the United States and this great Republic.

I don't think I will ever hear the word ''Darfur'' and not see FRANK WOLF's face in my mind's eye. I don't think that I will ever read articles that deal with child hunger, wherever it might exist, in some of the most forgotten places on Earth, and not think of FRANK WOLF.

I will always remember, sir, your gentlemanly manner, your great passion. I will always recall the work that you have done to stand up for those who speak for liberty in places, forgotten corners in China, for religious leaders who have been suppressed around the world. And what a great patriot you are and a gentleman who can work across the aisle and whose word is always gold.

I thank you very, very much for your support on this amendment. We wish you Godspeed in the years ahead. I know all my colleagues join me in wishing you well and thank you for your exemplary service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I share the sentiments of the chairman. Space technology is critically important. I want to acknowledge the work that was originally done by Bobby Braun, who is now at Georgia Tech, Mike Gazarik, who now is the chief space technologist at NASA doing an extraordinary job, but the resources are needed.

I want to thank you for offering this amendment because it points us toward greater resources in that regard. I am familiar with the great work that is being done in your home State of Ohio at the Glenn Research Center.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I just want to thank the ranking member who had such a broad range, Ranking Member FATTAH, certainly in the space science arena, but also in urban development, energy, and so many other facets of what we do as a committee and as a country. I want to thank you very much for being able to work in a collegial way on this amendment. We thank you very much for remaining true to your commitment to true science.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $4,167,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: *Provided*, That not less than $1,140,000,000 shall be for the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle: *Provided further*, That not less than $1,915,000,000 shall be for the Space Launch System, which shall have a lift capability not less than 130 metric tons and which shall have an upper stage and other core elements developed simultaneously: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for the Space Launch System, $1,600,000,000 shall be for launch vehicle development and $315,000,000 shall be for exploration ground systems.

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; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities, including operations, production, 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, $3,885,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

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, $106,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which $9,000,000 shall be for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research and $30,000,000 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, exploration, 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, $2,779,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

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, $446,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That hereafter, notwithstanding section 20145(b)(2)(A) of title 51, United States Code, all proceeds from leases entered into under that section shall be deposited into this account: *Provided further*, That such proceeds shall be available for a period of 5 years to the extent and in amounts as provided in annual appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That such proceeds referred to in the two preceding provisos shall be available for obligation for fiscal year 2015 in an amount not to exceed $9,584,100: *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, $34,000,000, of which $500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER 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.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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 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; $5,973,645,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, 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, $200,760,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I wish to enter into a colloquy with Chairman WOLF.

I rise today to highlight an increasingly abused law enforcement tactic known as ''civil asset forfeiture.'' This process is an ugly development that enables law enforcement to take legal action against property of individuals, regardless of whether the property owner is guilty, innocent, or even charged with a crime at all.

Although criminal forfeiture is a legitimate tool for law enforcement that has helped in the war on drugs and human trafficking, the civil forfeiture system has created the opportunity for local and State law enforcement to police for profit in coordination with the Department of Justice.

Specifically, the practice of equitable sharing between local and/or State Departments and the Federal Government has increased 250 percent over the last 12 years, reaching $657 million in 2013 alone, according to The Heritage Foundation. Equitable sharing allows State and local agencies to work around State laws that prohibit civil forfeitures so long as the State agency partners with the Department of Justice and splits the profits.

State and local governments, in their pursuit of the fruits of seizures have at times been too eager to seize property, with the result that innocent citizens have been adversely affected with little or no compensation for their damages and economic losses. The recent story of Terry Dehko from Michigan exemplifies the problems that can occur under the civil asset forfeiture policy.

On January 22, 2013, the IRS obtained a secret warrant and used their civil asset forfeiture powers to empty Mr. Dehko's bank account of over $35,000 based on spurious evidence that the longtime grocer was a money launderer. The IRS offered to settle the case for 20 cents on the dollar. Unfortunately, this is a normal procedure for IRS, Department of Justice, and the law enforcement partners: seize property, then negotiate without having to prove guilt in a court of law.

It is time to rethink our Federal policies on civil asset forfeiture and end the abusive era of seize, forfeit, and profit. Law-abiding citizens should not fall prey to police departments and their Federal partners. I believe we can find a solution to this problem that maintains a legitimate policing tool while respecting our Constitution.

I will continue to work with the chairman, the Judiciary Committee, and my colleagues in the House to craft a sensible forfeiture policy that helps law enforcement but protects our constitutionally protected property rights.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the committee and your leadership in making us aware of the pressing need to review Federal forfeiture policies.

As you were speaking, I thought: Why don't we ask the inspector general to look into this? So we will work with you to do a letter asking the IG to see if he has the authority to look in to see, because based on what you said, we don't want this to happen.

Although an appropriation bill is not the best place to address civil asset forfeiture reform, we look forward to a constructive partnership to make sure we are protecting Americans. We will work with you on crafting a letter to the inspector general to see what we can find out and how we can make this not happen again.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I would join and sign such a request to the IG.

Secondly, I do think that, given what you said and given the overreach, we do need to see if we can work with the authorizing committee and if, perhaps, a package that could be acceptable to the authorizers, it could even be included in such a conference committee when we finalize this bill, because we should protect Americans from the loss of property absent due process.

So what you have explained is a process that is backwards under our system of laws. Before someone is penalized, there should be an allegation, there should be a fact hearing, people should have a chance to answer and hear from their accusers, versus a circumstance where their property is taken and then they have to fight a rear guard action to try to get it back.

I am very concerned about this. I would be glad to work with the chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH 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:

Page 69, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $15,350,000)(increased by $15,350,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, first I want to thank the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for his earlier comments about our National Science Foundation amendment. I appreciate his efforts to hold the NSF accountable for its grant funding decisions.

The Smith-Cantor amendment reduces the fiscal year 2015 funding in the bill, the National Science Foundation's Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences directorate, or SBE directorate, by more than $15 million. This reduction will freeze SBE at its current funding level rather than increase it to the level requested by the President.

The Smith-Cantor amendment maintains the overall level of National Science Foundation research funding in the bill. It redirects the amount of the SBE cut to the physical sciences and engineering, the areas that were prioritized in the NSF authorization act reported out of the Science Committee yesterday.

Much of the research funded through the SBE directorate has obvious scientific merit and is in the national interest. But the SBE directorate has also funded dozens, perhaps hundreds, of questionable grants. For example, when the National Science Foundation pays a researcher more than $227,000 to thumb through the pages of old National Geographic magazines to look at animal pictures, taxpayers feel as though the NSF is thumbing its nose at them.

The NSF also spent $340,000 for a study of human-set forest fires 2,000 years ago in New Zealand. Americans who have lost their homes and businesses to wildfires could ask how this helps them.

Taxpayers can't help but wonder why NSF spent $1.5 million of their money to study rangeland management in Mongolia rather than, say, in Texas.

□ 1700

We shouldn't reward frivolous use of taxpayer money with even more money. This is what the President has proposed.

The Smith-Cantor amendment zeros out the SBE increase for fiscal year 2015. This should encourage the NSF to apply higher standards when awarding its grants.

Yesterday, the House Science Committee marked up the FIRST Act, legislation that reauthorizes NSF programs.

My colleagues and I approved an amendment to the bill that cuts the SBE directorate to $150 million, $100 million less than the current fiscal year. That is where we think the discussion ought to start next year. So this amendment is only the first step.

I also want to point out the SBE directorate isn't the only source of questionable NSF grants. For instance, NSF that handed out $700,000 for ''The Great Immensity,'' a climate change musical, and $5.6 million for a climate change scavenger hunt and phone game.

Such grants make taxpayers even more skeptical about how their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent and diminishes public support for scientific research.

Investments in science are essential if our country is to continue to lead the world in nanotechnology, supercomputing, and other fields that yield new jobs, new businesses, and, in fact, entire new industries.

The way to restore public support is not to continue funding questionable grants with taxpayer money.

The Smith-Cantor amendment is a small but important step in the right direction. It sets the precedent for the Science Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the House to take additional steps in the future to assure that NSF-funded research is, in fact, in the national interest.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I have no objection to the amendment.

I share the opinion that NSF must exercise caution. I should tell Members, the NSF funding here is at an all-time high. This is a Republican committee, if you will. The House and we support the sciences. I want our country to stay ahead of China and the other countries. I want America to be number one.

But I appreciate what Mr. SMITH, the chairman, said: NSF must exercise caution and grant awards and ensure—and I hope NSF is listening today—that every grant is both scientifically, meritorious, and responsive to the national interest. The subcommittee has already taken steps to help improve accountability and transparency in its NSF operations by including language in the FY15 CGS report and is working with NSF to understand improvements that the agency is making in its review and communication process.

In addition, last week, I sent a letter to the NSF director, Ms. Cordova. She is a very impressive person, very knowledgeable, she is brand new, I think she is committed to making sure that they only fund scientific things. But this letter emphasizes the need for the agency to be judicious in a grant it awards and to ensure that taxpayer funds are used wisely.

The subcommittee will continue to provide oversight on this topic as needed.

I thank the gentleman. I think it is important for NSF to know that since the funding is at a record high in order that America can be and will always be number one in math and science and physics and chemistry and biology and lead the world, with that excess funding, extra funding, goes the responsibility to make sure there are not grants that then weaken the program and give there an opportunity for people to say this program is out of kilter. I appreciate Mr. SMITH raising these.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I want to acknowledge the great work of the gentleman from Texas on patent reform. We worked together and he led the effort that has reformed our patent system, I think, in a remarkable way.

The majority leader and I spent some time on one of the last vote days here to go over to NIH and hear from Dr. Collins about great research, particularly interested in pediatric cancers and the like.

So these are two gentlemen, the authors of this amendment, who have been very positive and focused in a number of areas that I share with them. However, this amendment is misguided, and I want to speak in opposition to it.

The notion that we would want to eliminate certain investigations by the National Science Foundation into economic science or behavioral science, when we talk about disasters, the reason why we have saved so many lives, it is not just that we have improved weather forecasting, even though that would be eliminated in terms of the moneys here for investigative purposes by the National Science Foundation, but also understanding the behaviors of people facing disasters is very important. That would be cut.

This area of posttraumatic stress is a critical area. We know now that many of our returning soldiers face posttraumatic stress, but we also know that children living in very difficult circumstances in our country are more traumatized than if they were living in a war zone, an active war zone in another country. So eliminating, cutting back scientific investigations in this regard would be, I think, disastrous.

That is why I am hoping that whatever is causing this, there will be some reversal of it eventually. But in the meantime, I want to suggest to the House that we should oppose this amendment, we should oppose the notion that somehow we don't want to know certain things.

I was at the University of Pittsburgh. I saw some results of National Science Foundation funding that started out 30 years ago that a Member on this floor would be on the floor complaining about now. It was the examination of what happens in the neurons of a monkey when they move their arm, what neurons fire off in their brain.

Well, that research today, 30 years later, literally has a woman who, because of a disease, has no control of her body, but can now move an artificial arm through her thoughts. This is the result of research by the National Science Foundation. It is the world premier basic science foundation, it is the model for our economic competitors. They are imitating it.

A small country like Singapore with less than 5 million people is investing $7 billion in their national science foundation. Here we are, the wealthiest country in the world, and we are putting $7.4 billion, which is the highest ever, and I thank the chairman.

But now we want to put handcuffs on the agency about what it is that they can look at in terms of improving the life chances of Americans. The research has paid off. That is why we are the great country that we are today. The World Economic Forum says our Nation and our Nation's economy is driven by innovation.

The last thing that we should be doing on the floor of this House is equivocating or compromising or making it more challenging for those who are engaged in the innovation ecosystem to do their work.

Even though I compliment the gentleman, Mr. SMITH, and the majority

leader, Mr. CANTOR, for all their efforts, I can't imagine for the life of me why we would be on this floor tonight debating a retreat on behavioral science, on economic science. It makes no sense. I would hope that the House, notwithstanding the fact that the majority is held by the other team, I hope in this instance, as the chairman said, we would realize that this is not a competition between Democrats and Republicans. We are competing against countries that have big and plus populations like China and India, they want to eat our lunch economically, and what we need to do is stop the bickering back and forth and figure out what is best for our country.

The chairman and I voted for Simpson-Bowles. We were one of just less than 40 Members who did so. I might be in the minority on this vote, but I am going to vote on what is in the best interest of our Nation, and that is to continue to invest in innovation.

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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LIPINSKI. 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 Texas will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $200,760,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. 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:

Page 69, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $760,000)''.

Page 70, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $29,500,000)''.

Page 70, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $37,000,000)''.

Page 71, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $70,000)''.

Page 100, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $67,330,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, this amendment would cut about $67 million from the National Science Foundation's appropriations increase—again, increase; not reduce their funding, but reduce the increase—and apply that amount to the spending reduction account.

The cuts in this amount are to four areas not directly involved in basic research such as construction, education and human resources, agency operations, and the Office of the National Science Board.

In 2007 and again in 2010, NSF was granted funding to launch new STEM education programs under the America COMPETES Act, not to mention the Recovery Act stimulus with the same focus.

Unfortunately, the U.S. continues to fall behind in producing enough STEM workers to compete globally, and our high school graduates' math and science scores are stagnant.

A 2013 GAO study found that 209 different Federal STEM education programs overlap across 13 agencies, spending a total of $3 billion—$3 billion, with a b. GAO also found that 173 of these programs shared similarities in objectives and focus.

The underlying committee report acknowledges program reductions and consolidation and yet increases spending on education and human resources by $29.5 million for an abandoned program that will be taken over by existing programs.

More often than not, increasing Federal Government spending on non-research science initiatives grows the Federal Government, not just the next generation of scientists.

Today, we are the world's leader in combined Federal as well as private sector investment in research and development, at last estimate, $465 billion for 2014.

Some are worried that China will catch up to our spending by the 2020s. Of course, those making that assumption also estimate that both the U.S. and China will be spending $600 billion each by 2022. Is Federal spending a race in which we want to engage with China?

National government expenditure per capita on R&D in China is $218 per capita—again, research and development in China is $218 compared to the U.S. per person amount of $1,276. This is not sustainable.

As the science community can attest, Congress often overpromises on funding and pulls the rug out on projects halfway through.

NSF is sitting on unnecessary and outmoded facilities without needed action on whether to close and sell. NSF should not be given more money for new facilities until it is established that NSF is operating existing facilities efficiently and effectively.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, in defense of the National Science Foundation and in opposition to these cuts, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman HOLT. This is another one of these amendments that works against the effort of the committee, which is to try to increase—in fact, we did increase—the National Science Foundation's budget.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I should point out, first of all, that as a percentage of our economy, the Federal Government's support for scientific research is half of what it was back when I was in college many decades ago. The point is that we are not keeping up.

Part of the problem is, here in this Chamber and around the country, people value the fruits of research, but they don't have a clue about how it is done. We see here, on the floor, people ridiculing research because of the title.

A prominent politician recently ridiculed NSF-funded research in fruit flies or game theory. Obviously, she didn't understand that one of the principal biological organisms that has been studied is Drosophila, which is the so-called fruit fly.

Social and behavioral research is important in understanding how people make decisions about energy use or about how to invest or about disaster response. It tells us a great deal about brain processes; so, in pointing out NSF studies to ridicule because they sound foolish, we here—we policymakers—can look like the fools.

I am a physicist by background, so I am pleased to hear the chairman talk about research in physics and chemistry and math, but we also need studies, based on evidence, as NSF studies are, on human behavior. Let's look at library science.

It would be easy to ridicule a study that I saw described not long ago in library science, which was funded by the National Science Foundation. It just so happens that it turned out to be the basis for what we now know as Google.

Yes, that research was done with taxpayer money, and it could have been ridiculed as foolish, as a waste of taxpayer money, but I think the country's economy has benefited, maybe several thousand times over—maybe many thousands of times over—the amount that was spent on that foolish research on library science.

We should be asking, through NSF studies, why humans engage in unhealthy behavior. We could learn a lot about applicable public health programs through such things.

This idea of cutting back on funding in the taxpayers' interest is terribly misguided. As a country, we are greatly underinvesting in research. I thank the gentleman for standing up for NSF research.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, in reclaiming my time, there will also be

another amendment on NSF that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) may speak to, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment of my good friend from Georgia because it would negatively impact a range of NSF activities. The amendment would hamstring NSF's main operational account that funds activities like financial management, grant oversight, and procurement.

I know the gentleman cares very strongly about protecting the taxpayers' interests, and I don't believe that making it more difficult for NSF to monitor and to oversee its funds helps those interests in any way.

The memo would eliminate the increase that the bill provides for NSF's critical STEM education programs. These funds are urgently needed to address widespread and serious challenges that we have currently in our U.S. economy.

Compared to our major international competitors, our K–12 students do not perform well in STEM-related subjects, and our universities produce a smaller percentage of STEM-related graduates.

In addition, our STEM workforce is not big enough to meet the current or projected demand for skilled employees by high-tech companies. NSF's STEM education programs will play a major role in solving these programs by improving the quality of STEM instructors, by attracting more students to STEM fields, and by enabling talented students to pursue STEM degrees.

These investments are important to the economy and to the overall importance of the Nation as a whole. For this reason, I would urge my fellow Members to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, in closing, I am not cutting basic research here at all. I am suggesting cuts in the directorate.

There are just silly things that they have—the Climate Change Narrative Game, for instance, and the climate change media exhibition that portrays scientists and students at work in Amazonia, which is the indoctrination of young girls. There is ''The Matter of Origins.'' I could go on and on.

I believe in research. I am an applied scientist, and I am a physician. We are not cutting research. In fact, I believe in research, yet what we are doing is just trying to cut the directorate and save the taxpayers money.

We are broke as a Nation, and we have just got to stop spending money at random and without, really, responsibility. I encourage the acceptance of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who represents, in part, one of the greatest research triangles in the country outside of Philadelphia.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to these efforts to target the funding for the National Science Foundation's Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences directorate (SBE).

The world is changing rapidly, and we need quality research to help us understand how imminent and unforeseen changes in areas such as technology, climate, immigration, and the economy will affect our society and our future. And these things do have policy implications.

We shouldn't be wasting hard-earned taxpayer money, in fact, on policy solutions that are not rooted in sound research, precisely the type of research that some of these efforts here today seek to curtail.

As a result of research funded by the SBE directorate, for example, we are learning how to better respond to natural and economic disasters, how to improve the educational methods practiced in our Nation's classrooms, how to expand outreach to children regarding STEM education.

We have learned how to increase the safety of our troops in combat, how to better reduce violence among our young people, and we have expanded our knowledge of how the human mind works through the BRAIN Initiative, led by Ranking Member FATTAH and Chairman WOLF.

In this era of Tea Party preeminence and so-called fiscal discipline at the expense of rational policy decisions, taking cheap shots at Federal programs and research projects has become a favorite indoor sport.

I wish my conservative colleagues would spend as much time learning the facts about the programs they deride as they do in preparing the flurry of floor amendments and floor speeches to target them.

Helping policymakers make informed decisions is what NSF's Political Science Program (PSP), in particular, is all about. Let me just say a word about the SBE's Political Science Program, which is close to my heart by virtue of my previous life.

The PSP has consistently produced valuable, practical research that informs policymakers and government agencies on issues as vital as natural disaster response, environmental regulation, and foreign policy. Here are a few examples.

NSF's Political Science Program helps us gain a better understanding of public reactions to natural disasters, including Hurricane Katrina, which was researched at Rice University, as well as to the BP oil spill, which was researched at Louisiana State University. It has helped Federal, State, and local authorities develop more effective evacuation and recovery plans.

It has supported research on the causes and consequences of terrorist attacks, at Pennsylvania State University and at UNC-Chapel Hill; on competition for natural resources as a driving force in international conflict, research at the University of Georgia and at the University of Colorado; on third-party peacemaking, research at the University of Notre Dame; and on dispute resolution mechanisms that lead to lasting peace, at the University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa.

But this isn't just about political science research; it's about the entire SBE. NSF's rigorous peer-review process assures that only meritorious proposals are funded.

In an era when a quick Internet search can generate a statistic or an opinion to support any argument, it is more important than ever that we have clear, dependable, peer-reviewed research into the most pressing social, behavioral, and economic questions of the day.

Should you question the quality of such research, I simply note that nearly a quarter—that is 50 of 212—of the Nobel Prize winners in science funded by NSF since 1951 were recipients of funding from the SBE program. Every winner of the Nobel Prize in economic sciences since 1998 has been an NSF grantee.

In short, SBE taps the best minds in the country to help us better understand and address some of the most vexing policy dilemmas we face. The body of work it has produced informs the decisions of America's first responders, military leaders, regulators, diplomats, and policymakers.

I urge my colleagues to reject misguided attempts to target the work of NSF and, in particular, of the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate, which is and will be uniquely valuable in informing our country's policy decisions as we face the future.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $876,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

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; $335,000,000: *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 2015 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 that $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, $14,430,000, of which $400,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

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 15 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, 2015''.

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, $9,000,000: *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, $364,000,000: *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, $350,000,000, of which $319,650,000 is for basic field programs and required independent audits; $4,350,000 is for the Office of Inspector General, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be used to conduct additional audits of recipients; $18,000,000 is for management and grants oversight; $4,000,000 is for client self-help and information technology; $3,000,000 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.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 74, line 13 after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $350,000,000)''.

Page 100, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $350,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, I, along with my colleague from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), am offering an amendment to cut all funding from the Legal Services Corporation and to allocate that money to the Spending Reduction Account.

Legal Services Corporation was established 40 years ago, and I have no doubt that it was for the right reasons, but it hasn't been reauthorized since 1980. At no point in the last 34 years has either party in Congress felt that this agency was so important that it needed to be reauthorized.

In fact, in 2012, it was estimated that over 94 percent of the services that Legal Services was set up to provide were provided by State and local governments, bar associations, and pro bono work by attorneys.

This means that taxpayers are footing the bill of a million dollars a day for this service, yet this organization handles less than 6 percent of all indigent cases.

The purpose of this bill, Madam Chair, is to provide law enforcement to the American people. With $350 million, we could employ thousands of FBI agents, U.S. Marshals, and others to protect Americans from domestic threats every day. Instead, this bill proposes to provide significant funding to an entity that is plagued by abuse.

Allow me to provide a few examples, Madam Chair, from the recent LSC inspector general's report published April 30. The report found continued systemic deficiencies in the Legal Service Corporation grant program.

The Inspector General's Office opened 12 new investigations, including criminal cases that involved fraudulent activity and financial irregularities by grantee employees. The investigation also discovered unauthorized outside practice of law, as well as time and attendance abuse.

We are spending millions simply on the inspector general's investigations of Legal Services Corporation.

Additionally, cases arising from the Office of Inspector General resulted in the restitution of client trust fund moneys that had been converted to personal use.

As one example, these investigations resulted in the recovery of more than $21,000 in Legal Services funds for time spent by a grantee's attorney in unauthorized outside practices.

At a time of record deficits and climbing debt, we should eliminate the funding of this program, which has not been reauthorized by Congress, including this one, in 34 years.

Let's take the Legal Services Corporation off the taxpayers' payroll.

With that, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chairman, I do rise in opposition to the amendment of my colleague from Georgia.

The recommendation in this amendment provides $350 million for Legal Services, which is a reduction to 2008 level of almost $70 million. It is $80 million below the 2010 request.

I understand there are some concerns with Legal Services Corporation-funded programs, but the bill contains several important restrictions on political activity by the LSC grantees. That would include lobbying, abortion litigation, and class action lawsuits. These restrictions cover both the Legal Services funds as well as private funds.

The administration proposed to eliminate several of these restrictions, but the House bill rejects this proposal.

We have included language in the committee report directing Legal Services to vigorously enforce the restrictions on political activity, which we think is very important.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have supported Legal Services for Americans who would not otherwise have adequate access to civil legal assistance. We are facing an extremely challenging budgetary environment—and I realize that—but the recommendation is a fair compromise between the need for austerity and also the balance to provide civil legal assistance to low-income Americans.

For that reason, Madam Chair, I would urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I am opposed to this amendment.

I do, however, want to yield to the gentlelady from the great State of Florida—part of the Space Coast, and who does an extraordinary job—to speak on behalf of Legal Services. Before I do that, I want to make one point.

Last year alone, Legal Services helped 41,000 veterans of the United States of America who were facing foreclosure and had other challenges related to disability claims.

This notion that we should do away with access to courts for people who have worn the uniform to protect our rights, I think, is wrongheaded.

I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) to speak further on this subject.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Thank you to the ranking member for yielding to me.

I rise today to oppose the Scott amendment and urge the House to oppose the excessive cuts to the nonprofit and independent Legal Services Corporation. I am right in sync with the ranking member's comments, and appreciate the Republican committee chair's opposition to this amendment as well.

Legal Services has a mission to ''provide equal access to the system of justice'' in America. It is the most important provider of civil legal aid for Americans who cannot afford high-priced legal counsel. In fact, legal representation often is out of reach for many American families.

This amendment will make the lives of millions of American families even more challenging. Plus, if you take away legal counsel, you also complicate the resolution of disputes for businesses and others as well.

You all know Legal Services is not a Washington-based bureaucratic program. To the contrary, there are legal aid attorneys and professionals in every State, with more than 800 offices. Legal Services' moneys are put to work back home across America outside of Washington. In my Tampa Bay community, Bay Area Legal Services has a number of community-based offices and is helping the wheels of justice turn for everyone.

What type of legal help? Foreclosure, consumer assistance, domestic violence. Many of the domestic violence victims are simply trying to keep their children safe and their families together.

Others include veterans returning from war, families with housing issues, those that were hit hard by natural disasters and are dealing with the aftermath, and families involved in child custody disputes.

I have seen these advocates in action. Many Members of Congress actually refer cases to Legal Services groups in our area. They help families navigate the justice system. They also boost the economy through avoided costs and swift resolution of disputes.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that Legal Services has already undergone significant cuts, as mentioned by the chairman, over the past few years. The chairman's mark of $350 million is a 4 percent cut from current funding.

Funding for Legal Services was $420 million in fiscal year 2010. It was cut—especially after sequestration in 2013—and any further cuts will do severe damage.

This amendment jeopardizes access to justice and the rule of law. There have already been layoffs back home, closed offices, and reduced services. What you are doing there is saying to families, You can't get help. You can't avoid a foreclosure. You can't escape an abusive relationship or defend yourself against consumer scams.

We cannot allow hundreds of thousands of veterans, elderly victims of foreclosure, and women and children desperate to escape domestic violence to be denied assistance.

So I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on the Scott amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, in closing, I participated with the former Attorney General, Dick Thornburgh, in a pro bono effort for some of our major law firms, which is great. However, national Legal Services in many of these rural communities, unlike a big city like Philadelphia, don't have the benefit of the law firms where they can have pro bono partners and the like. If they are going to have a lawyer for a soldier, a veteran who needs help on a foreclosure, it is going to be Legal Services.

So to cut off their access to the court is the wrong thing for us to do, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, if only Legal Services were limited to the things that the gentlelady and the gentleman have discussed, like helping our veterans with foreclosures and other things, but in my part of the country, in the rural areas that I come from, Legal Services Corporation has hired plaintiffs that are pursuing our farmers and, quite honestly, attempting to put farmers out of business in Georgia. That is unacceptable and taxpayer funds should not be used for that.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman stated, we have no problem with the services that the Legal Services Corporation offers to the poor and to our veterans. What we do have a problem with is the fact that they are targeting our farmers, especially in Georgia.

We have brought this to the attention of Legal Services Corporation more than one time. We feel like some of the tactics that are being used on our farmers are not the right way and not the intent of what the Legal Services Corporation is trying to do.

If we look at the indigent here, both civil and criminal, for this country, including State funds, local funds, from lawyers' interest trust funds, and other funds, we spend $5.7 billion a year in indigent defense.

And so the point is, we believe in giving the poor representation. We just don't agree in the manner that it is being done.

We hope that, through this amendment, attention will be brought to that and there can be work on all sides to make sure that the intent of the Legal Services Corporation is to do what it was intended to do—to not go out and solicit clients, but to help the poor.

I admire them for the help that they have given all the veterans across this great country, but at some point you have to draw a line. I think this amendment sends a clear message to Legal Services that we want to get their attention and we want them to act appropriately, especially as far as our agriculture goes. These people

work very hard every day to produce our food, and we do not need to take advantage of them in the situation that we have now.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, 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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 2014 and 2015, 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.), $3,250,000.

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, $53,500,000, 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, 2016: *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)

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress, or for contracts to provide training for agency employees to engage in such publicity or propaganda purposes.

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 2015, 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 $770,000,000 during fiscal year 2015 from the fund established by section 1402 of Public Law 98–473 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

□ 1745

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by 230,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order upon the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R.

4660. This amendment would increase the cap on the Crime Victims Fund to $1 billion, providing needed funding for victims, while maintaining the stability of the fund for years to come.

Since 1984, the Victims of Crime Act has provided Federal grants to provide essential and, oftentimes, lifesaving services for victims of crimes across America.

The Crime Victims Fund is not financed—let's be clear about this—by taxpayer dollars, but by fines, forfeitures, and other penalties paid by Federal criminal offenders who have been convicted.

By statute, the fund is dedicated to solely supporting victims' services. Because these nontax dollars have already been collected and deposited into the fund, raising the cap does not add to the deficit or to the debt.

Right now, the Crime Victims Fund has more than $10 billion sitting in the account waiting to reach the hands of our Nation's victims of crime. However, budgetary rules that make no sense whatsoever, in my opinion, are preventing this critical fund from serving our Nation's crime victims.

The underlying bill caps the Crime Victims Fund to $770 million,—that is what is in the bill—leaving billions of dollars for the government to use to offset for other Federal spending. This is wrong. It is immoral. It is what our taxpayers don't like about the system here in Washington.

Thankfully, there is a solution. Congressman Judge POE—my good friend—and I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1624, the Crime Victims Fund Preservation Act, which would create a lockbox for the fund. Because the fund contains no taxpayer dollars, it should not be considered as a part of the budget.

Without this legislation, Congress will continue to place artificially low caps on the fund, which only denies and delays necessary services for victims of crime.

Congressman POE and I intend to withdraw the amendment with the recognition we must fix this problem going forward.

I would like to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member FATTAH for your good work on this bill, and I would hope that Judge POE and I could work with you and your staff to fix the rules that prevent this funding from reaching crime victims.

I yield the balance of my time to the Congressman from Texas, Judge TED POE, my good friend and cochair of the Victims' Rights Caucus.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my friend, for this amendment and not only this, but his hard work on victims' issues, even before he came to Congress, in California, being the author of the concept of the three strikes and you are out rule that is in California and many other States. I want to congratulate him on this.

Madam Chair, the VOCA fund, Victims of Crime Act fund, is a great idea. What it is is, when criminals are convicted in Federal court, Federal judges impose fees and fines on that criminal, and that money goes into a fund that is designed to go to victims of crime.

Great idea, let those criminals pay the rent on the courthouse, pay for the system they have created. $10 billion is in that fund, but less than 10 percent of it gets spent every year. Why is that? Because more money keeps coming in; those Federal judges are nailing those criminals, and more money keeps coming into the fund every year. It is $10 billion. Now, we are only spending a little bit of it for victims services.

The reason is—this is my opinion—fuzzy math in the accounting procedure. If more money is spent, for some reason, that is counted as an increase in spending, even though it is not taxpayer money. The money belongs to victims, funded by criminals; so, because of the accounting procedure, we are only able to spend a fraction of the money each year.

We want to spend more of the money because more keeps coming in. Victims deserve it. As my friend said, it is immoral that this money is not spent for victims that is in this fund.

We understand the problem with the point of order. We would like future possibility to have the bill that Mr. COSTA and I have sponsored, to get it on the floor. To make it very simple, the money that goes in the fund goes to victims, and it is not used to pay offsets for other government projects.

I thank the gentleman. I do want to thank Chairman WOLF for working with us—he understands the problem—working with us to try to spend more of the money that belongs to victims that criminals have donated, maybe unwillingly, to the system.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend and cochair of the Victims' Rights Caucus. I could not have said it any better. Common sense suggests that we fix this problem.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, and I hope we can work on this in the future.

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

There was no objection.

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:

Amendment by Mr. THOMPSON of California.

Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 145, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

AYES—260

Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

NOES—145

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Johnson, E. B.

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Fortenberry
Green, Al
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

□ 1823

Messrs. HOLDING, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, NUNNELEE, LAMBORN, NEUGEBAUER, TIPTON, ROKITA, HUNTER, McALLISTER, DesJARLAIS, WILSON of South Carolina, RAHALL, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, LUETKEMEYER, BECERRA, PETERS of California, GRAYSON, MULVANEY, ROTHFUS, and MEEKS 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. POLIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 66, noes 339, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

AYES—66

Amash
Bentivolio
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Capps
Cárdenas
Cohen
Conyers
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Hahn
Hensarling
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Hunter
Jeffries
Jones
Kind
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Maffei
Massie
McDermott
McNerney
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pelosi
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Thompson (CA)
Van Hollen
Yoho

NOES—339

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Garcia
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hurt
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Schock
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

□ 1827

Ms. DUCKWORTH changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against;

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 250. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 212, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

AYES—196

Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—212

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Bass
Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Velázquez
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1831

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 201, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

AYES—208

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—201

Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Richmond
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Bass
Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Waters

□ 1836

Mr. ROONEY changed his 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. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 116, noes 290, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—116

Amash
Bachmann
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Cantor
Chabot
Coble
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Lucas
Marchant
McClintock
McHenry
Meadows
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho

NOES—290

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Shuster
Slaughter
Stockman
Waters

□ 1840

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. DENHAM, 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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year

ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4745, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4681, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–465) on the resolution (H. Res. 604) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4745) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 585 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. 4660.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1845

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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. DENHAM (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1845

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 81, line 24.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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) A grant or contract funded by amounts appropriated by this Act may not be used for the purpose of defraying the costs of a banquet or conference that is not directly and programmatically related to the purpose for which the grant or contract was awarded, such as a banquet or conference held in connection with planning, training, assessment, review, or other routine purposes related to a project funded by the grant or contract.

(d) 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.

(e) 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 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 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 Federal Bureau of Investigation and other appropriate agencies; and

(3) in consultation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation 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 and supply chain risk management experts, a mitigation strategy for any identified risks;

(2) determined 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.

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 the current fiscal year and any 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 escalation 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 the current fiscal year and any 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 2015 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015.

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 available for ''Department of Commerce, Departmental Management, Franchise Fund'', $2,906,000 is hereby rescinded.

(b) Of the unobligated balances available to the Department of Justice, the following funds are hereby rescinded, not later than September 30, 2015, from the following accounts in the specified amounts—

(1) ''Working Capital Fund'', $54,000,000;

(2) ''Legal Activities, Assets Forfeiture Fund'', $193,000,000;

(3) ''United States Marshals Service, Federal Prisoner Detention'', $122,000,000;

(4) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office on Violence Against Women, Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs'', $12,200,000;

(5) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Office of Justice Programs'', $59,000,000; and

(6) ''State and Local Law Enforcement Activities, Community Oriented Policing Services'', $26,000,000.

(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, 2015, 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.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chair, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

As the gentleman from Virginia is aware, I have serious concerns about the nonresponsiveness of certain Federal officials to legitimate congressional oversight activities. In some of these situations, there have been actions taken by the House to hold these officials in contempt of Congress.

As the gentleman is aware, I was considering offering an amendment to this bill that would simply prohibit funding for any Federal employee who has been found in contempt of Congress. It is my firm belief that the American people should not be footing the bill for Federal employees who stonewall Congress or rewarding government officials' bad behavior. If the average American failed to do his or her job, she would hardly be rewarded.

However, based on conversations I have had with the chairman and other Members, I do not plan to offer such an amendment to the bill, with the understanding that the chairman and the committee will continue to work with me to assure that this matter is considered in an appropriate bill.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he would commit to working with me to find a satisfactory vehicle for addressing the issue of compensation for public officials found in contempt of Congress.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to address this important issue, and it is an important one. I can assure him that we will work with him on this as we move forward in the appropriations process.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 527. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws to preserve the ability of the United States—

(1) to enforce vigorously its trade laws, including antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws;

(2) to avoid agreements that—

(A) lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies; or

(B) lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(3) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market-access barriers.

SEC. 528. 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 NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk. The amendment would strike both section 528 and 529 so I ask that they would be considered en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment at this point?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 528 and 529.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Sections 528 and 529 of this bill would restrict the Department of Justice from transferring detainees to the United States. The problem with this is that Guantanamo is now a rallying cry for extremists around the world. Until we transfer and try these detainees, there is no denying that Guantanamo is hurting our national security, and so my amendment would strike sections 528 and 529.

Mr. Chair, we are currently spending $2,670,000 per detainee per year at Guantanamo compared to $34,000 per year at a high-security Federal prison here in the United States.

In fiscal year 2014, the Department of Defense estimates that it is going to spend $435 million in operations and personnel costs to operate this facility. That money could so much better be spent on military readiness, medical research, improving the quality of life for our men and women in uniform.

The fact is, Mr. Chair, nearly 500 defendants charged with crimes related to international terrorism have been successfully convicted in the United States since 9/11, quoting a former Gitmo detainee: the Times Square bomber; the shoe bomber; and a 9/11 co-conspirator, Zacarias Moussaoui. All of them are incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons here in the United States with no security incidents.

Now, by comparison, military commissions, which is the alternative, have managed to prosecute eight cases in that time, and many of them have, in fact, been overturned on appeal.

There are six DOD facilities where Gitmo detainees could be held in the United States that are currently only at 48 percent capacity.

The political and legal expediency of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay is not worth the cost to America's reputation around the world nor to the erosion of our legal and ethical standards here at home.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank the gentleman. We visited Guantanamo Bay together. I think any Member who has not been down there, you should go down and see what is there. These are important provisions that have been put in appropriation bills for the last several years. They represent a strong and enduring consensus in Congress.

Striking these provisions would have unknown consequences for U.S. communities. Imagine bringing Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who beheaded Daniel Pearl, and who was the mastermind of the 9/11 attack. About 170 people from my district died in the attack on the Pentagon. Can you imagine, they were initially going to bring him to New York City, and Mayor Bloomberg and Senator SCHUMER all opposed it because they knew what the impact was going to be and the security requirements. So this would have an unbelievable impact on communities.

Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and, I think, disastrous. Former FBI Director Mueller stated: ''To transfer detainees to local jails could affect or infect other prisoners or have the capability of affecting events outside the prison system.''

One of the things I think Members have to understand is this. There was a pirate, if you saw the movie ''Captain Phillips.'' He was arrested. He was arrested and tried. And they said that he would be convicted, and there would be no way that he would ever be released.

You ought to go see ''Captain Phillips.'' It is a fascinating movie.

He was tried and he was acquitted, and now he is seeking asylum. He is in Virginia. He is seeking asylum maybe in Virginia.

There was another case, if you recall, Attorney General Holder said there is no way that this guy will ever get off, and he was only convicted on one count; and had that count not been a conviction, he would have been released.

Lastly, there were Uighurs that were arrested in Tora Bora in a training camp run by Osama bin Laden. They were there to learn how to kill Americans, but also to kill Chinese, if you follow the concerns of the Uighur issue in China. The administration had reserved apartments. They were in Guantanamo Bay. They reserved apartments in northern Virginia at Seven Corners for them to live here.

□ 1900

I know the gentleman is well meaning, but I think to bring Guantanamo Bay detainees here, people like Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, people like that, and then what if they ever were tried here and were acquitted, and then can you imagine they then apply for asylum, because we are now going to see a case where one pirate acquitted is applying for asylum and now is living in Virginia and may very well want to stay in Virginia.

I urge defeat of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I understand that there is an irrational fear of bringing Guantanamo detainees into the United States, even though we would only do so to bring them to justice. In contrast to the military commissions at Guantanamo, which have not reached one verdict other than by plea, the Federal Court system in the United States has been extremely successful at prosecuting terrorists and safely imprisoning them for long periods of time.

One of the 9/11 terrorists is in a U.S. prison. The shoe bomber is in a U.S. prison. The underwear bomber is in a U.S. prison. The Times Square bomber is in a U.S. prison. One of the Boston Marathon bombers is in a U.S. prison. We have tried and convicted terrorist masterminds in U.S. courts in my own district.

But others are being held at Guantanamo without any prospect of a trial. Ever since Magna Carta, we have denied the government the power to imprison and punish people on mere accusation. Just because the government labels someone a terrorist doesn't make him one. The government must be asked to prove the accusation in court. That has always been a bedrock American principle until we opened Guantanamo. Now we imprison people indefinitely without trial. By what claim of right do we do this?

How can we be sure we are punishing actual terrorists and not actual people when we hold no trials? Mr. WOLF said someone may be acquitted. If he is acquitted he should be released. That is our basic principle of justice for the last thousand years.

Guantanamo should be closed and its inmates either tried or released. It is beyond time to close Guantanamo so it can no longer be used to rally our enemies to recruit terrorists, to undermine our ability to bring terrorist suspects to justice, and to violate bedrock American principles of due process of law.

I am astonished, frankly, that I would hear on the floor of the United States Congress someone say that people might be acquitted, therefore, they should be held in jail forever because maybe the evidence doesn't exist because someone in the government in

the all powerful, almighty, all knowing bureaucracy says that if someone is a terrorist that person must be held in jail indefinitely because maybe we don't have the proof. That is not America.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, Politico talks about this case and said:

> The failed prosecution of an alleged Somali pirate—and the fact that that failure could leave him living freely, and permanently, inside U.S. borders—is highlighting anew the risks of trying terror suspects in American courts.
>
> Just a few weeks ago, Ali Mohamed Ali was facing the possibility of a mandatory life sentence in a 2008 shipjacking off the coast of Yemen—an incident much like the one dramatized in the film 'Captain Phillips.' Now, the Somali native is in immigration detention in Virginia and seeking permanent asylum in the United States.
>
> One current Federal terrorism prosecutor said the Ali case and the potential for his eventual release is another reason why foreign al Qaeda suspects picked up overseas should not be brought to the United States but should instead be detained at Guantanamo or some other facility.

I personally would think the very thought of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, or some of the people when you go down to Guantanamo Bay and see them, walking the streets here in the United States should they be acquitted—they ought not to be brought to the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the person that my good friend refers to is not a Guantanamo detainee. The reality is that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is not representative of the vast majority of Gitmo detainees who were brought 13, 14 years ago. There are a handful several years later that were brought to Guantanamo. They are really bad guys. They are kept separately. But I am talking about the people, 86 percent of whom were turned in for bounties, the majority of whom were not involved in combat activity against the United States or its allies.

We ought to look at this Guantanamo population and do what this country, our Founding Fathers, intended that we do. Give them a right to trial, prosecute them, and punish them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

As for myself, I believe that America and our ideals, the notion that someone could have their liberty taken, be held with secret evidence, be denied an opportunity to appear before a court of law, be denied counsel or outside contact, is something that our country would never engage in.

The problem with this theory is that we are engaged in it. The problem is that, under President Bush, Sr., he would say about China: You all are arresting people with no charges, no public evidence, no tribunal of any sort, and that this is not part of the civilized world.

I remember questioning the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich. We had a talk right after 9/11. He was talking, and I said: Well, if we are a Nation of laws, how are we going to reconcile that in this new circumstance? He said: It is going to be very difficult. And here we are. It is very difficult.

We are spending $3 million per prisoner to house people in a foreign land under charges that we are not prepared to make public, no offering of a trial, most of whom were turned over for bounty or for ransom paid out by our government. I don't know how it is that we suggest that we want to project to the rest of the world what a Nation of laws actually looks like, but as for me and my district, I am going to cast a vote in favor of this amendment because the Constitution of the United States was drafted and written and signed in Philadelphia, and somehow I believe that the notion that our country would ever come to this moment is the voice from the source of those who wrote that document at that time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 529. (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.

SEC. 530. 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. 531. 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. 532. (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 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. 533. None of the funds made available by this Act 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.

SEC. 534. (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, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 535. The Departments of Commerce and Justice, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation 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 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 536. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 537. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and has made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 538. 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. 539. 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. I would like to offer and withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, strike lines 7 through 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 539 of the bill.

Section 539 is an unnecessary and harmful gun rider that would bar the ATF from using any funds to investigate straw purchases or trafficking of certain highly dangerous weapons.

This ''long gun'' requirement, which has been in effect since 2011, is an essential tool for law enforcement to combat drug cartels and weapons trafficking.

In fact, in the first 8 months after the rule was enacted, more than 100 criminals and traffickers were identified for prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the reporting requirement is keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, and the ATF must be able to continue to do this important work.

I thank my colleagues who are in support of our gun violence prevention efforts, today and every day.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, law-abiding Americans shouldn't have to sacrifice their right to privacy to exercise their Second Amendment rights because they live in the southwestern part of the United States.

I don't understand why they want to take the people who stand on the border and take this onslaught of the failure of the administration to defend and prosecute those who violate the laws of our country, and they want to have something that imposes upon our right to privacy and our right to exercise our Second Amendment rights.

Law enforcement tools are not taken away by the fact that we have limited this intrusion upon the rights of the people in the States that are on our southwestern border. In fact, law enforcement has the right to at any time walk into a Federal firearms dealer and request any sales records, and they mandatorily must provide them. A bouncer can walk into a Federal licensed firearms dealer and get these records every day. The amendment doesn't prohibit gun dealers from reporting multiple sales of purchases. It just doesn't mandate on four States of this Union a violation of their right to privacy.

The playing field should be level in anything we do under the law. But the fact is we are unleveling the playing field for the very people that stand down in the direct onslaught of the invasion coming across our southern border as a result of this administration's failure to properly enforce immigration policy.

This is something that we shouldn't even be discussing, limiting the ability and making reporting requirements on four States and involving their right of privacy contrary to the rest of the union. I don't understand why this is even being discussed.

I oppose the attempts to toss out the Second Amendment rights of the people of the State of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO, my colleague.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Congresswoman ESTY's amendment, which strikes a dangerous rider that would bar the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives from enforcing a reporting requirement on certain semiautomatic weapons in four southwest border States.

It is over 16 months since the tragedy in Newtown, Connecticut, where six adults and 20 children were murdered in cold blood. It has been almost a week since the latest mass tragedy that occurred in California. Nineteen people were shot, and four were killed in New Orleans last weekend.

Even before what happened at UC Santa Barbara, over 80 Americans were killed by guns last week, and all of the families who have lost loved ones—the families in Newtown, in Santa Barbara, and all across America—are still waiting for Congress to act.

It is no secret that the appropriations bills have been used to incrementally chip away at the Federal Government's ability to enforce the gun laws and to protect the public from gun crime.

This is yet another example of the same bad behavior. Currently, licensed gun dealers in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas are required to report to the National Tracing Center when a dealer sells multiple assault rifles to one individual, just as all dealers have reported multiple handgun sales for over 20 years.

This requirement is narrowly tailored, applying only to the sales of rifles that are semiautomatic, that are greater than the .22 caliber, and that hold a detachable magazine.

Multiple assault rifle sales reports help law enforcement crack down on gun trafficking along the southwest border, where dealers are disproportionately fueling Mexican cartel violence.

This reporting requirement is effective. During the first 8 months it was in effect, the ATF initiated 120 investigations based on reports of multiple sales of assault rifles and recommended the prosecution of more than 100 defendants in 25 separate cases.

Furthermore, every Federal court has addressed this issue and has found that requiring dealers in these four border States to report multiple assault rifle sales is well within the ATF's authority. This requirement is critical to identifying straw purchasers who put guns in the hands of criminals.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that will continue to give ATF the tools it needs to combat gun trafficking and to keep the public safe.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this recordkeeping is directed at multiple rifle and shotgun sales of a semiautomatic character. It becomes a habit around here to call anything that will fire six shots when you pull the trigger an assault rifle.

In fact, this requires the reporting of semiautomatic shotguns, as well as of semiautomatic rifles. People all over the United States—and particularly in our State—hunt every day with these weapons. Families have these weapons

in their homes. They are not assault weapons. They are semiautomatic shotguns and rifles. This reporting requirement is on those weapons, and it doesn't say anything about assault weapons.

I question the logic of this whole thing when we are talking about the privacy of the individual under the Second Amendment and about the right for Americans to keep and bear arms.

Therefore, I think that the language that is in place today is the right language for the policies of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my colleague.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Representative ESTY's amendment to remove this misguided rider that will only prevent law enforcement from doing its job.

Since the ATF launched this initiative—the so-called long gun rule—to track multiple purchases of rifles and assault weapons, it has become a crucial tool with which to investigate and prosecute straw purchasers who enable the flood of illegal guns to cities and towns across our Nation. In my home city of New York, 85 percent of guns used in crimes were originally sold in a different State.

When we see the toll that illegal guns takes on our streets, why do we in Congress stand idle, now blocking law enforcement from addressing this crisis?

In the first 8 months of this initiative, the Bureau launched 120 investigations into gun trafficking in high-powered assault weapons, and a former special agent has called this rule a huge tool to combat illegal sales.

Please vote ''no'' on this misguided rule.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this law pertains only to the southwestern border States and that my friends from Connecticut and New York are not affected by this rule. There is no reason why you can't buy long guns in New York or in Connecticut and ship them down to the border. This is discriminatory against four States and four States only. It is bad policy.

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. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of points.

One is that this requirement is in place now and has been in place, and it has not disrupted life. It has saved lives, however.

This requirement does not actually apply to normal shotguns or to hunting rifles. I think it is important for the House to understand that it applies to semiautomatics that are greater than a .22 caliber and that can hold a detachable magazine. All this says is, if somebody shows up and buys 1,000 of these, the Federal firearms license dealer needs to report that multiple sale. It is a reasonable thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank the outstanding ranking member of this committee for his work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Let me be very clear. The long gun rider currently in this bill makes it easier for drug cartels to smuggle weapons across the border and more difficult for law enforcement to identify straw purchasers and get weapons out of the hands of dangerous people.

The reporting of multiple purchases for powerful semiautomatic firearms is the same policy we have had for handguns for decades, and it saves lives.

Let me be very clear, my friends. The long gun reporting requirement would not stop a law-abiding person from purchasing a firearm. It only allows the reporting of multiple sales of powerful, semiautomatic rifles—greater than the .22 caliber—and only if they can hold detachable magazines.

The Justice Department found that more than half of the guns recovered in Mexico in connection with drug cartels originated in the United States of America. A case study of firearms trafficking by one drug cartel found that, during a 15-month period, the cartel purchased 251 assault rifles from U.S. gun dealers, all but one of which was purchased as part of a multiple sale.

Law enforcement needs more, my colleagues, not less to fight drug cartel violence. Support this amendment. Help law enforcement stop the trafficking of weapons and save lives.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, and thank you for your leadership on this issue.

I appreciate the kind words of my colleagues and their support for this amendment.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, here I stand in support of an amendment to the Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriation Act. Specifically, the proposed amendment would strike Section 539 of this bill to allow funding to be used to mandate reporting to the Justice Department the name of an individual who has purchased multiple long-barreled arms in five days. The Republicans attempted to disallow the Justice Department from keeping these records, even though these records are crucial in cracking down on gun trafficking and straw purchasing.

I stand in the wake of another unconscionable mass shooting. A recent wound not yet healed, our nation still mourns the lives that were cut short by a mentally unstable gunman. I stand not only as a Member of Congress but also as a concerned United States citizen, outraged by the fact that no measures have been taken to defend our nation's people against gun violence. I stand just as many of my distinguished colleagues have, to implore the Republicans to finally pass gun control legislation. I also stand in frustration, knowing that the Republicans will decry such acts of violence as the recent UC-Santa Barbara massacre but will refuse to take action to protect our nation's innocent citizens.

I will do everything in my power to convince my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to defend our nation's people while also upholding the second amendment of our Constitution.

Dare I invoke the names of the hundreds of victims of mass-shootings in the last few years? Should I mention the alarming number of Americans murdered by guns every day which averages to more than 30 people? Or perhaps I should comment on the startling statistic that 140 Americans are taken to the emergency room every day to be treated for a gun assault.

Of course, Republicans are aware of the thousands of people who are injured and murdered by guns every year. They know the toll that gun violence is taking on the American people. I am sure they also acknowledge that their pillar of conservatism, the 40th President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, supported gun control.

Yet, Republicans still attached a gun rider to this bill to bolster their NRA ratings at the risk of the safety of the American people. They don't seem to care that less than a week ago, an individual documented for struggling with mental illnesses legally purchased a firearm and proceeded to use said firearm to deprive families of their loved ones. Well, according to the FBI, more than 400 people were murdered in my home state of New York in 2012 alone and I am outraged.

It is in the honor of the victims of the UC-Santa Barbara tragedy and their families that I support this amendment. It is in the honor of those lost in other tragedies, who are not forgotten, and all victims of gun violence and their families who have wept at funerals that I support this amendment.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, once again, Americans are heartbroken by a gun violence tragedy, mourning the students killed in Santa Barbara.

Since that mass shooting on Friday, more than 120 others have lost their lives at the hands of a gun, including an 18-month-old who was shot in front of his mother this morning in West Palm Beach.

This mother will never see her child go to school, graduate from college, or walk down the aisle—she will never hear him say, ''I love you Mom.''

As a former Mayor of an urban city, I've seen firsthand how gun violence disrupts entire communities and devastates families.

Too many lives have been taken. Too many families have lost their daughters and sons, their sisters and brothers. And too many people have endured unimaginable pain and grief caused by senseless acts of gun violence.

And, it is unbelievable to me about in the wake of more heartbreaking killings with firearms that the reaction of some in this Congress is to weaken gun laws. That's why I support the Esty amendment to keep strong laws against gun trafficking on the books.

Not only should we pass this amendment, we must do much more to improve our national background check system and strengthen mental health intervention and research.

From California to Florida, American families are counting on us to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and keep our children safe.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 540. 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. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 by this Act under the heading ''Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery'' may be used for grant guidelines or requirements to establish minimum riparian buffers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For the past 15 years, a large part of the success of the salmon recovery in the Northwest and in other States has been through locally driven solutions funded through the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund, and I continue to support this program.

This amendment will ensure, however, that these funds continue to benefit salmon through on-the-ground projects, but without questionable buffer guidelines imposed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, as a condition of their use.

Agriculture is the background of my central Washington district, and it is estimated that these and other similarly imposed land set-aside guidelines by NOAA could restrict the use of vital crop protection tools on as much as 50 acres of farmland per mile. I am not alone in my concern about NOAA's use of unverifiable salmon buffer requirements in other instances.

Last year, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals found similar NOAA salmon buffer requirements in a biological opinion that were based on scientific standards that ''did not always appear to be logical, obvious, or even rational.''

In my home State of Washington, over two dozen agricultural associations strongly oppose NOAA's recommendation of large buffers on agricultural lands, and one local recovery board group that has successfully used these funds to improve salmon survival in the upper Columbia River opposes mandatory buffers tied to these important salmon grant funds.

Let me be very clear. This amendment won't cut Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery funds, nor will it prohibit riparian buffers where they are appropriate, but it will ensure that NOAA does not make them a prerequisite for these funds to be awarded for on-the-ground projects, respecting unique geographical priorities of agricultural areas and locally driven solutions to salmon recovery.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be approved, so that the Federal Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery funds, which have been proven effective over the years for farmers and local projects, will not be used as a backdoor way for NOAA to implement other controversial guidelines for these buffers.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, this is an attempt to authorize on an appropriations bill. These buffer zones that have been put in place under the expertise of NOAA have been part and parcel to making sure that the salmon in the hatchery system work properly. I think for us to delve into this at this point is difficult, and the wording is challenging.

Rather than deal with it here, I would ask if we could talk about it and see what we could do in conference, and that would be a good thing. I would hate for us, after having invested tens of millions of dollars in the salmon, to be taking a rash action here on the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman, and I would like to work with you on this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I respect that, but let me clarify what is going on here because the gentleman, with due respect, represents an urban area, and I represent a rural area. That is self-evident. That is not criticism. I am just pointing out the obvious.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, it is true that I represent an urban area, yes. I would be glad to continue to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

I just want to make this point. These are suggested guidelines, and we have gone through this before. In fact, the EPA is working on this precisely.

□ 1930

I oppose what the EPA is doing, as a matter of fact, and most people on the ground.

I am just simply saying that through the funding mechanism, NOAA should not be able to impose these guidelines that have a great deal of controversy in the Pacific Northwest.

I know this is the start of this process. I know NOAA had some problems with the initial language. We changed that language now. They can't say they oppose this because this only affects particularly these guidelines that are being proposed.

So I think the amendment is something that needs to be passed, frankly, to send a message.

By the time we go through this process, if they want to have some other adjustments, when they make their adjustments, I would be more than willing to talk. But I think this amendment should be passed so we can send a message to NOAA.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, the United States taxpayers have invested a lot of money for the help of salmon in your neck of the woods. I am all for it. I like to make sure that whatever we are doing is correct. We have got treaty obligations. We have got hatcheries. We have got all kinds of stuff going on with both the Native Americans and the commercial fishermen operations there.

All I am saying is I don't want to come to the end of the night, after we have been debating this bill for 2 days, and rush something forward that may not be the way to go.

It is interestingly worded. I know that you have good intentions. I would like to work with you and the majority staff and see where we are. I just can't support this, given the complexities of the issues and the limitations of me being from an urban area. I want to make sure I have a complete grasp on the issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I appreciate that. I simply want to say that these are issues that I know are unique to mainly the Western part of the United States.

But in many respects, the gentleman made a statement that really supports my amendment. Because he said the American taxpayers are spending billions of dollars on salmon recovery. That is true. So are the ratepayers in the Bonneville power system. They are paying billions of dollars for salmon recovery.

The good news is the fish runs in the last 5 years have come back in record numbers.

To be very honest with you, these guidelines haven't been imposed, and the salmon are coming back. So why

would you want to impose these buffer zones when it probably wouldn't add anything, and when a Federal court has said it is questionable science anyway.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, a lot of us would love to go out to dinner tonight and have salmon.

The issue for the science of this is that you can't make a mistake. This is a multiyear process. You have got a lot going on here. And if you blow it, you are going to blow it for a big industry that is important for America.

So I would like to work with you and make sure that we get it right. And the expertise of NOAA, I think, could be helpful in that process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate, again, the ranking member working with me. But I think this is sufficiently important that we should adopt this amendment.

Again, I will point out the American taxpayers, as have the ratepayers, spent billions of dollars recovering salmon.

The good news in the Pacific Northwest, as I mentioned, some of the salmon runs are coming back in record numbers in the last 4 or 5 years.

So if there is something that is before the final part of this bill becomes a law, and there needs to be some adjustment, I would be more than happy to talk about it. But I think it is sufficiently important to send a message right now to NOAA to not impose these guidelines when the evidence is contrary to what they are trying to do.

So I urge adoption of my amendment, 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. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOYLE

Mr. DOYLE. 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. __. Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, and United States International Trade Commission shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The authorities of the Department of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, and United States International Trade Commission, respectively, to impose sanctions against corporations or other legal entities that benefit from utilizing trade secrets or other information—

(A) obtained by such corporations or entities through cyber intrusions or other illegal methods; or

(B) provided to such corporations or entities by a national government, foreign intelligence service, or other entity using such means.

(2) If the Department of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, or United States International Trade Commission does not have sufficient authorities described in paragraph (1), recommendations to improve or broaden the scope of such authorities to address the matters described in paragraph (1).

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to start off by saying to my good friend the chairman that I plan to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague TIM MURPHY and I are offering this bipartisan amendment that directs the Department of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative, and the United States International Trade Commission to report to Congress on the sanctions they can bring against companies that benefit from information acquired by hacking into private computers in the United States.

The Justice Department recently indicted five Chinese military officers for stealing commercially valuable information from a number of companies in the United States. These indictments highlight what we have known for a long time: namely, that China and governments around the world are hacking into computers in the United States and using that information they steal for their own economic advantage.

These hackers have targeted the offices of Westinghouse, U.S. Steel, the United Steel Workers Union, Alcoa, Allegheny Technologies, and SolarWorld, five of which are located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The information they stole helped Chinese companies in negotiations or trade disputes with each of the targeted organizations. While these indictments are the first of their kind, businesses in the United States have been facing cyber attacks like this for years.

I would like to think that these cyber spies will be prosecuted and imprisoned for their actions at some point, but that won't do anything to reverse the damage that they have done. Congress needs to focus right now—today—on protecting the American workers and businesses who face these attacks every day.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our amendment and begin taking the necessary measures to counter cyber espionage against American workers and businesses. This amendment would take the first step by determining whether the U.S. government has the tools it needs to do just that.

Let's send a clear message to bad actors around the world that the United States has the power and the will to punish those that engage in criminal trade practices.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank my friend, Mr. DOYLE.

On Monday, May 19, the U.S. attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed an indictment against five members of the Communist Chinese military, affirming what I as chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus and other lawmakers have contended for quite some time. This indictment proves we are losing manufacturing jobs not because the U.S. stopped making great products, but because the Chinese Government is stealing ideas, inventions, and intellectual property straight out of western Pennsylvania.

The Chinese Government has hacked into our computers, stolen business blueprints, erected trade barriers, and manipulated currency markets to give state-owned enterprises an unfair and illegal advantage in the American marketplace.

For example, in 2010, as American factories were shutting down because of dumped and illegally traded Chinese pipe, Chinese agents were trying to cheat in court as well. The Chinese army hacked into computers at U.S. Steel and the United Steelworkers Union in 2010 to obtain privileged legal communications about the crucial unfair trade case then being litigated before the International Trade Commission on the oil country tubular goods from China.

This amendment will help us continue this effort and apply the same crackdown on trade crimes. By dumping sophisticated, high-cost oil country tubular goods onto the U.S. market, countries like China are in clear violation of their obligations under international trade agreements.

Western Pennsylvania—nor the rest of this country—won't be a welcome mat for the Chinese or any foreign competitor to walk over.

Mr. DOYLE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman WOLF for his efforts and support. Hopefully, we can work together to achieve the goals of this amendment with language in the conference report or some other means.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. This is one of the better amendments offered today. Frankly, I will do everything I can to make sure this is in the bill when it comes to the conference report.

If the Members would take the time to go out and look at the place whereby you can see all the companies that are being hit, the Chinese are stealing jobs.

And so I thank Mr. DOYLE and Mr. MURPHY for offering this. I will do everything I can. I think the staff knows how strongly I feel. Mr. FATTAH has been a great help on these issues.

So if the amendment is ruled out of order, we will make sure that we try to put it in the bill, and I thank both of you for offering it.

Mr. DOYLE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman, and I 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. I want to thank my colleagues from Pennsylvania.

And yes, the case that was referenced centered in Pennsylvania, and it is a case that is pending before our courts. I won't have much to say about it other than under our system, an indictment is merely a charge. We have to go through the process.

But the one thing that we do know—having nothing to do with the instant case—is Chairman WOLF has worked on this for a number of years. He has exposed all of us to information about this and arranged briefings from our highest levels of law enforcement officials in our country.

And clearly, there is a great deal of cyber snooping going on. It emanates from a number of different places, China included: Ukraine, Nigeria—we can go through the laundry list. But we have to do more to protect ourselves.

I want to thank the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE and Mr. MURPHY, for bringing this amendment forward. As the chairman indicated, we will work with them in a way to make this as concrete as possible as we go forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 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 the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin first by thanking Chairman WOLF for his patience. Every single year, as he has shepherded this appropriations bill, I have come to this floor and offered an amendment that would include a 1 percent across-the-board spending cut. He has been very gracious and very kind, even though he opposes. And even though I appreciate the good work that the committees have done to reduce spending and to get these levels down, I believe that we can do more—and that we should be doing more.

I think it is admirable that the committee is showing us a 0.8 percent reduction. But if we would pass my amendment, we would save another $400 million. And that is a step that we need to take.

I think it is important to realize that this amendment exempts the $8.5 billion budget that is for the FBI. We think it is important that they get that for their vital mission that they conduct every single day in protecting American citizens at home and abroad and in conducting the activities that do help to keep the homeland and our people safe.

My amendment will not affect the efforts that are combating terrorism, cyber crime, human trafficking or violent gangs. It is a targeted spending cut that will result in a savings to the taxpayers of over $400 million.

□ 1945

Given the $51 billion price tag of this bill, I do not feel that it is asking too much to cut a little bit more.

I think it is important to note also that across-the-board spending cuts have worked at the State level. There is no reason not to utilize them here in Washington.

We have heard from so many of our Governors and our mayors that have trumpeted the use of across-the-board spending cuts. We have heard Chris Christie, a 9 percent across-the-board spending cut; Rick Perry in Texas, a 5 percent savings.

We have Governor Cuomo, who was looking at reducing 10 percent across the board; Schweitzer in Montana, 5 percent across the board.

They work, and there is a reason they do—because it is an equitable cut.

Mr. Chairman, we are $17 trillion in debt. This is something we can do for our children and our grandchildren and begin to responsibly roll back the amount that the Federal Government spends.

At this point in time, we are spending the money that our children have not made for programs that they do not want and will never, ever use. What we need to do is be wise stewards of the taxpayer dollar, now and in the future.

I also think this is an idea that the American people are beginning to support. I noted a recent poll—Washington Post-ABC News poll. This was March 6, 2013. Sixty-one percent of the American public actually supports not a 1 percent or a 2 percent, but a 5 percent across-the-board cut in all Federal spending.

It is time for us to do a little more to save a little more, to make a few more spending reductions, and to think about what the addition of debt—piling on more debt does to our children and our grandchildren and to their futures.

It is, indeed, capping and trading our children's futures to the people that hold our publicly-traded debt.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentlelady is saying, and I think she makes a powerful case, but I think, to bring it back to this bill, the allocation for the bill already represents a cut of $398 million below the FY14 level. Thirty-three individual programs have been terminated in the bill.

Moreover, and I will end with this, since the beginning of the 112th Congress, the allocation for Commerce-Justice-Science appropriation has been cut by $13.1 billion, or over 20 percent, so you have had a 20 percent cut since the 112th.

As a result of that, I would ask for a ''no'' vote.

Mr. Chairman, 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. 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. 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 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 the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that requires 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 Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase the new light-duty vehicles, except in accord with the President's memorandum.

This amendment has been supported by the majority and minority on appropriations bills eight times over the past few years, and I understand it will receive similar support today.

Our transportation sector is, by far, the biggest reason we send $600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't have to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel.

Alternative technologies exist today and, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet. By supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, agriculture waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them.

If they can do this in Brazil, then we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide which is best for them.

Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I also want to mention that Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and I have a bill which would mandate that, by a certain amount of time, all cars in America would be flex-fuel cars. We can build these cars for under $100 per car, and I think it is ridiculous that we don't do it.

I want to thank Mr. WOLF and Mr. FATTAH for their courtesies, and I ask that the Engel amendment be supported.

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. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment forward. It is so very important that our country move aggressively in this area.

As you travel around the world, you see other countries doing so much more in terms of renewable energy and utilizing cleaner energy sources.

In Ireland, it is wind energy. In France, it is nuclear. In Israel, you have solar along the Dead Sea. Morocco has got one of the largest solar operations.

One of the things that our government can do to save money, as was mentioned in the last discussion about the need to save money, is that we could be moving to a different type of fuel, and we also could be improving the circumstances under which the air that our grandchildren will breathe will be healthier.

I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this forward. There are vehicles that are coming forward that are going to be solar-powered and powered by other types of alternative fuel. Our military has been investing very significantly in this regard, in terms of aviation fuel.

There is work for us to do. We can actually do it together, Democrats and Republicans; and therefore, I rise in support of 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 New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 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. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for operation, renovation, or construction at Thomson Correctional Facility in Illinois.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of my amendment to shut down the Thomson Correctional Center in Illinois. The amendment would prohibit any funds being made available for operations, renovation, or construction at Thomson Correctional.

Section 529 of our CJS bill prohibits funds to construct, acquire, or modify a facility in the U.S. to house detainees. However, my amendment goes further, by not allowing any funds for operations at Thomson.

In addition, I recognize that CJS also prohibits the use of funds to transfer Guantanamo detainees to the U.S. However, the administration has proven resourceful at finding pots of money to achieve their goals.

Thomson Correctional Center is ground zero in this debate. As long as it remains operational, we run the risk of seeing Guantanamo Bay detainees on American soil.

One of the President's first acts in office was signing Executive Order 13492 on January 22, 2009, to close Guantanamo Bay detention center. The administration has attempted to purchase the facility since 2009 to hold these detainees.

We have the letter from December 15 to Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, which was signed by several administration officials, including Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, stating the following:

> As the President has made clear, we need to continue to detain some individuals currently held at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. To securely house these detainees, Federal agencies plan to work with me and other State officials to acquire the nearly vacant maximum security facility in Thomson, Illinois.

It later adds:

> The Defense Department will operate part of the facility to house a limited number of detainees from Guantanamo.

Congress passed language in subsequent bills to prevent the transfer of detainees from Guantanamo prisons to the U.S. However, the administration, once again, went behind the intent of Congress and purchased the Thomson facility in 2012 for $165 million, using money from various DOJ accounts. Supposedly, that was to combat prison overcrowding.

Mr. Chairman, today, the prison is still empty.

President Obama also requested $43.7 million in his fiscal year 2014 budget to begin activating Thomson. I think that we all know that this administration intends to close the Guantanamo Bay detention center. When it is shut down, those detainees are going to go somewhere.

The handwriting is on the wall. President Obama, Hillary Clinton, and other Democrats have clearly stated their intent to bring those detainees to American soil.

I think that it is imperative that we accept this amendment and make certain that there is no money for operational funds for the Thomson facility.

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment and seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the Congresswoman from Tennessee.

The amendment she offers that aims to deny funding for the Thomson Correctional Center in Thomson, Illinois, would not only negatively impact public safety and put our hardworking prison guards in harm's way, but it would also be a big disservice to our Nation's taxpayers.

On a personal level, it would also be another setback for Thomson, Illinois, and the surrounding communities that have been thirsting far too long for the good-paying jobs and the economic opportunity that will come with the long-awaited opening of this dormant facility.

□ 2000

When fully opened, the Thomson prison will create 1,100 jobs and will infuse more than $200 million into our local community. But making sure this facility remains on track to open has very important ramifications for communities across our country as well.

Due to the shortage of prison bed space, high security prisons are today operating at 53 percent over capacity. This is especially alarming when considering that nearly nine out of every 10 high-security inmates have a history of violence. This overcrowding has put our hardworking prison guards and staff at facilities from coast to coast at risk of harm every day while they are on the job.

My husband ran our county jail for more than a decade, and I can tell you, I understand this on a very personal level.

Let me quote the Government Accountability Office, which says that overcrowding has affected Bureau of Prisons' ''institutions, institution staff, and the infrastructure of Bureau of Prisons facilities, and has contributed to inmate misconduct, which affects staff and inmate security and safety.''

Opening the Thomson prison will add critical high-security beds that will help alleviate overcrowding and make our prisons safer for guards, staff, and inmates.

In addition to increasing safety, opening the Thomson Correctional Center would also save taxpayers' hard-earned money. The cost of constructing a new facility comparable to Thomson would exceed $400 million and take 3 to 4 years to complete. That is more than double the funding needed to open the existing Thomson facility. In short, by purchasing Thomson from the State of Illinois, the Federal Government potentially saves the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Finally, the U.S. Attorney General has pledged, most recently at his House appropriations hearing, that no detainees from Guantanamo could or would be transferred to Thomson—zero, none. Additionally, there is language in the underlying bill that prohibits this. It is simply not going to happen. I repeat: it is not going to happen.

The Bureau of Prisons has already designated funding for the activation of Thomson prison, and local job hiring has already begun. We cannot turn the clock back now. To even make that attempt is a display of contempt for the American taxpayer.

The opening of the Thomson prison is good for prison guards. It helps relieve an overcrowded prison system and pays respect to our hardworking taxpayers who are seeking common sense, no more nonsense.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand with me in opposing this foolish and misguided amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

There are other priorities within the Bureau of Prisons, including bringing online two other recently constructed facilities and maintaining sufficient staffing levels at existing facilities to ensure safety.

I am also concerned—and I think what the problem is, if I could just maybe speak to the gentlelady from Illinois. I think if the administration were saying that there will never be any Guantanamo detainees transferred, but the problem is we see the veto threat on the DOD bill. No one is trying to hurt your community, and I commend you for fighting for it; but every time you begin to kind of say, okay, we will go that way, you then begin to see the veto threats. The administration has not set a veto threat to this bill but has expressed concern with regard to our Guantanamo Bay language.

And my sense is, if honestly, ethically, morally we were all convinced no Guantanamo Bay transfers—and, quite frankly, I don't think you want Khalid Sheikh Mohammed to come to your local community either. So I think you would probably agree with me as much as anything. But if there was convincing evidence that they were never going to be brought there, then I wouldn't have any problem.

But I think the gentlelady from Tennessee raises a very, very good, good point. And every time you come back to that, it always comes back to, we are going to veto that.

So I think it is a good amendment. I guess the challenge would be: How could we remove this so that this does not become a problem? Eventually, I can understand. I think you make a legitimate case. But the hurdle is Members up here on both sides of the aisle believe that the administration ultimately will take people from Guantanamo to Thomson, and that becomes a problem.

If you could remove that risk whereby nobody will ever come back to it, then I think this problem would go away. Until that time, I think it is going to be a battle constantly, constantly, constantly. And I know that Senator DURBIN has made a strong effort, but there are some of us on this side who believe that it becomes a big political issue, too.

So if you can somehow make it whereby there is some convincing and not run the risk of, in 2 or 3 years from now, say, ''Ah-hah, we have got you; we are going to take them there,'' then I think this problem would probably go away. But until that time, I support the gentlelady's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank my good friend and colleague from Illinois, who has been a real leader on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, like Congresswoman BUSTOS, I rise in opposition to this amendment today. This amendment would harm our economy and would add greater stress to our prison system as well.

Iowans and Illinoisans have waited for years for a solution on the Thomson Correctional Center. For too long, politics in Washington—which I think is on display again tonight, unfortunately—got in the way of creating jobs in our region, and for me, it is in eastern Iowa. It is a type of partisan game that really must end. And I do appreciate the comments from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on this.

The Thomson prison will bring more than 1,000 new jobs at a time when families badly need them and will spur economic development in our region. Money for this facility was included in the FY14 omnibus bill that we just passed in January, and it makes no sense to me to prevent progress on a facility that we just voted to enhance 4 months ago.

In addition to those economic benefits, I hope that I don't need to remind my colleagues of the fact that we have a capacity problem in our Nation's prisons. The problem only grows worse when we intentionally prevent more facilities from operating. And, again, while I understand the arguments that have been made tonight against it, those folks will not come here.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind my colleagues of a couple of things. Number one, going back to the letter dated December 15, 2009, it says in the letter: ''The Defense Department will operate part of the facility to house a limited number of detainees from Guantanamo Bay.''

Now, I have to ask my colleagues: Who do you think is going to be there? This is a prison that is empty. It is empty right now. We know what is going to happen. This is going to be used to receive Guantanamo Bay detainees.

The 9/11 families support this amendment. It is supported by these families. They do not want to see Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and other detainees here

on American soil. They do not want them to have access to our civilian court system. And passing this amendment will save us millions of taxpayer dollars that could end up being used not only to house, not only to give access to the courts, but to pay for lawyers to defend enemies who have taken up arms against our brave men and women in uniform.

It was clear from 2009 what the intent was. It said it in the letter: ''The Defense Department will operate part of the facility to house a limited number of detainees.''

I encourage support, and 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. Let me say a couple of things. One is I am opposed to this amendment.

Now, generally, I am opposed to us building new prisons. I think we would be much better off building new schools. But there are circumstances in which people have to be incarcerated to protect society from them.

I want to talk about one young man who lost his life, and I think it is important relative to this amendment. His name was Eric Williams. It was February of 2013. He worked for us. He worked for the Federal Government. He worked in a Federal prison in Pennsylvania, and he lost his life because of the overcrowding there.

So one of the things is that, if we are going to imprison more people than any other nation on the face of the Earth, then we have to do it. And we can't do it on the cheap. We have to have facilities that are well staffed so that our guards and the people who work for us are not put in unsafe circumstances.

Now, this political nonsense, this is a new theme of some of my colleagues on the other side. We can't pass immigration reform because the President might not do something or might do something. We can't do this prison that we have already invested money in because the President might do something or not do something. So it is kind of like this hyperconcern about what the President may do.

We should do our job, and our job is that, if we want to take the prison census from 20,000 to 220,000, then we have to have the facilities. We can't stand on the floor and vote for prison sentences that go out years and decades, have people tried through the DOJ that we are funding, and then have no place to incarcerate them. It doesn't work that way.

So this amendment makes no sense, that you would have a facility that the taxpayers have paid for, you have a system that is overcrowded, you have people like Eric Williams who have lost their lives trying to do a job on behalf of the American public, and then we have politics intrude. This is not about criminal justice management. This is about politics. This is about, well, you know, Obama and this and that.

There is no place in America in which we can have a circumstance in which we incarcerate someone and make sure—we don't have any breakouts from Federal maximum security prisons. If you did, the Congress would be excited about it. It hasn't happened. So the idea that we can't incarcerate people safely is defied by the facts. What we can't do is safeguard our prison staff if we put them in a situation where overcrowding exists.

So I would hope that we would reject this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. It boils down to the issue of trust.

I was specifically told by the Justice Department that the Uighurs from Guantanamo Bay would not be released. We had a meeting in my office. The White House was there. They were all there. They said they will not be released.

We got a call from somebody in the administration who called us to say that the helicopters are getting ready and leaving Guantanamo. And, by the way, they have leased an apartment at Seven Corners. These were three people who had been picked up at Tora Bora in a camp.

I understand. I mean, if we could work this thing out, I would be happy.

So when you see the veto message, as the gentlelady from Tennessee said, the concern is that they will just blink and come and go. But they looked me directly in the eye and said: We will not release these inmates.

And then had I not gotten that telephone call—and, quite frankly, I think this person who stopped them from being released was the current mayor of Chicago, to his credit.

And so that is the concern we have. There needs to be a basic trust that if somebody says something, there is absolutely no question that that is the word and it will never happen.

But I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, when I was back in school, I read a paper called ''Metaphysical Madness,'' and the essence of it was that in politics the question was: How do you get ambitious, vindictive people to agree on something? That is how you make progress. Well, I don't know that we want to be vindictive. But the point here is that we still have to, in some way, come to a shared agreement about how this country is going to go forward.

If you think the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, who is from Illinois, is going to have this bill moved forward with this language in it, it is not going to happen. We are just asking for a bottleneck. So we should stop wasting time and find a way to go forward.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BUSTOS. 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARPER). 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 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 the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan 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 in thousands of 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 its own history. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson grew it. The first drafts of our Constitution and many of our first laws were written on paper made from it. In fact, during World War II, the USDA encouraged patriotic American farmers to raise it for the war effort. They even produced a promotional film entitled ''Hemp for Victory,'' and now at least 16 States have passed laws that will allow their farmers to grow it.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government stands in the way of family farmers who want to be able to grow industrial hemp. The senseless classification of hemp as a Schedule I drug does not further public safety, but it does rob our farm economies of a potentially multibillion dollar crop that can be used to make everything from rope to soap. In fact, it seems like the only thing you can't make out of hemp is dope.

Despite the fact that American farmers can't grow industrial hemp, hemp products here in this country account

for nearly $500 million in annual sales. Now, that is a sizable industry, but nothing compared to the economic impact that full-scale cultivation and commercialization would have if States were permitted to implement their laws and our hemp did not have to get imported from other countries.

This amendment would only allow farmers to grow hemp in accordance with their State's laws. It simply divests the Department of Justice and the DEA of their ability to treat industrial hemp like marijuana because it is not like marijuana. So far, 16 States have seen the value that hemp provides, and have passed laws to allow farmers to grow hemp and to closely regulate it.

Farmers in those States across the country are waiting for the Federal Government to get out of their way. But because the Department of Justice refuses to acknowledge what Washington and Jefferson knew—that hemp is an important agricultural commodity, it is not marijuana—these State laws must take a back seat to Federal overreach.

The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau Federation agree that we should allow our farmers to grow industrial hemp.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. The amendment seeks to fix a problem that does not exist. There is no restriction on use and transfer of domestically produced or traded industrial hemp products or seed. They never sought a license. They have every right to do this had they got a license. And the DEA had a responsibility, as the Customs and Border Patrol does, to ensure that imports are legal and safe, including the imports of agriculture products. The responsibility falls to those who seek to import these products to secure necessary import licenses in a timely way to ensure Federal law enforcement can do its job and confirm that the commodity imported is legal.

There is no reason to restrict the exercise of this important law enforcement mission. So they never sought a license, and that is what the problem was.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, may I please inquire as to the remaining time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy as I appreciate her leadership on this.

The matter is that 22 States have moved to reduce the barriers, 17 States now, including our home State of Oregon, have removed barriers to production. But there is uncertainty. As a matter of fact, I think my friend from Kentucky may talk about a problem they had in the State of Kentucky now.

We need to approve this amendment to get the Federal Government out of the way of a revolution that is taking place at the State level. States across the country understand that this is an important commodity, it is part of our heritage, and it is part of our future. The DEA has more important things to do than interfere with legal activities at the State level.

We need to remove the cloud of uncertainty and approve this amendment, and I respectfully request that people approve it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my cosponsor.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, officials in my home State of Kentucky were recently forced to file a lawsuit in Federal Court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds intended for a university research pilot program. What a waste of time, money, and the court system's limited resources.

States can't launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA seizes the seeds before they reach their destination. And although the DEA did recently agree to release the seeds, they still insist that they have the authority to regulate industrial hemp—which was clearly conveyed to the States in the farm bill.

Isn't it ironic that thousands of pounds of cocaine and heroin are somehow passing across our borders every week, yet the DEA thinks that seizing hemp seeds, industrial hemp seeds, is a worthwhile use of its time and resources? I say it is not.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. 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 yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) as a courtesy to my colleague to speak on the question of hemp.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentlewoman from Oregon and the gentleman from Kentucky.

I am very pleased to support both this amendment as well as a very similar one along with Representatives MASSIE, BLUMENAUER, BONAMICI, and BARR, thanking them for their leadership on a very commonsense issue that helps my home State of Colorado.

Last year, I was thrilled to be part of a successful effort to pass an amendment to the farm bill that allows colleges like Colorado State University in my district to grow hemp and cultivate hemp for academic and agricultural research purposes. But in no other instance can I think of urgent emails and texts that I have got from farmers where they are in dire straits and need my help in getting the seed they need to grow their crop approved through our own State Department of Agriculture.

Our current ag commissioner in Colorado is a former colleague of ours in this body, former Congressman John Salazar, as some of you may recall. He is our ag commissioner. They set up a rule process around industrial hemp farming. But farmers are unable to get the seed they need to be able to grow their legal crop.

Industrial hemp is critical for our economy. It is already used in countless products from clothing to a flag that is flown over this very United States Capitol last year to, in fact, some of the very first American flags, which were made of hemp. And yet we are forced to import it from other countries, driving jobs away from American agriculture and farmers to farms overseas.

It is really hard to grow industrial hemp when the DEA, without any clear reason, any argument, or any sense throws itself down as a roadblock to success. The DEA recently seized industrial hemp seeds intended for a university research pilot program. It is essential that our institutions of higher education are not prevented from growing or cultivating hemp seed.

In addition, hemp, as we know, is an important agricultural commodity and a historic one. We can do a lot better as a country. That is why Representative BONAMICI and others are offering this very simple amendment which states that the DOJ and DEA cannot use funds to prevent State agricultural agencies and universities from growing industrial hemp in States where it is always legal.

Let us have access to the seed to ensure that we can continue to grow this crop here doing the research we need to ensure that the next great generation of hemp products that are bought and sold in our country are made in America. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Bonamici amendment as well as the Massie amendment. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania kindly.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, in the hope that perhaps whatever the circumstances that might emerge from these couple of amendments, maybe it might bring greater harmony in our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOLF. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I join him in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chair, the purpose of this amendment ostensibly is to make it easier to import seeds for the purpose of research with regard to growing or cultivating industrial hemp, and for that reason the amendment is unnecessary and inappropriate. Current law imposes no impediment to legitimate research on industrial hemp being carried out in accordance with section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014.

Under current law, institutions of higher education and State Departments of Agriculture may import the seeds needed to conduct research authorized by section 7606 of the Agricultural Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. BONAMICI. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I do not. I don't have enough time, I don't believe, to finish my remarks.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Such institutions of higher education or State departments of agriculture simply need to first become registered with the DEA as an importer or as a researcher and, second, obtain an import permit authorizing the shipment of seeds.

The process is not burdensome. Within the last 10 days, the DEA registered two State departments of agriculture in Colorado and Kentucky to import industrial hemp seeds and issued an import permit to the Kentucky department of agriculture.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. BONAMICI. It is a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The Member having the floor would need to yield for a parliamentary inquiry to be entertained.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman does not yield.

The gentleman from Virginia may proceed.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. As the Chair stated, the gentleman from Virginia controls the time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure the record is clear. There are two amendments. It appears that the gentleman is talking about the other amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is not recognized.

The gentleman from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. This amendment would require the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to choose between ignoring existing law or barring all imports of seeds. Removing DEA from the registration and permit process without changing existing law would eliminate the only lawful means of importing Cannabis seeds for industrial hemp cultivation pursuant to section 7606.

To protect our Nation from the importation of potentially dangerous materials, our customs laws have always required the importer to demonstrate before the materials enter this country that the materials may lawfully be imported. In carrying out this function, the CBP consults with the appropriate government agencies, including the Department of Justice and the DEA. By cutting the DOJ and DEA out of this process, the amendment creates uncertainty and could potentially be construed to require CBP to allow any shipment by anyone to enter the U.S. as long as the shipper claims the goods are industrial hemp seeds. Since there is no way to tell just from looking at a bag of seeds whether they will actually yield Cannabis plants that fall within the TAT limits of section 7606, CPB, DOJ, and DEA consultation is important.

Requiring CBP to accept bare representations from anyone claiming to be a legitimate importer exposes the possibility of others importing any item under the guise of industrial hemp. The existing permit and registration process provides some protection against that risk. For that reason, I would join in opposing the amendment.

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

□ 2030

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FATTAH. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FATTAH. There may be some confusion. The entire comments of the gentleman who just spoke, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE). That is not the amendment that was being debated and is being offered by my colleague from Kentucky, and we were trying to clarify that because the House could be confused.

The Acting CHAIR. In response to the inquiry, the Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

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.

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. 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 may be used for the Investigative and Public Affairs Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation except for the Ten Most Wanted Fugitives, the Most Wanted Terrorists, and missing children programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, taxpayers should not foot the bill for the FBI to be consultants for Hollywood producers. However, this is the case with the FBI Investigative Publicity and Public Affairs Unit.

Although this unit does important work like publicize the Most Wanted Fugitives list, it also provides screenwriters, as well as movie and TV producers, advice on costumes, props, scenery, and weapons, as well as b-roll footage and fact-checking.

Now, I am confident that Hollywood and their hundred-million-dollar production budgets can afford to hire ex-FBI agents to consult on their projects. It just seems to make good common sense.

This unit's activities and most of its $1.5 million annual budget should be highlighted for what it really is, and that is Department of Justice waste.

If Hollywood can make millions from these movies and television shows, such as ''Without a Trace,'' ''CSI,'' and ''The Closer,'' and also movies like ''Shooter,'' featuring—and no relation I might add—Mark Wahlberg, that grossed over $80 million, as well as ''The Kingdom,'' which also grossed over $80 million, it does not need, I believe, the American taxpayer and FBI to help fund its research.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment that simply states that no taxpayer funds can be used by the unit except—and I make this clear—it doesn't zero out the entire budget, but funds can only be used by this unit for the Ten Most Wanted Fugitives, the Most Wanted Terrorists, and missing children programs. I think it is a reasonable amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I ask for support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. It won't take long to make this point. All of us grew up during a time in which part of the ability to attract people to Federal service, particularly to law enforcement, were

shows that highlighted the FBI and its prowess, but think about it today, in order to recruit people, in order to have job fairs and career fairs and to communicate information about the agency.

For instance, it is trying to recruit now people who can help in cyber crimes, and they have had a problem getting people who can get past some of the screening, so they have to do even more public relations in order to attract people who are capable of helping to build the cases like some of the ones which were discussed here earlier on the floor in which American companies were being cyber hacked and they were stealing essentially American jobs and wealth in that process.

I think, in this effort to separate the FBI from Hollywood, we might be separating the agency from its ability to promote itself. There is no Member of Congress that doesn't understand and appreciate the fact that there are times in which you need to be able to communicate with the public, and so it is the case with a Federal agency.

I think that the amendment—and I understand the impulse, and I am sure there is waste, and I can show you waste in the FBI and in any of these other agencies, but I don't believe that communicating with the American public is something that we should consider as wasteful. I, therefore, oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would concur with the need to communicate; but, again, we are talking over 600 Hollywood projects, most of which are grossing millions of dollars, $80 million, as I mentioned, for ''Shooter,'' $80 million for ''The Kingdom.''

It seems like, with that kind of grossing that is taking place, taxpayers shouldn't be on the bill to support the research that goes on. You have retired FBI agents, CIA, and others that can be brought in to do the research, as well as consult on these films.

We want accuracy, and yet we also understand that the taxpayer should only be footing the bill as necessary, and I don't think this is. Nothing against Mark Wahlberg or any others that are being used in these movies, especially with my name attached.

I still think the taxpayer deserves consideration here, and so I ask for this reasonable amendment to be supported. It allows the continued working on Most Wanted Fugitives and Most Wanted Terrorists and missing children programs. I think that is legitimate. Beyond that, I reject it. I ask for support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALBERG. 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 Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, just for the sake of perfect clarity, may I have the first few words of the amendment read.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 this year and last year that has been considered under an open rule.

This amendment would expand the list of parties the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting with because of misconduct on the part of those contractors. This list would include contractors who have been convicted of fraud; have violated Federal or State antitrust laws; who have been convicted of 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.

These are all offenses which any contractor doing business with the Federal Government must disclose to the contracting officer, but oddly enough, the contracting officer, absent this amendment, would then be free to ignore these transgressions and award contracts to the offending entities.

I commend the authors of this bill for their inclusion of sections 536 and 537. I still believe, however, that we can improve on the 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 remain noncontroversial, as it has been, and, again, will be passed unanimously by the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I accept 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 Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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, with respect to the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin, to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of medical marijuana.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment, which would prohibit the Department of Justice from using any of

the funds appropriated in this bill to prevent States from implementing their own medical marijuana laws. Twenty-nine States have enacted laws that allow patients access to medical marijuana and its derivatives, such as CBD oils.

It is no surprise then that public opinion is shifting, too. A recent Pew Research Center survey found that 61 percent of Republicans and a whooping 76 percent of Independents favor making medical marijuana legal and available to their patients who need it.

As I have said, 29 States have already enacted laws that will permit patients access to medical marijuana and their derivatives. By the way, 80 percent of Democrats feel the same way.

Despite this overwhelming shift in public opinion, the Federal Government continues its hard-line oppression against medical marijuana. For those of us who routinely talk about the 10th Amendment, which we do in conservative ranks, and respect for State laws, this amendment should be a no-brainer.

Our amendment gives all of us an opportunity to show our constituents that we are truly constitutionalists and that we mean what we say when we talk about the importance of the 10th Amendment.

In addition, this also gives us the opportunity to prove that we really do believe in respecting the doctor-patient relationship.

I proudly offer this amendment that has the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I am joined by Republican cosponsors DON YOUNG, TOM MCCLINTOCK, Dr. PAUL BROUN, STEVE STOCKMAN, and JUSTIN AMASH, as well as Democrat cosponsors SAM FARR, EARL BLUMENAUER, STEVE COHEN, JARED POLIS, BARBARA LEE, and DINA TITUS.

I urge my colleagues to support our commonsense, states' rights, compassionate, fiscally responsible amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I yield myself 1 minute.

The following national medical organizations are currently opposed to medical marijuana: American Medical Association, American Cancer Society, American Glaucoma Society, Glaucoma Research Foundation, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and American Psychiatric Association.

Also, recent research has demonstrated that marijuana use during teen years decreases IQ rates by an average of eight points.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

□ 2045

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose the amendment. My State is named in the amendment.

Look, everyone supports compassionate, effective medical care for patients with cancer, epilepsy, chronic pain. You will probably hear anecdotal reports, maybe even during the testimony this evening, about how medical marijuana can solve some of these problems.

There are two problems with medical marijuana. First, it is the camel's nose under the tent; and second, the amendment as written would tie the DEA's hands beyond medical marijuana.

With regard to the camel's nose under the tent, let me just quote from the DEA report just published this month: Organizers behind the medical marijuana movement did not really concern themselves with marijuana as a medicine. They just saw it as a means to an end, which is the legalization of marijuana for recreational purposes. They did not deal with ensuring that the product meets the standards of modern medicine: quality, safety, and efficacy.

Because, Mr. Chairman, the term ''medical marijuana'' is generally used to refer—and this is from the NIH. We respect the NIH. This is the National Institute on Drug Abuse: The term ''medical marijuana'' is generally used to refer to the whole, unprocessed marijuana plant or its crude extracts.

Mr. Chairman, that is not what medicine is about. Medicine is about refining the components THC and CBD, actually making sure they are efficacious, giving the exact dose, not two joints a day, not a brownie here, a biscuit there. That is not modern medicine. In fact, the DEA supports those studies, looking at the safety and efficacy and dosing regimens for these, THC, CBD. They have licensed some of the drugs.

Mr. Chairman, according to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, medical and street marijuana are not different. Most marijuana sold in dispensaries as medicine, again reading from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, is the same quality and carries the same health risks as marijuana sold on the street.

Mr. Chairman, we know there are health problems. The problem is that the way the amendment is drafted, in a State like Maryland which has medical marijuana, if we ever legalized it, the amendment would stop the DEA from going after more than medical marijuana.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We have 2½ minutes each.

I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I am not here to talk about brownies and biscuits. I am here to talk about a serious medical issue, cannabidiol, the CBD oil that comes from the cannabis plant. It is very low in THC and is nonpsychoactive. Research has shown very promising results in children with epilepsy, autism, and other neurological disorders. CBD oil is also showing promising results in adults with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and PTSD.

We need to remove the roadblocks to these potential medical breakthroughs. This amendment would do that. The Federal Government should not countermand State law. In this case, the absurd result of that is that medical discoveries are being blocked.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, let me say that in this discussion you may have heard reference to the 10th Amendment and the Commerce Clause. Let me address that. I want to get that out of the way, because I have talked tremendously over the past few days and weeks about the dangers of marijuana.

This controversy came before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2005 in Gonzales v. Raich. The Supreme Court reviewed the Federal Government's authority to enforce the Controlled Substances Act. In a 6–3 decision, Justice Scalia, a strong states' rights advocate, concurred with the majority ruling that the CSA does not violate the Commerce Clause or the principles of State sovereignty.

Just to read what he said:

> Not only is it impossible to distinguish controlled substances manufactured and distributed intrastate from controlled substances manufactured and distributed interstate, but it hardly makes sense to speak in such terms.

Drugs like marijuana are fungible commodities, as the Court explains marijuana that is grown at home and possessed for personal use is never more than an instant from the interstate market, and this is so whether or not the possession is for medicinal use or lawful use under the laws of a particular State.

Again, if we want to make a statement principle on the Tenth Amendment, fine, but don't do it on the backs of our kids and our grandkids. This is dangerous for them. How do we know this? The health risks: brain development, schizophrenia, increased risk of stroke. A study at Northwestern University recently showed profound changes in the brain just in casual marijuana users. Heart complications, three times normal in such use. Recent studies shows, as I said, not only damage in certain structures in the brain, but the same structures that attend to motivation, which again underlines the amotivational syndrome that we have all heard about.

So again, it is settled law. The Supreme Court has already spoken on the constitutionality of this. It is settled when it comes to medicine. We hear anecdotal stories, but there is no widespread accepted use of marijuana, medicinal marijuana and so forth. There is no acceptance of this by the medical community. It is not evidence-based. Fine, if you want to do research on it, but this will take away the ability of the Department of Justice to protect our young people.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN), our doctor in the House. We do believe in the doctor-patient relationship and that the government shouldn't interfere.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am a family physician and an addictionologist. Marijuana is addicting if it is used improperly. But used medically, and there are very valid medical reasons to utilize extracts or products from marijuana in medical procedures, it is a very valid medical use under the direction of a doctor. It is actually less dangerous than some narcotics that doctors prescribe all over this country.

Also, this is a states' rights, states' power issue, because many States across the country—in fact, my own State of Georgia is considering allowing the medical use under the direction of a physician. This is a states' rights, Tenth Amendment issue. We need to reserve the states' powers under the Constitution.

Please support this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I am listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle in opposition here and the notion about camel's nose, this train has already left the station. Eighteen years ago, the State of California voters approved medical marijuana. We now have 22 States that are doing so.

My good friend from Georgia is right. I mean, there are a million Americans now with the legal right to medical marijuana as prescribed by a physician. The problem is that the Federal Government is getting in the way. The Federal Government makes it harder for doctors and researchers to be able to do what I think my friend from Louisiana wants than it is for parents to self-medicate with buying marijuana for a child with violent epilepsy.

This amendment is important to get the Federal Government out of the way. Let this process work going forward where we can have respect for states' rights and something that makes a huge difference to hundreds of thousands of people around the country now and more in the future.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment as a coauthor of it and to point out this is six Democrats and six Republicans that are authoring this. There are 33 States, three of which have just passed laws and the Governors have indicated they will sign them.

This is essentially saying, look, if you are following State law, you are a legal resident doing your business under State law, the Feds just can't come in and bust you and bust the doctors and bust the patient. It is more than half the States. So you don't have to have any opinion about the value of marijuana. This doesn't change any laws. This doesn't affect one law, just lists the States that have already legalized it only for medical purposes, only medical purposes, and says, Federal Government, in those States, in those places, you can't bust people. It seems to me a practical, reasonable amendment in this time and age.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, for the District of Columbia and 22 States, including Nevada, with laws in place allowing the legal use of some form of marijuana for medical purposes, this commonsense amendment simply ensures that patients do not have to live in fear when following the laws of their States and the recommendations of their doctors. Physicians in those States will not be prosecuted for prescribing the substance, and local businesses will not be shut down for dispensing the same.

I urge you vote in favor.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oakland, California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor along with my colleagues. This amendment will provide much-needed clarity to patients and businesses in my home State of California and 31 other jurisdictions that provide safe and legal access to medicine. We should allow for the implementation of the will of the voters to comply with State laws rather than undermining our democracy.

In States with medical marijuana laws, patients face uncertainty regarding their treatment, and small business owners who have invested millions creating jobs and revenue have no assurances for the future. It is past time for the Justice Department to stop its unwarranted persecution of medical marijuana and put its resources where they are needed.

In States with medical marijuana laws, people with multiple sclerosis, glaucoma, cancer, HIV, and AIDS and other medical issues continue to face uncertainty when it comes to accessing the medicine that they need to provide some relief. So it is time to pass this. It is time to give these patients the relief that they need.

This is the humanitarian thing to do, it is the democratic thing to do, and I hope this body will vote for it and pass it on a bipartisan basis. It is long overdue. Enough is enough.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, marijuana is neither safe nor legal. Let's get it straight. The Controlled Substances Act makes marijuana in the United States illegal because it is not safe.

□ 2100

Mr. Chairman, there is more and more evidence every day that it is not safe. The effect on the brains, developing brains of teenagers and young adults, is becoming more and more clear, as the doctor from Louisiana has talked about, the effect on affect, the effect on mood; it is not safe.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a medicine. This would be like me as a physician saying: You know, I think you need penicillin, go chew on some mold. Of course I wouldn't do that. I write: for 250 milligrams of penicillin q.6 hours times 10 days. I don't write: chew on a mold a couple of times a day.

Mr. Chairman, why don't we have therapeutic tobacco? Nicotine, one of the substances in tobacco, purified is actually useful as a drug to treat autosomal dominant nocturnal frontal lobe epilepsy. Nobody writes a prescription: smoke a couple of cigarettes and cure your epilepsy. But that is what we are being asked to do.

Mr. Chairman, worse than that, this blurs the line in those States that have gone beyond medical marijuana. For instance, in Colorado, under Amendment 64, a person can grow six plants under the new law for general use, but if it is medical marijuana you can grow as many plants as you want as long you can prove you have a medicinal use.

So how is the DEA going to enforce anything when, under this amendment, they are prohibited from going into that person's house growing as many plants as they want, because that is legal under the medical marijuana part of the law, not under the new law?

Mr. Chairman, this is not the right place for this. The Ogden memorandum from this administration clearly states that the Department of Justice does not prioritize prosecution for medical marijuana—clearly states it. They don't do it. This is a solution in search of a problem that opens many other doors to the dangers of marijuana.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Dr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. WOLF.

Look, first of all, let's be clear, marijuana is an addicting substance. It is

schedule I, it is against Federal law, it was passed that way into the CSA in 1970.

What this amendment would do is, it wouldn't change the law, it would just make it difficult, if not impossible, for the DEA and the Department of Justice to enforce the law.

Members on my side have been criticizing President Obama for selective enforcement of ObamaCare and for immigration and other laws like that. So now we are going to start going down the road of selective enforcement for our drug policy.

Medicinal marijuana, what is it exactly? Folks, I can tell you it is nothing more than the end run around the laws against the legalization of marijuana. There is nothing medical or medicinal about it. It is not accepted by physicians. Oh, somebody claims it may do something for glaucoma, perhaps. Well, maybe it will, maybe it won't. But there are a lot more drugs that do a much better job than that and they are much safer.

But the most important thing I want everybody to know, Mr. Chairman, today is the fact that marijuana is highly addicting. It is the most common diagnosis for addiction in admissions to rehab centers for young people. Why in the world do we want to take away drug enforcement and leave our young people out there vulnerable? Yes, you say it can only be used by adults. Well, if it is sitting around on shelves at home the kids are going to get into it. We are already hearing about Colorado fourth-graders dealing with it. We hear about more poisonings in the emergency room.

If you look at other places that have gone down this road like Alaska, they retracted from their legalization. So I don't think we should accept at all that this is history in the making and that we are never going to go back. You look at Amsterdam, they put a lot more restrictions back in the control even in that very, very liberal nation.

So for that and many reasons I would just say tonight from a legal standpoint this amendment would not be constitutional. Our laws are currently constitutional, as found so in 2005 by the Supreme Court. And this is an extremely dangerous drug for our children and future adults and future generations.

Mr. WOLF. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is this the close of the debate?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is correct.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this is the most incredible debate we have had. Over half the States have already gone through every argument that was presented and decided against what you just heard. There are doctors at every one of those States that participated in a long debate over this and found exactly the opposite of what we have heard today.

Some people are suffering and if a doctor feels that he needs to prescribe something to alleviate that suffering, it is immoral for this government to get in the way, and that is what is happening. The State governments have recognized that a doctor has a right to treat his patient any way he sees fit, and so did our Founding Fathers.

I ask for support of my 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. ROHRABACHER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is 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 by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to solicit, offer, or award a contract in which the federal government is required to provide a minimum number of inmates to a private correctional institution or a private detention center.

Mr. GRAYSON. For avoidance of data, I would like to have the first few words of the amendment read, please.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It prohibits the Federal Bureau of Prisons from soliciting, offering, or awarding a contract—and by the way, I am talking about a new contract, not an existing contract—to a for-profit prison that guarantees the number of prisoners that will be housed there.

I believe it is not only bad policy but fundamentally immoral to guarantee that our government will incarcerate a specific number of people so that a for-profit entity can guarantee its profit margin. Whether or not we agree on the main impetus for incarceration—punishment, rehabilitation, or some combination of both—I would hope that we can all agree that a perverse conflict of interest, such as the one that this amendment addresses, should not be allowed to exist to be able to guarantee a profit on human bodies.

This amendment seeks to eliminate any potential for a repeat of the ''kids for cash'' scandal that unfolded in 2008. In that instance, two judges from Pennsylvania accepted money from the builder of two private for-profit juvenile facilities in return for imposing harsh sentences on juveniles brought before their courts. All told, those two individuals received $2.6 million in payments from the managers at that company.

American citizens' freedom and the length of a convicted person's prison sentence should never be a line item on a business sheet. I would hate to imagine a world in which certain segments of our society could honestly question whether or not they are being targeted purely for filling an incarceration quota guaranteed to a for-profit prison.

Let me be clear. I may not like for-profit prisons, but this amendment would not ban them nor would it have any effect on existing contracts that the Federal Government has already entered into. What it does do is it bans a practice of guaranteeing under new contracts a specific number of human beings that will be jailed or imprisoned in a given year. I think that is wrong. I hope that you do too.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned what this means for the Bureau of Prisons. I am inclined to maybe take the amendment. I think that is one of the concerns, somebody comes in without knowing.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. The author of this amendment, namely me, is open to whatever ameliorating second order amendments the gentleman may care to offer. I think we may be on the same wavelength here, and I would not oppose a second order amendment if the gentleman so sought one.

Mr. WOLF. Well, we may be, and I think that is probably not a bad idea.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have reservations about this that are very significant. I would oppose this amendment very strongly in its current form.

All private prison contracts provide for a guaranteed population. Without this, the contractors would operate at a significant risk which could only be addressed by significantly raising their annual operating cost, and also such language would adversely impact competition. Would contractors be willing to propose a 1,000 bed facility without

guaranteed minimums for private prison services? Lack of competition would likely result in higher costs.

But here is the thing. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has both prisons operated by the government and prisons that they privately contract for. So there is never an instance where they are going to house somebody just for the purpose of meeting the obligations here. If the prison population declines and they have a contractual obligation to house them in the private prison, they will reduce the population in the government-operated facility.

The Bureau of Prisons certainly wants to retain the ability to strategically prepare and issue solicitations which allow for guaranteed population minimums.

Also, with regard to children, there are so few children in the Federal prison population because we don't want to put them in a Federal-operated prison with adults, we usually contract out for the incarceration of juveniles. To pass this amendment would make that increasingly more difficult.

Mr. GRAYSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question again?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Would the gentleman agree that the gentleman's principles of guaranteeing a contract to the prison companies can be achieved by simply giving them a certain dollar amount in the contract, which I will concede my amendment does not prohibit? All my amendment prohibits is guaranteeing a certain number of bodies. Would the gentleman concede that allowing them to get their guaranteed contract through dollar amounts would achieve the same purpose, and would the gentleman concede that this amendment allows that?

Mr. GOODLATTE. First of all, let me say that it would not achieve the purpose of having a competitive bid process for the operation of prisons. Because if you would accept that premise you would have the Federal Government offering contracts; then if they are not utilizing those contracts the taxpayers are going to suffer the loss as a result of that.

As long as the Federal Government, which operates a very large prison system, has both publicly-run facilities and privately contracts you are not going to have the problem that the gentleman's amendment is concerned about addressing, and that is somehow people being incarcerated simply for the purpose of meeting the contractual obligations.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am going to rise in opposition to the amendment. There are just so many questions. I think Chairman GOODLATTE raises them.

We are open to work with you as we go through it. It is quarter after 9. Nobody is there at the Bureau of Prisons. We are not going to get a constructive answer, and we don't want to do something that causes damage.

One, I am going to oppose the amendment. Mr. GOODLATTE was so convincing.

And secondly, we will be willing to work with you though to see. Because I understand what you are trying to do, and I am sort of sympathetic to it. But for now with the way it is drafted I will oppose the amendment and ask for a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

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 hate to be the bearer of bad news, but the prison system that the Federal Government is operating, which has been growing exponentially over the last decade, will have gobbled up—by the time we pass this bill—about a fourth of the DOJ's budget. This is like the Pac-Man arcade game that keeps eating money.

Now, there are very interesting things going on in the land. There are Democrats and Republicans. There are the most conservative people in our country and the most liberal who are saying things that are fascinating, like we need to stop incarcerating so many people, that America really should not be the leading nation in the world in the percentage of people that we put in jail and that maybe we need to rethink part of what we are doing.

We have the problem of having very violent criminals we don't seem to have enough prison space for because we are locking up nonviolent people for things that we should probably find some way to have diversions for.

We have had multiple amendments today for diversion programs. You might not want to call them that, but that is what they are—drug courts, veterans courts. These are vehicles by which to divert people from the prison system because we know something about the prison system.

We know that, if you put people in there, the most likely circumstance is that they are going to go back again and again and again and that they are going to go back for increasingly more serious and more violent activities because the one thing that is happening in the prisons is that they are becoming involved in a vocation that is essentially antisocial.

I am not dealing with the amendment itself because the chairman is right, in that we need to know what it says, and we need to act in a responsible way, but we should not be, in any way, under some illusion that we are going to continue, as a country, to just put more and more people away.

It doesn't make sense, and as politicians who are supposed to be leading the most powerful nation in the world, we need to start to make some sense on this point.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. That is why, last year, we launched an overcriminalization of Federal law task force. We are looking at prison overpopulation and who is getting sentenced and what kind of alternative sentencing should be looked at and what kind of attention should be given to prisoners when they are in prison, so that we reduce the recidivism rate, which also can reduce the prison population.

As to one of the things I think we should do, there are a number of States that are seeing declining populations in their prisons, and they are not getting high recidivism rates. We should be looking at those States and finding out what they are doing.

Mr. FATTAH. In reclaiming my time, I can tell you that those are States that the chairman and the former ranking member, Mollohan—and now myself—have been investing in, in the Justice reinvestment programs, that help States think through how to do just that and operate a more safe environment for their people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment and work with the chairman and me, and we will see to what degree we might be able to meet his concerns.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, based upon the kind representations of the Chair and based upon the kind representations of the ranking member, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING

Mr. HOLDING. 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 by this Act may be used 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 the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds from this bill from being used to transfer or to detail employees to the Office of the Pardon Attorney.

The President possesses the constitutional authority to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States. However, in the first 5 years of this President's administration, President Obama granted fewer pardons and

commutations than any of his recent predecessors.

Earlier this year, the Deputy Attorney General took the unprecedented step of asking the defense bar for assistance in recruiting candidates for executive clemency, specifically Federal drug offenders.

The Justice Department intends to beef up its pardon attorney's office to process applications for commutations of sentence for Federal drug offenders. This is clear, and this amendment would prohibit that.

The Constitution gives the President the pardon power, but the fact that the President has finally chosen to use that power and to use it solely on behalf of drug offenders shows that this is little more than a political ploy by the administration to bypass Congress yet again.

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 who were duly convicted in a court of law and is serving a sentence. It is also just the latest example of executive overreach by this administration.

I am urging the support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, this is impractical. If there were a resignation in the office and if you needed to have a temporary detailee, it would be prohibited from this amendment. The last thing we would want is the President using such extraordinary power without the benefit of proper staff and due diligence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, no one denies the constitutional power of the President to grant clemency. The question here is whether this power is being used by the President of the United States as a way around the enforcement of the law as passed by the Congress when you invite mass representations of defense attorneys that thousands of their clients are entitled to have clemency granted to them. That is not a proper use of this power, and the Congress should not fund that office for that purpose.

I think the gentleman's amendment is well-advised, and I strongly support it, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Holding amendment.

Mr. HOLDING. 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. HOLDING).

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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. 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 implement Executive Order 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer a simple amendment to address an overreach by the executive branch of our government.

My amendment bans the use of Federal funds for the implementation of Executive Order No. 13547. Executive Order No. 13547, signed in 2010, requires that 63-plus bureaucracies essentially zone the ocean and the sources thereof.

This amendment addresses a critical executive branch encroachment into the powers of Congress as set forth in our Constitution. The activities being conducted under E.O. 13547 have not been authorized by Congress, nor have appropriations been made by Congress to fund these activities.

Mr. Chair, since 2010, this body has voted several times in support of this amendment in a bipartisan manner. Today, I am offering this amendment, again, because concerns have been raised that the effects of the recently created National Ocean Policy may extend well beyond restricting the ocean and inland activities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this harmful amendment. This amendment would cripple the important ocean planning efforts supported by the National Ocean Policy.

Our oceans are not just important to coastal regions, like the one I represent on the central coast of California, but they are important to our Nation as a whole, and the many uses of the ocean, such as tourism, shipping, fishing, and construction, are increasingly complex and require a cohesive decisionmaking process.

That is why I support funding for the National Ocean Policy, which simply aims to coordinate marine activities in harmony with existing laws. By reducing redundancies and conflicting government actions, we can remove burdens on ocean stakeholders and better focus our efforts on the more serious issues jeopardizing ocean health, and we can give our local communities the ability to make informed choices about how they use their marine environments.

A vote against the National Ocean Policy is a vote against government efficiency through smart ocean planning.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this.

I was around when this National Ocean Policy was before Congress and was heard in the committee. In fact, the commission that created it was created by Congress, and the members were appointed by President George Bush, and those members included members of the oil and gas industry.

They came up with recommendations that we need to do the conflicts of sea resolution, and that is what the National Ocean Policy does. It gets all of the Federal agencies together, and because they are together and can talk about what they each do when they are in conflict, the priorities it supports are consistent with the Gulf of Mexico Alliance, which is supported by Governor Perry and the Gulf State Governors.

It supports activities at Texas A&M, as they have signed a letter opposing any legislation that would undermine the National Ocean Policy. It affects the Texas coastal programs based in Houston, and they have also signed a letter in opposition to this amendment.

A local example of National Ocean Policy work is with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Navy, NOAA, the U.S. Geological Survey, and NASA. They have all worked on sensitive shorelines just north and south of Houston, which are key destinations for birders and beachgoers. They were able to resolve the critical conflicts between these agencies. Also, it would have an impact on the Port of Houston.

So there are reasons you want to avoid a conflict of interest. This is a great one with which to do it. We do it in law enforcement, we do it in firefighting, and we ought to do it with our conflicts in the oceans. Oppose this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from the great State of Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you for yielding me the time and for recognizing that it is the great State of Maine.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, which would block funding for the implementation of the National Ocean Policy.

This important policy seeks to improve the coordinated management of our oceans and coasts to address the most pressing issues facing our oceans, our resources, and our coastal communities. I happen to live on an island 12 miles off the coast of Maine, so I am well aware of the need for the improved coordination between Federal agencies and the inclusion of stakeholders in the policymaking process.

The National Ocean Policy brings together a variety of agencies at a single table, and it improves government efficiency and decision outcomes.

The work and research conducted under the National Ocean Policy supports tens of millions of jobs, which, in turn, generate billions of dollars for our coastal communities.

□ 2130

For example, in Maine, working waterfronts are critically important to Maine's coastal economy. These working waterfronts are critical for a variety of water-dependent activities, like ports and fishing docks, that are at the heart of our coastal culture and economy.

These water-dependent businesses, many of which are icons in Maine, are struggling to maintain their access to water in the face of increasing development pressure.

The National Ocean Policy will provide a framework to preserve waterfront access to traditional groups like fishermen. It is an extremely important issue for fishermen and the residents of Maine.

One of the constituents in my district, Richard Nelson, a lobsterman, says: ''The ocean is our workplace, our cultural heritage, and it economically sustains us and our extended communities.''

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting wise stewardship of our Nation's oceans and our ocean economy by opposing this amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming the balance of my time, without oceans that are alive and healthy, we are going to be challenged ourselves to live.

Our Nation has the responsibility for the greatest amount of oceans anywhere in the world. It is tough being the United States of America. We have some responsibility.

We now, for the first time ever, have an ocean policy, and the gentleman offers a proposal to prohibit the implementation of a policy to create better health for our coastal communities and for our oceans.

I reject the amendment, and hope that the House would do likewise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think now that you have heard the arguments against my amendment, it is important to set the record straight as far as what the real history was.

Congress did pass an act to establish a National Ocean Commission. That Commission was appointed by President Bush. And it made recommendations, but it did nothing else.

Those recommendations were considered by the 108th, 109th, 110th, and 111th Congresses, and Congress elected to take no action on those recommendations. Therefore, it is the intent of Congress that no further activity take place.

The President has wired around Congress by signing this executive order to establish a commission to empower 63 agencies to go spend money for which no funds have been appropriated and under which it has no statutory authority.

I have got 93 interests that include fishing, agricultural, farming, energy, and other industries that are concerned about the impact of this Federal overreach.

Again, this is a simple amendment that just stands up for the constitutional rights of this Congress to create the statutes under which this activity can be conducted.

We may not be against ocean planning. What we are for, though, is for the Constitution and to stand up for our congressional rights to enact the statutes related to this activity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 541. 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 American Community Survey.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the American Community Survey, first of all, is not the Census. What it is is a survey conducted by the Census Bureau of a portion of the American population every year. It has 48 questions, and those questions are intrusive.

There is, in my opinion, intimidation by the Community Survey workers to get this information from citizens.

A single mother in my district told me one of the workers came by her house and started peeping in the window, knocking on the door, and sat in the street waiting for her to come home from work to get this information from her.

The information is intrusive. It violates the right of privacy, in my opinion. It asks questions like: How many times have you been married? Does anyone in your household have a mental problem? What time do you go to work? And: How many toilets do you have?

It is 48 very intrusive questions.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the Federal Government from enforcing a potential fine against a person for failure to fill out this information. Right now, if a person doesn't fill out this information, Community Survey workers tell the citizen that they can be fined $5,000.

Do we really want to fine Americans $5,000 for not telling the government how many toilets they have in their home?

There are other ways this information can be gathered by the government without being intrusive and without violating the right of privacy.

I would ask Members to support my amendment to prohibit a fine being imposed on the American Community Survey, and 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. I will not take more than 50 seconds.

Simply put, the notion that we as a country are better off having less information defies most logic that I can think of at this hour of the night.

I think more information is probably good, and I would ask that we vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would make this simple comment. This information can be gathered by other means without violating the right of privacy of citizens, 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 NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple amendment, as well, that I can imagine nothing more than bipartisan support for.

First of all, I want to again thank the chairman, Mr. WOLF, and the ranking member, for their steadfastness and leadership on this appropriations bill, and to again acknowledge Mr. WOLF in his service and tenure not only to his district, but to the Nation.

I believe that we all have come for the common understanding that this Nation is founded on principles of due process and justice, and as well the recognition that we have a system of criminal justice laws that there are people who will be incarcerated.

I am very glad that I serve on the Judiciary Committee, where my chairman, Chairman GOODLATTE, along with Ranking Member CONYERS, established an overcriminalization task force.

With that in mind, it is to discuss how you look at laws and be fair to the individual that may be the victim, but also the person that was the perpetrator, or to look at the different charges and various offenses and determine whether or not today, in 2014, they are still appropriate.

My amendment is an amendment that addresses the question of the existing authority of the Attorney General to manage executive responsibilities under 28 U.S.C. 509 and 28 U.S.C. 510 as relates to authorizing the performance by any other officer and as it relates to all functions of agencies and employees.

It speaks to the question of prison overcrowding. It is straightforward, as I indicated. It makes a positive contribution to the problem.

The United States incarcerates nearly 25 percent of the world's inmates, even though it only has 5 percent of the world's population. Thirty years ago, there were less than 30,000 inmates in the Federal system. Today, there are nearly 216,000—an increase of 800 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked on this issue for almost two decades. In the early 1990s, I offered an amendment for good time, early release legislation, to look at providing relief to inmates who had been in the Federal system and reached the age of 45, had in fact not been engaged in any violent crime with a weapon, and had no violent incidents while they were incarcerated. We made the recommendation that we would have the opportunity to release those older inmates.

I am very glad to say that Senator Kennedy had the same kind of legislation. Over the years, we managed to get it into the authorization bill.

But, as I indicated, no other country imprisons a larger percentage of its population. The prison system costs $6.5 billion. That is part of the appropriations today.

My amendment will alleviate this overcrowding by clarifying that nothing in this bill prohibits the Attorney General from exercising his statutory authorities to expand the use of executive clemency to address prison overcrowding and redress sentencing injustices, so long as he does so in a manner consistent with the law and the Constitution.

Much of the overcrowding of our Federal prison system is a direct and proximate result of a proliferation of offenses carrying mandatory minimums. That is the basis of the Over-Criminalization Task Force. Again, I applaud the Judiciary Committee for that.

Heretofore, we had the 100 to 1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine. We in the Judiciary Committee changed that, along with the Senate. The President signed that legislation.

We now know the cost of imprisoning so many nonviolent offenders is fiscally unsustainable and morally unjustifiable. Remember, my emphasis has been that which is within the context of the law. And the legislation that I offered for the good time, early release was for nonviolent offenders.

It will take the combined efforts of policymakers, reform advocates, legal professionals, and private citizens to solve the problem. I can assure you there is a bar of lawyers that are interested in making sure that their clients come under the law and are treated fairly under the law.

My amendment gives life to this question by allowing the Attorney General, whoever it might be, to act within the law.

Just quickly, I give an example of Clarence Aaron of Mobile, Alabama, who was arrested in 1992 with 20 kilograms of power cocaine and distributed it as crack cocaine. It was in 1992. He received an enormous sentence. He was a first-time offender, and received a life sentence.

These are the kinds of issues that can be addressed if we are acting within the law.

My amendment simply says to act within the law using the authority that is given and to be able to address these questions of the overincarceration of persons and to give people a second chance.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Thank you for this opportunity to briefly explain my amendment.

Let me offer my appreciation and thanks to Ranking Member FATTAH and to Chairman WOLF for their work on this legislation and decades long commitment to the administration of justice and to developing sensible reforms to make our criminal justice system better.

Thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple, straightforward, and makes a positive contribution to the problem of overcrowding in our federal prisons.

The United States incarcerates nearly 25 percent of the world's inmates, even though it only has 5 percent of the world's population.

Thirty years ago, there were less than 30,000 inmates in the federal system; today, there are nearly 216,000, an increase of 800 percent!

No other country imprisons a larger percentage of its population than the United States or spends anywhere near the $6.5 billion that we spend annually on prison administration.

The Jackson Lee Amendment will help alleviate this overcrowding by clarifying that nothing in the bill prohibits the Attorney General from exercising his statutory authorities to expand the use of executive clemency to address prison overcrowding and redress sentencing injustices so long as he does so in a manner consistent with law and the Constitution.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT

At the end of bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for the ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS'' may be used in contravention of sections 509 and 510 of title 28, United States Code.

Much of the overcrowding of our federal prison system is the direct and proximate result of proliferation of offenses carrying mandatory minimums and the prior unjust and discriminatory 100 to 1 disparity between crack and powder cocaine sentences in federal law.

We now know the cost of imprisoning so many non-violent offenders is fiscally unsustainable and morally unjustifiable and it will take the combined efforts of policy makers, reform advocates, legal professionals, and private citizens to solve the problem.

There is no shortage of stories about the damage done to the lives of thousands of individuals and their families by the draconian sentencing laws passed by Congress and state legislatures beginning in the late 1980s in the ''War on Drugs.''

An example is Clarence Aaron, of Mobile, Alabama who was arrested in 1992 by federal law enforcement officers and charged with conspiring to process 20 kilograms of powder cocaine and distribute it as crack cocaine.

Even though this was his first offense, Clarence was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole because the judge was powerless to adjust the punishment to fit the crime because he was required by law to impose the sentence called for by the then-mandatory federal sentencing guidelines.

The case of Clarence Aaron case is not an aberration. The sad fact is that half of all inmates in the federal system (52%) were incarcerated for drug offenses, a rate more than three times as great (17%) as found in the state penal system.

And the racial and ethnic composition of federal inmates incarcerated for drug offenses is equally troubling because while whites and African Americans use drugs at similar rates, African Americans are much more likely to be arrested and sentenced for drug offenses.

Indeed, African Americans and Hispanics comprise more than 6 in 10 federal inmates incarcerated for drug offenses.

And African American offenders receive sentences that are 10 percent longer than white offenders for the same crimes and are 21 percent more likely to receive mandatory-minimum sentences than white defendants according to the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

In 2010, after years of working to reform our drug sentencing laws, our efforts finally bore fruit when the Congress passed and President

Obama signed into law the "Fair Sentencing Act of 2010" (P.L. 111–220), which finally ended the discriminatory 100:1 sentencing ratio.

But since the provisions of the "Fair Sentencing Act" are not retroactive there is still much work left to be done.

We need to keep working for reform until all federal inmates sentenced under the old regime are afforded the opportunity to have their sentences reconsidered under the provisions of current law.

Fortunately, Clarence Aaron will not be one of those who still must wait because after serving more than 20 years in federal prison, he was freed on April 17 because he was one of eight persons granted executive clemency, or a reduction in sentence, by President Obama on December 19, 2013.

The power to grant a reduction in sentence is among the powers vested exclusively to, and committed to the sound discretion of, the President by the Pardon Clause (Art. II, §2, Clause 1) of the U.S. Constitution.

In exercising clemency powers under the Constitution, the President typically relies upon the counsel and recommendations of the Attorney General.

President Obama's grant of executive clemency to Clarence Aaron and seven others was an act of simple justice and a welcome development.

So too is the announcement by the Department of Justice that it intends to be more aggressive in identifying and recommending to the President additional candidates for executive clemency consideration.

Let me emphasize that executive clemency is not amnesty. These inmates have been incarcerated for many years.

Applications for executive clemency that are most likely to receive favorable consideration are those submitted by non-violent, low-level drug offenders who were not leaders of, or had any significant ties to, large-scale organizations, gangs, or cartels.

Mr. Chair, until and unless the provisions of the "Fair Sentencing Act of 2010" (P.L. 111–220), are made retroactive, the need for innovative and effective measures to reduce prison overcrowding and bring greater fairness to federal sentencing policy will remain great.

The Jackson Lee Amendment ensures that Attorney General retains the latitude to develop and implement policies relating to requests for executive clemency for deserving petitioners, which will help reduce prison overcrowding and save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

[From Justice News]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS—ANNOUNCING NEW CLEMENCY INITIATIVE, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL JAMES M. COLE DETAILS BROAD NEW CRITERIA FOR APPLICANTS

As part of the Justice Department's new clemency initiative, Deputy Attorney General James M. Cole announced six criteria the department will consider when reviewing and expediting clemency applications from federal inmates.

Under the new initiative, the department will prioritize clemency applications from inmates who meet all of the following factors:

1. They are currently serving a federal sentence in prison and, by operation of law, likely would have received a substantially lower sentence if convicted of the same offense(s) today;

2. They are non-violent, low-level offenders without significant ties to large scale criminal organizations, gangs or cartels;

3. They have served at least 10 years of their prison sentence;

4. They do not have a significant criminal history;

5. They have demonstrated good conduct in prison; and

6. They have no history of violence prior to or during their current term of imprisonment.

"For our criminal justice system to be effective, it needs to not only be fair; but it also must be perceived as being fair," said Deputy Attorney General Cole. "Older, stringent punishments that are out of line with sentences imposed under today's laws erode people's confidence in our criminal justice system, and I am confident that this initiative will go far to promote the most fundamental of American ideals—equal justice under law."

In December 2013, President Obama commuted the sentences of eight individuals who were sentenced under an outdated regime—many of whom would have already paid their debt to society if they had been sentenced under current law. Since that time, President Obama has said he wants to consider more applications for clemency from inmates similarly situated.

28 U.S.C. §509: The Attorney General may from time to time make such provisions as he considers appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, employee, or agency of the Department of Justice of any function of the Attorney General.

28 U.S.C. §509: All functions of other officers of the Department of Justice and all functions of agencies and employees of the Department of Justice are vested in the Attorney General except the functions—

1. vested by subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 in administrative law judges employed by the Department of Justice;

2. of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.; and

3. of the Board of Directors and officers of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. I understand it says you must follow the law.

I accept the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. 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 in contravention of section 7606 ("Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research") of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Pub. L. No. 113–79) by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with four of my colleagues to offer a bipartisan amendment that simply requires the DEA to comply with Federal law.

Despite clear language in the recently passed farm bill that specifically allows State agricultural agencies and universities to grow industrial hemp for research, the DEA decided to ignore the plain text of a Federal statute.

Officials in my home State of Kentucky were recently forced to file a lawsuit in Federal court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds intended for a university research pilot program. What a waste of time, money, and the court system's limited resources.

□ 2145

States cannot launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA seizes the seeds before they reach their destination, and although the DEA did recently agree to release the seeds, my amendment ensures that this type of DEA action won't happen again.

If this were simply about seeds, I wouldn't be here. We have got that resolved, but there are further issues. There are more issues.

For instance, the DEA has been very ambiguous on whether they are going to assert authority to say that hemp can't be grown on private property. Listen, where else are you going to grow it? It is not like the government has farms.

The farm bill is clear on this language. The farm bill says that the State authorities shall register these sites, not the DEA; yet the DEA refuses to acknowledge that.

Furthermore, with regard to the seeds, the DEA requires—and this I find ridiculous—that the seeds—and these are industrial hemp seeds with no active THC—must be kept under lock and key, with only three keys available.

The way we have got these stored in Kentucky now is you put your handprint on the door and you can get into these hemp seeds. You want to know how ridiculous that is?

By the end of this growing season, we are going to have thousands of pounds of hemp seeds, not 250 pounds of hemp seeds. The question is: What is the DEA going to do going forward?

We just want them to simply obey the law. The fact is that growing hemp for research purposes has always been legal. So why hasn't it been done? Because it required interfacing with the DEA, and the DEA purposely used regulations to stop any of this research.

The farm bill that I cosponsored was to clear the way for hemp industrial research, not to perpetuate a broken

process where the DEA obfuscates and delays, but to give that freedom to State and local governments.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this is where I came in a little while ago. The gentlewoman was correct, that I was speaking earlier about this amendment and not hers. However, I oppose both these amendments. The principle is the same.

With regard to this amendment, I would say to the gentleman that the gentleman's amendment in the farm bill is new law, and it is being implemented, but it does not exclude the role of the DEA.

Your amendment here today would strip funds from the ability of the DEA to be involved, and the involvement is as described in your amendment with regard to the confiscation, seizure, and otherwise impeding the importation, transfer, and movement in interstate or interstate commerce of seeds intended for the purpose of growing or cultivating industrial hemp.

Mr. MASSIE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MASSIE. That is not my amendment that you just read.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Okay. What is your amendment then?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASSIE. The Clerk read it, but if you may, it says:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7606 (''Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research'') of the Agricultural Act of 2014 by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

My amendment at the desk says nothing about seeds.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Okay. Well, seeds or hemp, you have to still have the involvement of the DEA because seeds and hemp can be used to grow marijuana, as well as to grow hemp.

So if you don't have the ability to determine, just by looking at it, whether or not it is something that is going to be used for research purposes for hemp or whether it is going to be used to grow illegal marijuana to be sold to whoever, you need to have the DEA involved in that process.

If you take the DEA out of the process, which your amendment in the farm bill did not do and which I would strongly oppose having occur now, you are going to have a situation where this law will be honored in name only and will not be used for the purpose for which I presume you intended it, which is to do research with regard to the growing of hemp.

That is not what you are going to have here because you cannot determine, for example, the THC limits of cannabis plants simply by looking at them. You have got to have this examined, you have got to have it licensed, and that is a proper thing to do since the law requires it to be done.

The DEA needs to fulfill the role that the law requires them to do for that very purpose. As a result, I must strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman be willing to share a minute of that with our side?

Mr. MASSIE. Yes. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the bipartisan amendment I am proud to cosponsor with Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

This amendment simply says that none of the funds in the CJS bill can be used by the Department of Justice or the DEA in contravention of the section of the farm bill—the duly-enacted farm bill, which I supported for many reasons, one of which was that it had an industrial hemp research program, that authorizes industrial hemp research.

This is very simple. We passed a bipartisan farm bill. Its provisions are law. In Kentucky, one of the States conducting research, the DEA intervened. Only when Kentucky sued did the DEA get out of the way.

The amendment restates a law that is already on the books, but maybe the DEA needs to hear it twice. Remember, it is rope, not dope.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. MASSIE. I hope the chairman will vote for my amendment. Basically, it just says that we are going to enforce the farm bill, the language of the farm bill, and the farm bill is very clear in its language. It says no other Federal law withstanding.

Isn't it ironic that thousands of pounds of cocaine and heroin are somehow passing our borders every week? Yet the DEA thinks that seizing industrial hemp seeds in Kentucky is worthwhile use of its time and resources.

Furthermore, what are they going to do this fall when we harvest the hemp seeds?

There is no import-export there. These are Kentucky hemp seeds once they are grown in Kentucky. There is no Federal nexus this fall, so I hope that the farm bill and the language in the farm bill will be honored. We voted for it. It was signed by the President.

Our amendment is simple. It states that no funds may be used by the Department of Justice or Drug Enforcement Administration to violate the clear language of the farm bill, which says: States are allowed to grow and cultivate industrial hemp if the industrial hemp is grown or cultivated for the purposes of research conducted under an agricultural pilot program or other agricultural or academic research.

The DEA is not above Congress. It is not above the law. Executive branch agencies like the DEA must follow the laws passed by the legislative branch.

Please join us in support of this commonsense, reasonable 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 Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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 assess or collect the fee established by section 660.115 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking two of my colleagues, Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, for their hard work. I have been collaborating with them on this and related efforts to bring relief to our west coast fishermen.

This is a simple amendment. It would defer for 1 year the collection of a cost recovery fee in the west coast trawl program and provide some relief to groundfish fishermen who are facing mounting costs at a time when they can ill afford it.

The west coast groundfish industry has been rebuilding its stocks for several years. They have made hard decisions and taken hard cuts to ensure the long-term sustainability of that fishery, and they should be commended for that.

One aspect of that rebuilding plan was the adoption of a catch share program which, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, required the collection of a fee to cover costs of managing the program, and that was implemented this year.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. We accept the amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, approve, or implement a new limited access privilege program (as that term is used in section 303A of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a)) that are not already developed, approved, or implemented for any fishery under the jurisdiction of the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, New England, or Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the Southerland-Tierney-Jones amendment, a bipartisan provision that reaffirms, for the third time, the House's intent that no funding under the underlying bill should be allocated for new limited access privilege programs, also known as catch shares in the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico fisheries.

Catch shares is a fishery management tool that allocates a portion of a once-open public fishery to a select group of fishermen, forcing the others off the water and out of business. Put more simply, it is cap-and-trade for the oceans.

Our bipartisan amendment takes a big step towards halting the perpetuation of economic harm on our coastal communities, one of which my family has lived in for 200 years.

Let me be clear, our amendment has zero impact on catch shares already in place. If you have catch shares now, you will have them tomorrow, but we owe our fishermen a voice in addressing these issues through the House and Senate reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management Act before we consider funding for the development, implementation, or approval of new catch share programs. That is proper process. It is common sense.

I encourage all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan Southerland-Tierney-Jones amendment and preventing the funding of development, implementation, and approval of new catch share programs going forward.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. We accept the amendment.

Mr. FATTAH. If the chairman would yield, we have a member of the committee who wanted to say a few words on this and had some concerns. She is only going to take a minute.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment offered here tonight because I think we shouldn't be prohibiting any new catch share programs because it is such an important tool to manage our Nation's fisheries. This effectively supersedes the Regional Fisheries Management Council process that was already set up by Congress.

We have a lot of families in Maine who have very deep ties to the ocean, generations of Mainers who have worked in the fishing industry, but fisheries are facing a crisis.

Every year, our fishermen struggle to make a living on fewer fish and fewer trips going out fishing. The New England Fisheries Management Council is working very hard to develop solutions for these challenges by implementing catch share programs as an effective way to manage the fisheries.

This results in success stories, many that we have seen in Maine. Take a look at Port Clyde, one of our largest inshore fisheries communities. The fishermen in this sector have developed a fishermen's cooperative, Port Clyde Fresh Catch, as a way to market their fish using environmentally conscious fishing methods.

The result is sustainable fish, better quality fish, better prices for the fishermen. Membership in the sector has led to a profitable and sustainable on and offshore fishing industry.

I just want to say that fishermen in New England are not being forced into enrolling in the catch share programs. They can choose to stay in the common pool fishery or join a sector, but if we remove catch share as a management option, we would only be hindering fisheries management efforts around our Nation, stifling the creativity and innovation within the fishing industry, and preventing fishermen from working in an industry that is safer and more profitable.

□ 2200

Catch shares work. I have seen the benefits firsthand in Maine. I don't think we should be denying fishing communities the chance to improve their industry by removing a management option.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I respect Chairman WOLF's ability to accept the amendment. I just wanted to register my opposition to it.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I also want to remind my colleagues that no one was a greater champion of my amendment than former Massachusetts Congressman Barney Frank. He is definitely a stalwart in New England fisheries. So though he is not here, his spirit in favor of this amendment rings true.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for his work on this issue and his leadership on it, and I would like to thank the Democrats for allowing us to have this.

I want to just tell you, as a father who spends time in the Gulf of Mexico, in 2007, we were allowed to fish, as a family, 194 days out of the year. For 194 days, I could go out with my son and we could catch snapper, and we could catch up to four fish apiece. Today, we have now been reduced to 9 days. We have lost 95 percent. Mr. Chairman, 95 percent of the time that a family could spend on the water fishing together has been taken from us as sportsmen in the Gulf of Mexico with regard to red snapper.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for his work on this. I want to thank the other Members of the House for understanding us and how important this issue is to those of us who are the recreational anglers.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I want every father and son to be able to fish year-round in our Federal waters. Nine days is a problem—it absolutely is a problem—and I look forward to working with both the gentlemen from Florida and Georgia to ensure open access to our Federal waters.

I am also upset with NOAA and their continuously low stock assessment and flawed assessment methods.

My opposition to this amendment comes from the negative impacts that it will have on head boat captains in the EFP. This is a pilot program.

The Texas gulf coast, the area that I proudly represent, has a strong fishing heritage. Recreational and commercial fishing supports nearly 40,000 jobs in my State and generates $4.2 billion in sales.

I have talked to fishermen in my district, Mr. Chairman, and they are

against this amendment. They don't believe that the bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., should be telling—I agree with the gentlelady from Maine—regional fishing councils and local fishermen how to manage their fishery.

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is comprised of local fishermen and folks that have lived on the gulf their whole life. This council is developing and testing a very successful pilot program, where head boat captains have access to the water year-round—not just 9 days, year-round.

Under this program, they catch the same amount of fish but have the flexibility and freedom to go out when it is most convenient for their customers. I have heard from my constituents, and they want this program to grow, like the gentlelady said. This amendment would gut that pilot program and kick people out of the water.

Mr. Chairman, as a proud conservative, I believe that fishery management decisions should be made at the local level. Given the challenges our fishermen face, Congress should ensure local councils have all the tools in the fishery management toolbox available to them.

I will vote against this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. 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. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. 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 may be used in contravention of any of the following:

(1) The fifth and 14th amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (relating to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs).

(3) Section 809(c)(1) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (relating to prohibition of discrimination).

(4) Section 210401(a) of the Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (relating to unlawful police pattern or practice).

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WOLF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have read that amendment. It says that you are to follow the law. I agree with that, so I accept the amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. I will take ''yes'' for an answer, Mr. Chairman.

So with that, 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. PERRY

Mr. PERRY. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Advanced Food Technology Project.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman WOLF for offering me this opportunity.

This amendment prohibits the funding for NASA's Advanced Food Technology project, the AFT. The AFT project is responsible for providing spaceflight crews with a food system that is safe, nutritious, and acceptable to the crew while efficiently balancing appropriate vehicle mass, volume, waste, and food preparation time for exploration missions to Mars. The problem is we are not going to Mars anytime soon.

Since we have accepted as a fact that other nations such as Russia will be taking the lead on space exploration and we have no plans to go back into space over the next fiscal year—at least to Mars—there is no reason to waste taxpayer money on food research for a mission to Mars.

This project has been highlighted as a source of waste for years by my colleagues in the United States Senate, starting with NASA's use of taxpayer money to develop pizza and hundreds of other recipes for, again, a mission to Mars, which NASA has no plans to undertake. I want to ensure that taxpayer funding is not wasted on projects that are not going to happen.

I urge passage of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I accept the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, with brevity, I reject the entire predicate of the amendment, that we are not going to Mars or that Russia is leading space exploration or any of the other things.

However, I understand the gentleman would not like to not waste the taxpayers' money, and, therefore, he has offered this amendment. The chairman has accepted it. But the idea that our country is not the leading premier nation in the world in space exploration, I do not accept.

And with that point, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. 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. ELLISON

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

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:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition outlined in 48 CFR 52.209–7(c)(1)(i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term ''Fair Labor Standards Act.''

Mr. ELLISON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, no hardworking American should ever have to worry about whether her employer will refuse to pay her when she works overtime or take money out of her paycheck, especially if she works for a Federal contractor. This practice is known as wage theft.

Right now, Federal contractors who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act are still allowed to apply for Federal contracts. My amendment would deny Federal contracts to those who violate the Fair Labor Standards Act to deny workers the pay they have earned. The

amendment ensures that those in violation of the law do not get taxpayer support. We should only reward good actors.

Taxpayer money must be spent wisely, and as the largest purchaser of goods and services, the Federal Government must find a way to make sure that funds are going to companies that treat their workers fairly and according to the law and that give every American family a chance to succeed. More importantly, it signals to working Americans around the country that wage theft will not be tolerated.

Low-wage workers are fighting back. They are demanding that they be treated fairly. And now it is time for Congress to stand with these low-wage workers and say clearly that wage theft is not anything that we are willing to tolerate.

So we may not agree on the minimum wage or we may not agree on a lot of other things, but I believe Americans on both sides of the aisle believe that a penny earned is a penny that must be paid. Any time a Federal contractor is found to have violated a worker's rights and is found to have been guilty of that, according to the law, that Federal contractor should not benefit from the money in this particular bill.

So with the remainder of my time, I would like to just add that this is a very serious problem. A recent report by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee in the United States Senate reveals that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors. There should be a consequence. Similarly, the National Employment Law Project study found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime, and 11 percent have been forced to work off the clock.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that we can get cooperation from all Members on this.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and will add the point that many of these Federal workers are women who are the head of their household, and, therefore, the undermining of their compensation based upon overtime and the theft of wages because they are not paid fully for their work and hours really undermines the family.

□ 2215

So I believe that this is a very important amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the gentleman.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. No one knows what the amendment does. If you know what this amendment does, you should vote for it because nobody else seems to know. And that is one of the problems of these things coming rolling in at 10:15. I don't know what it does, and I wouldn't want to vote for it since I don't know what it does. So if you know what it does and you are for it, you can vote for it. But no one knows what it does.

So I strongly urge, in the interest of making sure that this place does not mess up, a ''no'' vote. 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. 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 Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN 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 in this Act may be used for a loan guarantee for Innovative Technologies in Manufacturing under the heading ''Economic Development Administration, Economic Development Assistance Programs.''

Mr. BROUN of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds from being used for the loan guarantee program created by the America COMPETES Act of 2010, a program which is essentially an $84 billion science experiment in stimulus spending.

The America COMPETES Act directed the Commerce Department to establish loan guarantees within the Innovative Technologies in Manufacturing program of the Economic Development Administration, or EDA.

These government-backed loans are meant to provide small or medium-sized manufacturers with new opportunities to use, manufacture, or commercialize any innovative technology. However, authorization for America COMPETES ran out in 2013 with little passing interest from industry. In fact, not one loan has been issued under this program to date—not one, not the first one.

In July of 2013, the Government Accountability Office found that the EDA had done nothing with its appropriated funds outside of establishing a staffing budget and a timeline for executing the program. At the same time, GAO noted that EDA officials had reached out to the Small Business Administration for technical assistance on how to run a loan guarantee program.

Mr. Chairman, think about this for a moment. If one government agency needs to consult another government agency about how to run a program which is similar to a program that is already established elsewhere, is the new program really necessary?

There are similar programs sprinkled throughout the Federal Government, yet we keep authorizing more and more. Congress needs to seriously reevaluate this approach and instead focus on real innovation in manufacturing. I would submit that if the Federal Government simply stopped taxing small and medium-sized businesses out of the country—or out of business—we would see an immediate increase in growth and new jobs, no new programs needed.

The America COMPETES loan guarantee program is a wasteful, duplicative attempt to spur innovation in manufacturing by creating more bureaucracy, and we should not allow it to go any further. Not one loan has been put out by this program.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. So we have had about 30,000 small and medium manufacturers close their shop in our country over last 20 years. We have 11 million Americans who go to work every day making things with their hands. We still lead the world as the number one manufacturer, but what used to be an absolute lead is now relative. Part of the challenge is technology.

This Congress has provided writeoffs for new machinery and other types of write-downs on capital equipment. We need to fortify our manufacturing base, and we also need to provide technical support. We provide billions of dollars to our National Laboratories. I went out to visit Oak Ridge in Tennessee. They have a manufacturing center there that helps small manufacturers think through their challenges. And the last thing we need to do is to retreat on this battlefield on manufacturing.

So the gentleman from Georgia is headed in the wrong direction. I hope

that the Congress does not follow him. I will be voting against this amendment, and I support this technology loan guarantee program. In fact, I authored it in this bill, and, yes, it has been built up over the last couple years to make sure that before they do anything that they do it correctly because we want to get it right.

But the one thing we should be certain about is that small and medium manufacturers, which are at the heart of our manufacturing industry in our country, they need our support, and this is a way to help them. It is not a handout, it is a loan, and it is actually a loan guarantee.

It is a way to go to help manufacturers across our land, and I hope that even at this late hour that we not fall victim to the suggestion that we can't do what we should do to make sure that this country can continue to lead in this critical area.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, during the public comment period, there was absolutely zero interest in this program—zero. The SBA already does this. I am all for manufacturing. I am all for small and medium businesses. But we do not need this program. It is an $84 billion program with no interest in it within small or medium businesses. Not one loan has been given out. All it has done is fund the bureaucrats that are established to do this program, and no loans have been made since 2010. In 4 years, zero loans, zero interest. We need to eliminate it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was agreed to.

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:

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 negotiate an agreement that includes a waiver of the 'Buy American Act'.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this concerns the Buy American Act and how it interacts with the work of the Trade Representative under this bill.

The Buy American Act dates back to every Republican's favorite President, President Hoover, who signed it into office on his last day in office in 1933. It requires the U.S. Government to prefer U.S.-made products in its purchases, and there already is precedent for this in the trade organization agreement called the WTO 1996 Agreement on Government Procurement. The Buy American Act was specifically excluded from the government procurement agreements program.

We are coming up upon a time when, according to news reports, the President may be presenting us with trade agreements. He may be presenting us with a fast track procedure for those trade agreements. The fast track procedure would basically give us a take-it-or-leave-it situation on these principles. Obviously, these trade agreements that have been negotiated are complex, but I think that we shouldn't be throwing out the baby with the bath water.

This is an 80-year-old law. It requires that the American Government give preference to American-made products when making procurement decisions. This is a commonsense principle that guides purchasing throughout the Federal Government, as it should.

Hard-earned American taxpayer dollars should be reused here at home. They should be going back into our economy and putting Americans back to work. I would hate to see this fundamental principle of government procurement slurred or undermined in any way by any agreement that is now being negotiated by the Trade Representative or anybody else in this administration or any future administration.

Therefore, I submit this amendment to make certain that the agreements now being negotiated, the ones being negotiated in the future, respect this basic, fundamental principle that American dollars and American jobs are what the American Government is all about.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition on the amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SALMON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, after line 17, insert the following new section:

SEC. 541. None of the funds made available to the National Science Foundation by this Act may be used to examine climate effects on tea quality and socioeconomic responses under award number 1313775–CNH.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to cut all funding for the National Science Foundation's program to study the climate effects on tea quality and socioeconomic responses in China and other locations. In fact, I find it deeply troubling that while our country is facing fiscal challenges of gigantic proportions, staring down over $17.5 trillion in debt, that I can quickly find programs such as this that are being funded on the back of the American taxpayer.

To date, this program has already received about $1 million in funding. Regardless of whether or not you believe that we must get our national debt under control, I believe we can all agree that these are difficult times for American families. With this in mind, how can we seriously look our constituents in the face and assure them we are looking out for their best interest when we allow their money to be spent like this?

While I certainly understand the value of predicting agricultural trends for tea, I believe that that is a task that ought to be left to the private sector, the ones that benefit from this kind of information.

Now, amendments like this are a high watermark. If we can't make the easy choices to eliminate these kinds of programs, how are we going to do the tough cuts? In a time where things are tough enough for the average American family, we certainly don't need to add another burden such as programs like this. And I might just say, finally, that our history has shown us that government getting involved in tea policy, as Great Britain did, can lead to a very, very slippery slope. I think government needs to stay out of tea policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. REED). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I will take about 50 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. I think intruding on the National Science Foundation and the work that is based on merit and peer-reviewed science, we should not be using politics in the political process as a substitute for it.

I hope that Congress would in its wisdom vote against the amendment offered by my friend, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for bringing this amendment forward. I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about appropriations bills, and, of course, people across the country are concerned, as we are, about the fact that our country is spending money we don't have. Washington spends almost 40 cents of every dollar with borrowed money. This is money we are borrowing from countries like China, ironically, and then here you have an

amendment that highlights the fact that we are spending money through the National Science Foundation on grants to study the effects of global warming on tea grown in China.

I mean, is this part of the deal that we cut with China when they loan us money to continue deficit spending? This is ludicrous. This is a classic example of wasteful Washington spending. And I commend, again, the gentleman for bringing this amendment because there are opportunities we have to highlight areas of wasteful Washington spending where we should at least be able to agree, as Republicans and Democrats, that every single dollar we are looking at we ought to ask the first question: Is this program—is this program worth borrowing money not only from countries like China, but borrowing money from our children? Our children are going to have to pay for these bills. And does this really rise to that level that it is worth borrowing money from our children, who are going to be getting that credit card bill, $931,000 of tax payer money, to study the effects of climate change on tea grown in China?

□ 2230

This is ludicrous. This is ludicrous spending. We ought not be doing it. We ought to at least be able to set priorities and agree, as Republicans and Democrats, that we are going to get serious about fiscal responsibility, and it starts with the little things.

This is not billions and trillions that we are talking about, but this is how you get to billions and trillions of dollars of debt. So while China holds maybe over a trillion dollars of our debt, I don't think it is going to cause any kind of international relations problem, that fact that we are going to say we should not spend $931,000 of money we don't have that is being borrowed from countries like China to study the effects of global warming on tea grown in China.

This is ludicrous. This doesn't pass the laugh test. When they say it is not all of the tea in China, this is a place where we should agree to stop spending taxpayer money on something that is incredibly wasteful.

Again, this is money borrowed from our children and borrowed from countries like China. We ought not be doing it.

Again, I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment. It is a great example where we should be able to agree and say enough is enough.

Mr. SALMON. I will just say in summation, I think the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) said it very well, and that is: How in the world are we going to get to the serious cuts to try to get our budget balanced if we can't even cut a million dollars to give to China to see how China's tea is going to grow with climate change?

This is ridiculous. If we can't do an easy thing like this, I fear for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

The amendment was agreed to.

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:

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 journalist or reporter to testify about information or sources that the journalist or reporter states in a motion to quash the subpeona that he has obtained as a journalist or reporter and that he regards as confidential.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I regret bringing this up at 10:30 at night. I apologize for that because this is a weighty matter, and I think it deserves fair consideration. I hope we are not all too tired to deny this question the attention that it deserves.

The purpose of this amendment is to raise the possibility of a Federal shield law that corresponds to shield law already in place in 49 States, but not at the level of the Federal Government.

A shield law is legislation designed to protect a reporter's privilege or the right of news reporters to refuse to testify as to information and sources of information obtained during a news gather and dissemination process. In short, a reporter should not be forced to reveal his or her source, and that is in fact the law in 49 States, the only exception being Wyoming.

This has come up in court cases at the Federal level and at the Supreme Court level, beginning with the 1972 case Branzburg v. Hayes, which I think poses this question in the microcosm.

In that case, a reporter wanted to inform his readers about the nature of the drug hashish, and he realized the only way to go about that was to find and interview people who had actually used the drug hashish, and so he did that.

After he published his article, relying upon these two confidential sources, at that point, he was subpoenaed to provide those sources, compromising their identity and compromising the principle of protecting your sources.

This is an issue that comes up from time to time, often at the State level, occasionally at the Federal level.

Some of us may remember the case of the Plame affair, the CIA leak scandal. A reporter was asked to release the name of the person to whom he had been perceived to leak regarding Valerie Plame. Reporters were asked, in general: Who are your sources with regards to this leak?

One reporter, Judith Miller of The New York Times, was jailed for 85 days in 2005 for refusing to disclose her source in the government probe.

At this point, under current law, journalists are in a quandary. They realize the need to protect their sources. That right is recognized in 49 States, but it is not codified at the Federal level, so what I seek to do at this late hour today is to do just that.

I think this is a very important principle, as Branzburg pointed out, that springs from the foundation of our law. The Constitution and the First Amendment provide for freedom of speech and of the press. It is completely incongruous to say we have freedom of the press, but the Federal Government can subpoena your sources and put them and you in prison—you, if you don't comply.

This is something that should have been handled perhaps years, if not decades ago. It falls upon us tonight, at this late hour, to try to handle it ourselves. I respectfully submit this amendment as being a much-needed and long-delayed clarification that the Federal Government treats this matter no differently than 49 States now do, and therefore, I ask for support on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is significant change. The authorizers should be looking at this. This is not something to put on an appropriation bill at 10:35 at night.

I listened to the gentleman, and a lot of what he said, I seem to agree with, but you have to really look at this and have hearings, and for those reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I share the gentleman from Florida's interest and support for shield laws as well, but I don't believe this has been carefully vetted. There are implications here about exactly who has the right to make the determination about whether or not funds could or could not be used. The way the language reads suggests that maybe the reporter would have that right, rather than a court.

To me, this is not the best way to go about doing this. We will continue to work on shield law legislation in the House Judiciary Committee, which has passed out forms of shield law in the past, and we will continue to work on it.

I must oppose this amendment in these circumstances. I don't think this is the right place to legislate something as complicated as this issue.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and think he is exactly right.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FATTAH. Without claiming my own time, I just want to support the thrust of this proposed amendment, which is that we should provide a shield law. The idea that, in 2005, a reporter was jailed for over 85 days is wrong, and we do want to have the freedom.

We have a constitutional responsibility to protect the freedom of press, but I agree with the chairman, we don't want to do it on an appropriations bill at 10:30 at night. We want to make sure it is clear what we are doing, so I oppose the amendment under those circumstances.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the Supreme Court decision that we are talking about here was decided in 1972. There have already been hearings. There has been plenty of draft legislation. It is hard enough to get anything voted on around here. It is time to vote on this.

After 42 years since the Supreme Court first addressed this, we don't have this body on record saying whether or not there should be a Federal shield law. I understand the reservations that have been expressed, but the time is now.

The reporters in this country have waited long enough. It is time to be fair and show fealty to the First Amendment and to pass this amendment tonight.

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. 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:

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 create or maintain a national firearm registry.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study the social effects of online interactive games.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how humans react to popular baby names.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how humans react to trends in popular culture.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study any facet of professional or collegiate sports, their games, or their playoff systems.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study whether or not humans are more or less racially-focused when seeking love online.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study the effects of romance novels on human activities.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study whether or not any social media application is able to predict trends in the stock market or any global trading market.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how rumors are started.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how much housework a member of one household creates for the rest of such household.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study the relationship between online virtual world users and their avatars.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how long animals can run on treadmills.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how humans ride bikes.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study robot rodeo hoedowns (defined as assemblies of robotic devices brought to central locations for the purposes of being programmed to move in unison for no other purpose than entertainment, record-setting, or to generally recreate or attempt to recreate any form of dance) or what they look like.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to study how dog became man's best friend.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to continue to withhold from the Treasury undisbursed grant balances for grants which were initiated before January 1, 2013.

SEC.____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to instruct any financial institution to designate a firearms dealer as a ''high-risk'' merchant customer for the purposes of restricting or regulating commerce.

Mr. GOSAR (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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a multifaceted amendment to limit funds within the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act to programs that are constitutional, appropriate, and sane.

For the sake of time, I will just highlight some of the provisions within my amendment.

My amendment protects Second Amendment rights and individual liberties. It does so by prohibiting a Federal firearm registry from being created with funds in this bill. Similar language has previously passed the House.

I also want to bring the House's attention to some of the ludicrous studies that taxpayers have funded via the National Science Foundation.

First, I appreciate the National Science Foundation's mission and its work. The National Science Foundation grantees and funds have been instrumental in advances in the Internet, astronomy, energy, chemistry, and many other important aspects of scientific scholarship; but, like our well-funded government operations, the bureaucracy begins to grow and proper oversight of the grant process begins to wane.

In 2011, Senator TOM COBURN released a publication titled ''The National Science Foundation: Under the Microscope.'' In that document, he outlined a litany of wasteful, superfluous, and seemingly idiotic studies, some of which I will outline here.

There was a study on human reaction to popular baby names. There was a $580,000 grant to study racial preferences in online dating. There was nearly $1 million in multiple grants to study how rumors are started.

There have been nearly two decades of grants awarded to a certain panel in which the National Science Foundation has granted about $60 million. One of the panel's studies covered how much housework a man creates for a wife in his household. There was a $90,000 grant to study the relationship between a researcher and their online avatar in virtual worlds and differences in their behaviors.

Since 2000, grants provided by the National Science Foundation have been used to study crustaceans running on tiny treadmills after being exposed to different microbes.

These little shrimp were also given tiny backpacks to weigh them down, so researchers could study test variables such as weight and resistance. In 2011, the lab said it planned to build treadmills and create studies for lobsters and blue crabs as well. This amendment would prevent these types of abuses.

There was a 2009 grant disbursed to the tune of $300,000, to study how humans ride bicycles. There was another $300,000, which actually came from the stimulus funds, that was disbursed to a married couple to travel to seven countries around the world to study stray dogs in an effort to discover how dogs became man's best friend. Sounds like a heck of a honeymoon to me.

Possibly the most ridiculous grant highlighted by Senator COBURN's report was a National Science Foundation grant to support a robot rodeo hoedown. Let me repeat that: a robot rodeo hoedown. I would like to point out how laughable it was to my staff to work with legislative counsel to define what a hoedown is for the purpose of this amendment.

The project involved programming small robots to dance to ''Chicken

Coop Shuffle,'' but I suppose the event wasn't a total loss. It produced hundreds of YouTube views.

I want to, again, thank Senator COBURN and his staff for producing these reports that shed light on these issues. My amendment will not prohibit all future ridiculous taxpayer-funded studies, but hopefully, I can take part in shedding a little bit of light of those that are the most egregious.

The hope is that those people awarding these moneys wake up and use a little more discretion with hard-earned taxpayer money, but I have a feeling I will be back here next year offering a similar amendment. I urge passage of this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires new determinations.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination. 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.

□ 2245

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. 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, add the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to obtain the contents of wire or electronic communications in a remote computing service as described in section 2703(b)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment which seeks to correct a serious injustice against U.S. citizens and the United States Constitution.

As many of us learned from the intelligence disclosures last year, the Federal Government is engaged in a wide variety of surveillance practices. These practices, though mostly focused internationally, also encompass domestic communications on a regular basis.

I hear many in the executive branch—and the legislative branch, no doubt—making excuses as to why this happens or how that is not all that bad, but I say that it is. It is an absolute violation of our basic civil liberties and the Fourth Amendment.

I could go on and on about the different practices that violate our Constitution and the trust of the people, but my amendment focuses on one simple statute, one simple statute I believe almost everyone will agree needs to be changed. Section 2703 of title 18, U.S.C., United States Code, allows the Federal Government to obtain your personal emails in your email account if they are 180 days or older. It is essentially a carte blanche authority to do so.

What is it about a piece of email being 180 days old that suddenly makes it the business of the government? What is it about a piece of email being 180 days old that suddenly makes it no longer your property? After 6 months, are those emails suddenly a threat to national security? Moreover, if these personal emails do discuss plots against the Nation, in many cases it is a little too little, a little too late to do anything since the government is 6 months behind the ball.

I do not know anyone who can make a legitimate argument to keep this provision of law. I know of no real justification.

To put support for this amendment in perspective, I will point out that there are a handful of bills in the House that abolish or significantly alter this provision of law.

One of these bills is H.R. 1847, introduced by my friend and colleague Congressman MATT SALMON of Arizona. The other is H.R. 1852, introduced by my friend Congressman KEVIN YODER of Kansas. If you add up all the Republicans and Democrats cosponsoring these two bills alone, the number is 217, just about enough to pass this amendment. I can tell you that our constituencies certainly do not accept this gross violation of privacy and abuse of power.

We saw a good bill in the U.S. Freedom Act get watered down and mutilated last week, which was a disgrace. I supported the original act because it made real reforms. I voted against the version that came to the floor because it extended section 215 of the PATRIOT Act for another 2 years.

But can we not agree on this one simple change?

Must the NSA or the FBI or the Department of Homeland Security have access to our emails that are several years old with no other justification than an arbitrary date? I think not.

I urge passage of my commonsense amendment.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for raising this important issue.

The Electronic Communications Privacy Act was written long before the Internet was in common use. It is out of date. It needs to be modernized. It needs to have some of the requirements that not only the gentleman has noted, but also some of the courts of appeals have noted.

However, the particular way this amendment works on the particular section of the Stored Communications Act, which is a part of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, has implications beyond what I think the gentleman intends would have a significant impact on not only Federal, but also State and local law enforcement ability to carry out their job.

If the gentleman would agree to work with me, as have the two individuals that you referred to have introduced bills and many others in this Congress who know that this needs to be modified—I have had conversations with Senator LEAHY, chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, and we have agreed that this is a priority for both of us to significantly reform this law and address some of the very concerns that the gentleman raises. If he would agree to withdraw the amendment, I would look forward to working with him and others to accomplish that goal in what I think would be a better setting. We have already held two hearings on this issue, and we will be continuing to work on this in an expeditious manner in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, with the understanding that the chairman has given, 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

Mr. PERRY. 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 appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to design, implement, administer, or carry out the U.S. Global Climate Research Program 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. 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 the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, it is my understanding the chairman accepts the amendment. If that is the case, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. WOLF. I accept the amendment.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

Mr. DUFFY. 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 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.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, I think most Americans are aware that the President has recently stated that he intends to transfer the core functions of the Internet to an international or foreign body. What my amendment does today will prohibit the President from using any of these funds to relinquish control of those core functions to the Internet.

I think this is an incredibly important amendment because America and our zest for freedom of speech has made sure that the Internet is an open forum for dialogue, an open forum for ideas. By relinquishing these rights or core functions to a foreign body, I don't think we will retain the current system of the Internet and the current rights of freedom of speech that the Internet currently enjoys.

If you look at stakeholders, you have a say in how the Internet is run. I think when we use the term ''stakeholders,'' what we are really referring to are foreign governments and corporations. I think we have to ask the question: Do we think that China, that Russia, that Iran, who have a say in the core functions of the Internet, have the same concern for the freedom of speech that we Americans do?

I think it is important that this institution use its control of the purse strings to limit the President's authority to transfer those core functions to this foreign body.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and I appreciate him offering it.

Have you seen how difficult it is to get sanctions in Syria from Putin? sanctions against the Sudanese with regard to the genocide from China?

The gentleman is right. I accept the amendment and urge all Members to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Mr. DUFFY's amendment.

The current way the Internet is governed is soon set to change, as we all know, and the question remains: Who will take over? The answer will have consequences for human rights, for the global economy, as well as Internet security and stability.

We must get it right. It is important to the future of our economy. It is important to the type of world we want to live in. We need to ensure the continuation of an open and accessible Internet which can serve to fulfill people's aspirations for freedom and for democracy. And when it comes to Internet policy, the administration has botched consultations over the transition of the duties at the NTIA.

We cannot allow countries to use their influence to stifle speech and commerce on the Internet. This amendment will give us more time to ensure we get this right.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, the process that the gentleman seeks to intervene in with this amendment started some 16 years ago. And I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect this, that apparently if a Presidential election doesn't go in the right direction, the other team's notion is to yank all of the authority away from the person who did win.

Unfortunately in our democracy, it doesn't work like that. When they are not calling for some Member of the Cabinet to resign or doing something else to intervene in the President's authority, they have these theories. Well, this new theory is that Obama has concocted some strategy to turn over the Internet to our enemies.

This is a process that started 16 years ago, and through the Bush administration and the Clinton administration. It is a process having to do with what we might want to call the yellow pages for the Internet, the domain names and how people can create their addresses on the Internet.

The theory of the Internet was to have no government in control. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America has been one of the major proponents of this. I don't believe that anyone on the other team would suggest that somehow they have concocted this scheme with the President to have us empower the Syrians or someone with control of the Internet.

So it is hard for me to focus on this as a substantive matter, because the truth is so far from what has been stated it is hard to reconcile the two things. But the point here is that one of the things that we have tried to say to the rest of the world is that the Internet is not controlled by government, that it is an opportunity for people to enjoy an American ideal, which is freedom of speech, freedom of association.

There were those on the other team who were happy when, during the Arab Spring, people were using social media and Twitter to interact against oppressive regimes around the world. So we have this kind of selective amnesia on these issues. It seems to come into play having anything to do with the Obama administration. There is nothing I can do about it this evening. Maybe it is covered under the Affordable Care Act. But I oppose this amendment, and I oppose the knee-jerk, irresponsible actions that would suggest to countries like China and others that we want to control the Internet versus we want it to be an opportunity for people to gather information, speak freely, and associate freely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

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 24 C.F.R. 100.500.

Mr. GARRETT (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 2300

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that stops the Justice Department from using one of the most dangerous and illogical legal theories of all times: the theory of disparate impact.

In short, disparate impact liability allows the government to allege discrimination on the basis of race or other factors based solely on the statistical analysis that finds 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 forced these companies to pay multimillion dollar settlements.

What is wrong with this, one might ask? Well, under disparate impact, one could never intentionally discriminate in any way, and even then have strong antidiscriminatory policies in place, and still be found to have discriminated.

If, for example, a mortgage lender uses a completely objective standard to assess the 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.

Some of these statistical differences and outcomes may actually be due to discrimination, but others may not be. It is impossible to tell which is which from the statistics alone. Under disparate impact it doesn't matter though. All statistical differences are considered by themselves discrimination.

To be clear, none of us have a tolerance for intentional discrimination. If there is intentional discrimination, we must prosecute it 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 the pressure to weaken their current standards to keep their lending statistics in line with whatever the Justice Department bureaucrats consider nondiscriminatory.

We have seen what this discriminatory and damaging risky lending can do to our economy. It is truly reckless for our government to be encouraging those dangerous and short-sighted practices to continue.

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.

You and I both know, Mr. Chairman, that even an accusation of discrimination could have a devastating impact on a small business.

I quote Roger Clegg, who is the president and general counsel for the Center for Equal Opportunity. He said:

> The disparate impact standard for antidiscrimination law pushes people to do one of two things: Get rid of legitimate selection criteria, or use a racial double standard to ensure that the numbers come out right.

On balance, Mr. Chairman, disparate impact will make it more difficult and expensive for families to buy a home, and 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 my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether I can raise a point of order against this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is already pending.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I won't waste the Congress' time going through a great deal of debate. But as brief as I can, what the gentleman's amendment says is no matter what the result, if whole classifications of people are discriminated against based on a set of policies, the DOJ can do nothing about it. That is the America he wants, and I hope the Congress would register our opinion on it when we get a chance to vote. We will be seeking a roll call vote on this matter.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. You just said something. You said that the Justice Department will not go after them if a whole set of policies result in discriminations.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, what I said is what the gentleman offers to the House is an opportunity where no matter what the result, if whole classifications of people are left out, i.e., there is a disparate impact, that DOJ can't go after it. That is what you offered to the House.

I appreciate your offering, and we will see what kind of America we would like to have when we cast a vote on this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think what America wants is to only be able to bring lawsuits against discrimination when there was, in fact, intentional discrimination, not just because, at the end result from some statistics, some may believe that there was discrimination. If there was intentional discrimination, this amendment does not do anything that would prevent the Justice Department from proceeding.

I would like to enter into the RECORD support for legislation from a number of organizations, including the Consumer Mortgage Coalition, Credit Union National Association, National Association of Federal Credit Unions, and also NAMIC, PCI, and American Insurance Association, which in part states:

> All 50 States have a strong and comprehensive antidiscrimination regulatory regime, including definitions of unacceptable conduct and full panoply of enforcement tools that includes rate approval, license revocation, and fines. There is no evidence that these regimes are insufficient.

Furthermore, they state:

> Under the disparate impact theory, even when a lender takes every step to prevent discrimination and treats all consumers fairly and equally, a neutral policy can serve as a basis for very serious and harmful results.

And ''could increase the cost and undermine the availability of credit throughout the economy.''

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN FINANCIAL SERVICES ASSOCIATION, CONSUMER MORTGAGE COALITION, CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY BANKERS OF AMERICA, MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

May 29, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned organizations support Representative Garrett's amendment to H.R. 4660, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The amendment would prohibit any funds made available by the Act from being used for litigation in which the Department of Justice (DOJ) seeks to prove illegal discrimination based on the ''disparate impact'' theory.

All of our organizations and their member companies view illegal discrimination in housing and lending as morally, ethically, and legally abhorrent and do not tolerate it in any size, shape or form. They are committed to providing financial services to American consumers in full compliance with all lending laws.

Recently, the Department of Justice, along with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), entered into a $98 million settlement with Ally Financial and Ally Bank over allegations that it discriminated against minority borrowers in its indirect auto lending program. The order represents the federal government's largest auto loan discrimination settlement in history. The CFPB and DOJ based their allegations solely on a disparate impact theory of discrimination. They do not allege that Ally intentionally discriminated against any consumers. This settlement was only a part of a larger joint effort between the CFPB and DOJ to address disparate impact in the auto lending market.

Disparate impact claims also have been brought under the Fair Housing Act pursuant to rules issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is notwithstanding that the basis for such claims under the Act is in considerable dispute.

Under the disparate impact theory, even when a lender takes every step to prevent

discrimination and treats all consumers fairly and equally, a neutral policy can serve as a basis for very serious and harmful claims in the absence of intentional discrimination. Smaller lenders, in particular, will find it difficult to manage this type of litigation risk. Left unchecked, disparate impact enforcement could increase the cost and undermine the availability of credit throughout the economy.

We ask the Members of the House of Representatives to vote in favor of Representative Garrett's amendment.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES, PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSOCIATION

May 29, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned insurance trade organizations strongly support Rep. Scott Garrett's amendment to H.R. 4660 to prevent the Department of Justice (DOJ) from using funds to litigate in order to prove illegal discrimination based on the ''disparate impact'' theory. In particular, we are concerned about the use of the ''disparate impact'' theory in relation to a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rule (24 C.F.R. 100.500) issued on February 15, 2013. The new rule would allow HUD and DOJ to hold insurers liable for discrimination when a housing-related practice has a discriminatory effect based on ''disparate impact'' theory.

We individually and collectively abhor any unfair discrimination in any aspect of insurance. However, application of the rule to the provision and pricing of homeowners insurance as HUD intends is impractical and contrary to existing State and Federal law. All 50 States have a strong and comprehensive anti-discrimination regulatory regime, including definitions of unacceptable conduct and a full panoply of enforcement tools that includes rate approval, license revocation, and fines. There is no evidence that these regimes have been insufficient.

The rule could be used to challenge common and regulator-approved factors used for risk-based pricing—including an applicant's claims history, construction materials, the presence or absence of a security system, and distance from a firehouse—if they were found to result in a statistical disparity for a class defined by race, ethnicity, or gender. However, accurate risk classification is essential to the business of insurance and treating similar risk profiles in a similar manner is a form of reasonable and fair underwriting that is at the very heart of the business of insurance. The rule ignores this and under it, an insurance company acting in full compliance with a State rating law standard could see itself challenged under the ''disparate impact'' theory.

Accordingly, the rule is impractical and contrary to existing law. Therefore, we support passage of Mr. Garrett's amendment to H.R. 4660 to prevent DOJ from funding litigation to prove illegal discrimination based on the ''disparate impact'' theory.

Sincerely,

American Insurance Association, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America.

Mr. GARRETT. In the end, Mr. Speaker, what we are intending to do here is to allow for the Justice Department to proceed when there is evidence of intentional discrimination. But when there is no evidence whatsoever, when it is purely on statistics, then it should not proceed under that theory of law.

With that, 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. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one other point here.

Every single Federal appellate court has upheld a way to proceed in terms of looking at the impact of policies.

What the gentleman offers is that if American baseball looks like it looked prior to Jackie Robinson, that that is just perfectly fine. I happen to think that American baseball is a little bit as a pastime more enjoyable for all of us after the Jackie Robinson decision, which was to take into account those who have been left out and to take an affirmative action to include them in. That is the America I want my children to grow up in.

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. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. 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 may be used to carry out Operation Choke Point.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Mr. Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, how does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it simply doesn't like? Easy. It cuts that industry off from the financial services it needs to operate.

Sound impossible? Sure, it does. However, that is exactly what the Department of Justice is doing in conjunction with the FDIC. This program even has a name: Operation Choke Point. It is designed to force legally operating and licensed entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need.

What started with nondepository lenders is spreading to other industries. Media reports indicate that DOJ is now pressuring financial institutions that service the gun and ammunition industries. As a former bank examiner and banker, I know how they are using the power of their position to intimidate the banks and undermine the banks' ability to serve their customers who are doing a legal business. It is just plain wrong, Mr. Chairman.

However, I want to be very clear. I strongly support DOJ's authority to go after the bad actors. Those actions should be commended and should not be inhibited. But what cannot be tolerated is the Federal Government using its authority to broadly target entire industries, including those that obey the law and are living within the rules.

The staff report just released in the Oversight Committee summarizes 853 pages of internal DOJ documents. Many of these internal documents show that even DOJ officials question the legality of their actions, and yet they continue.

This isn't a Republican or Democrat issue. This isn't a conservative or liberal issue. This is an issue of DOJ stepping outside the law.

We have worked on a bipartisan basis to inform DOJ and other regulators of the unintended consequences of Operation Choke Point, but those concerns have fallen on deaf ears.

As a result, this bipartisan amendment is an important step to ensuring that DOJ can continue to do its job, but makes clear the Department must not abuse its authorities.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my good friend.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

I supported the original intent of Operation Choke Point, which sought to restrict online payday lenders, usually operating from overseas, from lending in States that prohibit payday lending, but the program expanded and is now being pushed well beyond its stated objective.

Eliminating fraud and illegal transactions from our Nation's payment system should continue to be a priority for the Department of Justice and other Federal regulators, but employing a ''dragnet'' on companies engaged in legitimate business activities is wrong.

State banking commissioners have also expressed concerns the Federal agencies are attempting to deny essential banking services to lawful State-licensed firms.

Operation Choke Point pressures banks to close accounts and stop processing payments for those businesses that pose a reputational risk.

What is happening here is this approach, this dragnet approach, causes a chilling effect on legitimate businesses and legitimate banking services. As a consequence, going after bad guys, the Department of Justice needs to do that, but not in such a broad, all-inclusive way to chill legitimate business.

That is why I support this amendment, and ask for an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. With that, Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by saying I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's support.

This is an agency that has gone well beyond the scope of its authority. It even questions its own authority in its internal memos. The original intent is questionable, but at this point it has gone well beyond even the original intent. There is now even a list of other industries to go after.

I think that this is a situation where we need to stop what is going on, and I think my amendment clearly sets out what needs to be done.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Consumer and financial fraud are major crimes in the country, and fraud investigations are a matter of high priority for the FBI.

I just think this issue ought to be addressed by the committee of jurisdiction. In this case, the Judiciary Committee, also the Financial Services Committee.

We do hear stories of, outside of military bases, veterans being exploited.

I am just concerned about what it actually means, and I think it ought to be looked at by the committee of jurisdiction and not by the Appropriations Committee at 11:15 at night. So for that reason I oppose the 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. I concur with the chairman. Maybe it will get approved, but not in our bill and not at this time because we don't completely understand it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 under the heading ''Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'' may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 2315

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits any of the funds used within this portion of the bill from going to cities that have passed and enacted what we call sanctuary cities or sanctuary political subdivisions. The section of the code that we refer to, 8 U.S.C. 1373, reads this way:

Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which would now be ICE, information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

This is current law. We have multiple cities in the country that are violating current law, and they are doing so with impunity, and when we send funds out of this appropriations bill to those cities, it simply ignores an opportunity that we have to restrain these cities, which is for them to come back and comply with Federal law.

I was brought up in a law enforcement family. I had the Constitution waved at me on a regular basis. It was expressed to me clearly that it is the supreme law of the land, and the enumerator powers in it, which this Congress does assert and defend, are included within 8 U.S.C. 1373.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if these cities and if these political subdivisions disagree with Federal law, they can come here and ask Congress to change the law, but to defy it and to do so with the level of impunity that they have cannot be accepted by the United States Congress. We have a responsibility to assert our constitutional and statutory authority.

That is what my amendment does. It says any cities that have sanctuary policies and that implement those sanctuary policies are not going to receive funds out of this section of the bill, and the dollar figure we are dealing with here is from a fund of $1.235 billion.

I would point out that, today, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, testified before the Judiciary Committee. He was speaking specifically of Secure Communities, the act that allows for fingerprints to be transferred back and forth between the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, or the NCIC.

He said:

Even with the Secure Communities issue, we have mayors and Governors pursuing laws that limit the effectiveness of Secure Communities.

This addresses Secure Communities in this way, and it addresses sanctuary city policies, of which the Secure Communities policy, according to Secretary Jeh Johnson, is a very worthy one.

So this supports at least the tone of the message delivered today in the Judiciary Committee, and it supports what this Congress has done multiple times in the past. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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. Mr. Chairman, obviously, between the Garrett amendment on disparate impact and this, this is, I guess, not actually part of their effort to reach out for a greater fan base—the idea that local communities can't make decisions in their own interests and that we need the heavy hand of the Federal Government to herd them into some particular set of responsibilities that are actually our responsibilities.

Immigration law is our responsibility. It is not a local community's responsibility. When the fire department shows up, it is supposed to put the fire out, not worry about where someone's papers are. I just think that it is somewhat contradictory of what we hear from the other team about where they are headed, but this might be representative thereof, rather than doing comprehensive immigration reform.

We must do our job as the United States Congress. Now, the Senate has done its job. The President has said that he wants to sign a comprehensive bill. The Chamber of Commerce and all of the various religious and faith-based groups in our country have come forward, but rather than the Congress taking up a bill—any bill—on immigration reform, what we have is this constant effort to get at local communities that are just trying to make the best of a very tough situation that the Federal Government is creating.

Now, we will burden them because we don't want to take our responsibility and enact a comprehensive immigration program.

I am opposed to this amendment, but I am pleased that the gentleman has reminded us that this is, in essence, the immigration program that has some currency from the majority party. We should do something different than this, and we can.

There are 218 votes on this floor that would do comprehensive immigration reform if we would bring it, then we wouldn't have to deal with these kinds of amendments year in and year out, bill in and bill out, because we would have dealt with the problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that these political subdivisions, particularly in the cities, are contravening and ordering their officers not to cooperate with Federal immigration officers, refusing to allow them to collaborate with or to transport or to otherwise cooperate with our Federal immigration officers.

We simply cannot have a law enforcement structure in the United States

where you don't have local and State and Federal officers cooperating with each other. It is not good for our communities' security, and it is not good for our national security.

This is in defiance with and in contravention of Federal law that directs that they cannot do this. They write these ordinances anyway in defiance of the law, and this Congress must assert its primary authority over the funding that flows to those communities.

If we fail to do that, we shouldn't be surprised if there are many other Federal laws that are contravened or defied, so I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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 Iowa will be postponed.

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. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

Mr. MEADOWS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I have a very simple amendment. Currently, there are negotiations going on with the USTR. This amendment would prohibit funding to have any of the negotiations to enter into a trade agreement that would establish a limit on greenhouse gas emissions.

The 110th Congress—Democratically-controlled Congress—rejected the cap-and-trade in 2009. It would be very clear in supporting this amendment that we would carry on the will of the House in terms of making sure that we wouldn't use any funds to circumvent the will of Congress.

Additionally, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce came out recently with proposed rules from the EPA, which are set to come out next week, that would indicate that these types of rules could cost anywhere in the neighborhood of 3.5 million jobs over the next 15 years.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to seek time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

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 North Carolina will be postponed.

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 amounts made available by this Act may be used for any program not authorized by law as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to offer an amendment to the CJS appropriations bill that would prohibit the funding for any program that is not authorized by law.

For far too long, Congress has continued to appropriate spending on government programs with little or no oversight. Our country has essentially been on autopilot towards a cliff of fiscal and economic disaster.

This has resulted in a massive and out-of-control, bloated bureaucracy. In this bill alone, there are 141 unauthorized programs. Some of these programs were last authorized in 1993, and there are others that have never been authorized.

In total, these unauthorized and unchecked programs in this legislation receive $57 billion. With over $17 trillion in debt, it is time for us to say: enough is enough.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSON. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania when I get a second.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funding in the bill for unauthorized programs. It parallels my Sunset Act of 2014, H.R. 3847, which would force Congress to actually do oversight and evaluate each individual program.

This type of sweeping reform would dramatically overhaul the way Washington budgets and spends hard-earned taxpayer dollars, and it would allow Congress to finally take back control, scale back our bloated bureaucracy, and provide accountability for the Federal Government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman would yield for a second.

My question was that a large swath of our bill has not been authorized, including NASA, so we have to deal with transport back and forth to the International Space Station.

Even though it has not been reauthorized, your amendment, as written, would seem to prohibit NASA from being able to conduct life-sustaining activities relative to the space station.

That was my question. The gentleman neglected to yield, but I will have it stand as a rhetorical question for the moment, and I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 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 designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to 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. Chairman, 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 the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the opportunity, and it looks like I am probably bringing up the boots. I think I am on a boat, as they say. I am the last one coming in.

I just want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the time.

I have been watching all night, and I just want to thank you all for the work you have done on this bill, and I look forward to offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to ensure that no funds appropriated under H.R. 4660 are used to assist States and localities whose laws and policies are in direct contradiction to Federal immigration law and enforcement efforts.

State and local jurisdictions are implementing policies that directly contradict U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's statutorily-mandated mission to identify and ultimately remove illegal aliens who are currently incarcerated.

Not only do these policies go against the spirit and the letter of the laws enacted by this body, but they ultimately do a disservice to the very communities that they are designed to protect.

Local jurisdictions are increasingly implementing policies that bar State and local officials, including law enforcement officials, from asking people about their immigration statuses, from reporting them to Federal immigration authorities, or otherwise cooperating with or assisting Federal immigration authorities.

Some jurisdictions are even going farther to defy Federal law by implementing antidetainer policies that restrict local and State police from cooperating with Federal authorities that are seeking to remove aliens who have been arrested and charged with other crimes, and when local sheriffs choose to follow the Federal law and honor ICE detainers, some have been slapped with a lawsuit for cooperating with these detainers.

In response to a number of local jurisdictions for their refusing to honor ICE detainers in all or in many cases, former ICE Director John Morton warned of what would occur.

He said that:

> The approach of one particular county is ultimately going to lead to additional crimes that would have been prevented had we been able to enforce the law as the law is presently written.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment and send a clear message that, if localities and jurisdictions refuse to honor ICE detainers and implement policies in contradiction to Federal immigration law, they should not be eligible to receive funds under this act, specifically Federal reimbursement grants under the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

With that, Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2330

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, I reluctantly rise in direct opposition to the amendment, and I rise with mixed emotions. I am very pleased this is the last amendment. But, nonetheless, I am opposed to it—not in the main. That is to say, of course, none of the funds in this bill should be used to operate contrary to our laws, but some of the vagueness of the language as it intersects with State and local communities and decisions they may make.

So, for instance, a local community may say that in an emergency situation public safety officers should not engage in questions about whether you have papers or not. Or, when you are seeking information about a child that has been kidnapped, and you go to a certain home or family, you shouldn't be questioning them about their immigration status when you are trying to save a child who could be in imminent danger.

There could be circumstances in which this apparent language would create a real problem.

I reluctantly oppose the amendment. I thank the gentleman for joining the party and closing us out tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the ranking member's opinion on that. As the son of a Georgia State trooper, I think the descriptions that you have just made are basically a little bit of hyperbole in the sense that when an officer or others go in an emergency and have this situation in which they would not act in the best interest of the situation which they are in.

All we are simply saying is we are not going to give Federal funds to cities and localities and States who want to directly contradict immigration local law in the normal course of business. That is exactly what this amendment does, and will continue to do so.

I 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 yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, let me briefly say I rise to speak on this bill which directly impacts our economy, our competitiveness, and our ability to create jobs that pay well and open doors of opportunity.

While there are many positives to this bill—not limited to the strong support of NASA and the Goddard Space Flight Center, which is in my district, as well as robust funding for the National Science Foundation—this bill nonetheless makes two deep cuts to vital programs that protect against crime, promote innovation, and facilitate exports.

But the reason I wanted to come to the floor is because I wanted to take a moment to congratulate my friend, Representative FRANK WOLF of Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee who is managing this bill on the Republican side.

FRANK was elected in 1980. I was elected a few months later in a special election in 1981. We served together for 23 years on the Appropriations Committee. We served all that time until I left when I was elected majority leader.

We served on the Helsinki Commission together, which fought for human rights while the Soviet Union existed and so many were enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

FRANK WOLF has chaired this subcommittee for many, many years. He has done so with honor, with honesty, and with fairness.

He and I have served together in this House for 33 years. We sat together on the Appropriations Committee, as I said, for 23. When he retires at the end of this Congress, it will be a significant loss to the people of his district and to this House, which he has served so well.

We may sit, FRANK, on opposite sides of the aisle, but that has done nothing to diminish the friendship and alliance we have forged over the course of our service together, and the level of respect I have for him as a legislator and as a human being.

He has been indefatigable, Mr. Chairman, in his work on behalf of his constituents, on behalf of our Federal employees, and on behalf of the interests of the Washington metropolitan area.

This is his final Commerce, Justice, and Science appropriations bill, at least as being initiated on this House floor.

I know his passion and professionalism when it comes to these issues will be greatly missed, not only by the many outside groups that provide input to him and the subcommittee each year, but to his Democratic colleagues on the subcommittee, including Ranking Member CHAKA FATTAH, with whom he has worked so well, and previous ranking members who have worked well with him. I applaud them for their work.

FRANK WOLF is a principled, courageous, tenacious advocate for human rights in every corner of the Earth. I have traveled with him frequently behind the Iron Curtain to argue for those who were discriminated against, whose human rights were undermined, and whose civil rights did not exist.

FRANK WOLF is always prepared to go anywhere, anytime, in the toughest of circumstances, by himself and yes, with others, to advocate on behalf of those who had no advocate.

I have had the privilege of working with Congressman WOLF on many issues over the years. I have always found him focused on the merits of issues and not on their politics.

Mr. Chairman, I join all my colleagues in thanking him for his service to this House, to the subcommittee, to the Nation he served in the uniform of the United States Army, and to the people of his district.

I look forward, FRANK, to working with you the balance of this year as you continue your focus and advocacy on behalf of the issues which you so ably support.

The 113th Congress will come to an end, and FRANK WOLF will leave us. He will still have many things to accomplish. He will still make many significant and important contributions to his country and to his community.

I know that all the Members join me, FRANK, in thanking you for your service, your dedication, and your friendship.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I think we all owe thanks to FRANK WOLF and Mr. FATTAH for all of the work that they have done today.

This has been a long, hard slog. There has been dozens of amendments and almost endless debate, but they have stayed at the chore and they have guided us through this maze that we have been coming through—and, I think, done really well.

So I want to thank both of them for the hard work they have done on this bill yesterday, last night, and today and tonight.

In addition to what the minority leader has said about FRANK WOLF, I want to say that he and I came here together in the same class. There are only three of us left out of 54 now; two after he leaves.

FRANK WOLF, as the leader has said, never fails in compassion and honesty and transparency. He is above board. What you see is what you get. They say that character is when you do the right thing when no one is watching. Certainly, that is true of FRANK WOLF.

He is a patriot. He served his State, his district, his Nation, and the people of the world, for that matter, in an exemplary way. I can think of no one in this body that I have served with in these years together who better exemplifies honesty, integrity, and devotion to his country and family as has FRANK WOLF.

So, FRANK, we are going to miss you dearly. This is the last time that you will chair this bill on the House floor. You have been a great chairman of this subcommittee which I had the pleasure and honor of serving as chairman of for several years, and as a member of that subcommittee for many, many years. No one has done it better.

Our hearts are open when it comes to our love of FRANK WOLF. We wish him the very best in the next chapter of his life.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my request for a recorded vote on my amendment be withdrawn to the end that the amendment stand adopted by the earlier voice vote.

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, and the amendment stands adopted in accordance with the earlier voice vote thereon.

There was no objection.

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:

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 14 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 15 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

Amendment by Mr. HOLDING of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. SOUTHERLAND of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) 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 169, noes 230, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—169

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—230

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie

Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—32

Benishek
Bilirakis
Campbell
Capito
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Duckworth
Flores
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hurt
Lankford
Lewis
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Woodall

□ 0008

Ms. JENKINS, Messrs. GRAVES of Missouri and MCKINLEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. JONES, STOCKMAN, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 253, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—148

Amash
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Capps
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—253

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Cantor
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—30

Benishek
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Duckworth
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Kaptur
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Lewis
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Woodall

□ 0011

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 255, I was unexpectedly detained and therefore missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 208, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—198

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess

Byrne
Calvert
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—208

Amash
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rokita
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Duckworth
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Woodall

□ 0015

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 170, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

AYES—237

Amash
Amodei
Barber
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—170

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry

McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman
Woodall

□ 0018

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. CONAWAY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 189, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 258]

AYES—219

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Welch
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Aderholt
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Lucas
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0022

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 189, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—189

Amash
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0025

Mr. CONAWAY changed his 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. MASSIE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 162, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—246

Amash
Barber
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibson
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—162

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Wagner
Walberg

Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0029

Ms. PELOSI changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) 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 185, noes 223, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—185

Amash
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Fleischmann
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grimm
Guthrie
Harris
Heck (NV)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—223

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Goodlatte
Granger
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0033

Messrs. PALLONE and AMASH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 211, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—196

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan

Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—211

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0036

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 262, I intended to vote "no" rather than the recorded vote of "yes." I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 183, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—225

Amash
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gosar
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—183

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schock
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0039

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 178, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—178

Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Paulsen
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0042

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 264, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) 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 216, noes 190, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—216

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Neal
Palazzo
Rangel
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0045

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 265 on H.R. 4660, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "aye" when I should have voted "nay".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 194, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—214

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Barber
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reichert
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0048

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) 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 226, noes 179, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—226

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—179

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Fattah
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Kaptur
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nolan
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0051

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, 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. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 585, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Yes, sir, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

M__. ___ moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4660 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 38, line 2 (relating to amounts made available for Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 8 (relating to amounts made available for grants to combat violence against women), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 44, line 6 (relating to amounts made available for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 21 (relating to amounts made available for grants to address backlogs of sexual assault kits at law enforcement agencies), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 52, line 18 (relating to amounts made available for Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Programs), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 53, line 6 (relating to amounts made available for grants for the hiring and rehiring of additional career law enforcement officers under the COPS Program), after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 70, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Ms. MOORE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment of this bill. This amendment will not kill the bill nor will it merely send it back to committee, but rather, if adopted, the bill

will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is straightforward and simple. It would increase funding for three critical priorities: first, our chronically underfunded Violence Against Women Act programs; second, for grants to process the backlog on rape kits; and, third, for our Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, grants program, which was slashed deeply in the appropriations bill before us tonight.

Now, given the limited time that I have and the late hour that I have to discuss all these issues, I just want to focus my remarks on one of the Nation's staggering backlogs that we haven't talked about. We have talked, and importantly, about the backlog at the Veterans Administration, but we have been silent about the backlog of the sexual assault kits that have not been analyzed. We have not seen a similar amount of attention paid to the crisis in these rape kits that have been backlogged.

We have all heard these harrowing tales from our communities from young women and men who have waited so long for justice—and waited, and waited, and waited, and waited some more. These victims have not only endured the initial assault, but they have also endured an invasive exam to collect DNA shortly after the attack.

Mr. Speaker, these exams last for over 4 hours in some cases. It is unimaginable how difficult this is to bear. It takes so much courage for a victim to come forward and endure in hopes that the perpetrator will be caught. You know, it is the very least we owe to these victims to process all of the evidence, yet thousands of victims across the country never hear anything ever again.

Police already possess the evidence that is needed to identify and convict the perpetrators of these crimes, yet criminals remain at large primarily because these unprocessed kits remain in back rooms, warehouses, and labs. And given the sad reality that most sex offenders are recidivists, it is imperative that we close the loop on these old cases so offenders don't seek out new victims.

Part of the terror of being raped is knowing that the perpetrator is still out there, he can come back to get you, someone else, you don't know who he is, and it puts not only that individual in terror, but puts the whole community in terror.

On the aggregate level, the Department of Justice has tallied about 400,000 rape kits that remain sitting in evidence lockers, largely because local authorities can't afford the $500 to $1,500 it costs to test these kits. Some of these kits go back to the 1980s. And even though this evidence is old, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't assume that they are meaningless.

In Detroit, law enforcement personnel, as an example, are currently analyzing 11,000 abandoned kits they found in a warehouse. Six years, these kits have been sitting there for 6 years. After processing only 10 percent of these rape kits, they have identified 46 serial rapists that they have identified.

□ 0100

In New York City, they showed that after they processed their backlog of 17,000 kits, the arrest rate for rape kits increased from 40 percent to 70 percent.

The overwhelmingly scourge of backlogged kits require nothing less than a national commitment, Mr. Speaker, including a dedicated response from the United States Congress.

I am pleased that the bill before us tonight fulfills the request from the Obama administration to provide funding for a new grant program to inventory and test rape kits, develop units to pursue new investigative leads, and offer support to victims during the process.

The new investment through this bipartisan bill is an important first step.

However, through simple addition, we can tally the pending cost of clearing the backlog.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, we have now spent more than 15 hours debating and amending this bipartisan bill—and I appreciate Mr. FATTAH's help in it—that sufficiently and responsibly funds Federal programs that provide for our safety and economic well-being.

This legislation ensures that our laws are enforced, that our businesses have the tools needed to succeed, and that uncertainty doesn't hinder progress.

This bill already provides targeted increases for counterterrorism and cybersecurity, fights the scourge of drug abuse, and bolsters American scientific innovation and manufacturing.

This is also a landmark bill for reducing violence against women. It strengthens services for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking by funding above the current level and above the President's request for these programs.

In addition, it increases funding for victim assistance and programs that will address human trafficking.

After amendments, the bill includes $41 million for the Community Response Teams to address the sexual assault kit backlog program.

This is $6 million—17 percent—above the President's request.

The bill also includes $125 million for core DNA programs, including the Debbie Smith program.

This is $25 million above the President's request.

Moreover, we do all this while staying within our allocation for this bill—$400 million less than last year. Making commonsense reductions and eliminating waste wherever possible helps make a more efficient government that won't create undue doubt about the fiscal future of the Nation.

The bill has had bipartisan support throughout the process, and I believe it deserves bipartisan support today.

I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to recommit and pass H.R. 4660 tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 220, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—185

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—220

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Johnson, E. B.
Lofgren

NOT VOTING—24

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Gardner
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0108

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 87, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—321

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—87

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Franks (AZ)
Gabbard
Gingrey (GA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Holt
Huffman
Jeffries
Jones
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Massie
Matheson
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Payne
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tierney
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Welch

NOT VOTING—23

Benishek
Campbell
Capito
Chaffetz
Clay
Cleaver
Cramer
Dingell
Green, Al
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Palazzo
Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Shuster
Slaughter
Vela
Waters
Waxman

□ 0114

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUILD SITES RESERVOIR

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, at a time in the West—especially in California—of severe drought, we need to take immediate action to address the issues of water storage and of building

supply that California and the West need for our future—for agriculture, for the great needs we have—that have been neglected for so many years.

We haven't built any significant storage in California for at least 40 years, and it is high time that, in this time of drought, we seize this opportunity to move forward with bipartisan legislation, such as what I am carrying, H.R. 4300, to build Sites Reservoir—whatever it is going to take—to add to our water supply in the State and for our Western States.

I ask for the Congress and for the Senate to come together and get behind a measure to build water storage for the West.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a familial obligation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, May 30, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2013 and the first and second quarters of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ALEXIS COVEY-BRANDT, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 12 AND APR. 18, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Alexis Covey-Brandt	4/12	4/18	Tanzania	2,639,947	1,599.00	11,106,268	6,727.10			13,746,215	8,326.00
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALEXIS COVEY-BRANDT, May 19, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, KATHERINE HALEY, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 12 AND APR. 18, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Katherine Haley	4/13	4/18	Tanzania		1,590.00		6,727.10				8,317.10
Amount returned to U.S. Treasury											−190.00
Committee total											8,127.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KATHERINE HALEY, May 13, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, EMILY MURRY, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 12 AND APR. 18, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Emily Murry	4/13	4/18	Tanzania		1,379.00		12,089.80				13,468.80
Amount returned to U.S. Treasury											−190.00
Committee total											13,278.80

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

EMILY MURRY, May 12, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, AFGHANISTAN, TURKEY, AND PORTUGAL, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 12 AND APR. 20, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Boehner	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. John Kline	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Doc Hastings	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Dave Camp	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Tom Latham	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Greg Walden	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Steve Womack	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Brian Monahan	4/12	4/15	UAE		1,714.00		(3)				1,714.00
Jennifer Stewart	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Michael Steel	4/12	4/13	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Amy Lozupone	4/12	4/15	UAE		1,714.00		(3)				1,714.00
Hon. John Boehner	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. John Kline	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Doc Hastings	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Dave Camp	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Tom Latham	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Greg Walden	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Steve Womack	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, AFGHANISTAN, TURKEY, AND PORTUGAL, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 12 AND APR. 20, 2014—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jennifer Stewart	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Michael Steel	4/13	4/14	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. John Boehner	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. John Kline	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Doc Hastings	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Dave Camp	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Tom Latham	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Greg Walden	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. Steve Womack	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Jennifer Stewart	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Michael Steel	4/14	4/15	UAE		538.00		(3)				538.00
Hon. John Boehner	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. John Kline	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. Doc Hastings	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. Dave Camp	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. Tom Latham	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. Greg Walden	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. Steve Womack	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Brian Monahan	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Jennifer Stewart	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Michael Steel	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Amy Lozupone	4/15	4/17	Turkey		826.00		(3)				826.00
Hon. John Boehner	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. John Kline	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. Doc Hastings	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. Dave Camp	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. Tom Latham	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. Greg Walden	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Hon. Steve Womack	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Brian Monahan	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Jennifer Stewart	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Michael Steel	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Amy Lozupone	4/17	4/20	Portugal		843.00		(3)				843.00
Committee total					33,216.00						33,216.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, May 19, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Germany, Kenya, Somalia, Egypt, Libya, Qatar, Austria, January 15–24, 2014 with STAFFDEL Kuiken:											
Peter Villano	1/16	1/17	Germany		314.55						314.55
	1/17	1/18	Austria		199.14						199.14
	1/18	1/20	Kenya		445.00						445.00
	1/19	1/19	Somalia		0.00						0.00
	1/20	1/21	Egypt		582.50						582.50
	1/21	1/21	Libya		0.00						0.00
	1/21	1/22	Turkey		174.40						174.40
Commercial airfare							13,814.20				13,814.20
Peter Villano	1/16	1/17	Germany		314.55						314.55
	1/17	1/18	Austria		199.14						199.14
	1/18	1/20	Kenya		445.00						445.00
	1/19	1/19	Somalia		0.00						0.00
	1/20	1/21	Egypt		582.50						582.50
	1/21	1/21	Libya		0.00						0.00
	1/21	1/22	Turkey		174.40						174.40
	1/22	1/23	Qatar		263.00						263.00
Commercial airfare							13,814.20				13,814.20
Paul Arcangeli	1/20	1/21	Egypt		582.50						582.50
	1/21	1/21	Libya		0.00						0.00
	1/22	1/22	Turkey		174.40						174.40
Commercial airfare							3,633.50				3,633.50
Visit to Vienna, Austria-Cairo, Egypt-Tel Aviv, Israel, January 16–23, 2014 with CODEL Rohrabacher:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	1/17	1/18	Austria		621.80						621.80
	1/18	1/20	Egypt		184.00						184.00
	1/20	1/23	Israel		976.00						976.00
Commercial airfare							7,487.00				7,487.00
Visit to Azerbaijan, Georgia, Romania, Kosovo, Spain, January 17–25, 2014:											
Kimberly Shaw	1/18	1/19	Azerbaijan		353.81						353.81
	1/19	1/21	Georgia		605.00						605.00
	1/21	1/22	Romania		299.07						299.07
	1/22	1/23	Kosovo		441.40						441.40
	1/23	1/23	Germany		0.00						0.00
	1/23	1/25	Spain		491.16						491.16
Commercial airfare							16,984.00				16,984.00
Craig Greene	1/18	1/19	Azerbaijan		363.81						363.81
	1/19	1/21	Georgia		610.00						610.00
	1/21	1/22	Romania		233.97						233.97
	1/22	1/23	Kosovo		441.40						441.40
	1/23	1/25	Spain		505.16						505.16
Commercial airfare							16,984.00				16,984.00
Ryan Crumpler	1/18	1/19	Azerbaijan		363.81						363.81
	1/19	1/21	Georgia		610.00						610.00
	1/21	1/22	Romania		233.97						233.97
	1/22	1/23	Kosovo		441.40						441.40
	1/23	1/25	Spain		505.16						505.16

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2014—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare							16,984.00				16,984.00
Debra Wada	1/18	1/19	Azerbaijan		363.81						363.81
	1/19	1/21	Georgia		610.00						610.00
	1/21	1/22	Romania		223.97						223.97
	1/22	1/23	Kosovo		441.40						441.40
	1/23	1/25	Spain		505.16						505.16
Commercial airfare							16,984.00				16,984.00
Delegation expenses			Kosovo						386.64		386.64
Delegation expenses			Georgia						108.55		108.55
Visit to Korea, Japan, Burma, Hawaii, January 16–26, 2014:											
Kari Anne Bingen Tytler	1/18	1/21	Korea		748.29						748.29
	1/21	1/23	Japan		486.00						486.00
	1/23	1/24	Burma		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							11,370.70				11,370.70
Spencer Johnson	1/18	1/21	Korea		748.29						748.29
	1/21	1/23	Japan		1,002.90						1,002.90
	1/23	1/24	Burma		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							10,513.10				10,513.10
Stephen Kitay	1/18	1/21	Korea		748.29						748.29
	1/21	1/23	Japan		1,002.90						1,002.90
	1/23	1/24	Burma		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							11,370.70				11,370.70
Delegation expenses			Korea						1,815.61		1,815.61
Delegation expenses			Japan				1,971.97				1,971.97
Visit to Hawaii, Guam, Japan, Hong Kong—January 17–26, 2014:											
Hon. Robert Wittman	1/20	1/22	Guam		0.00						0.00
	1/22	1/24	Hong Kong		0.00						0.00
	1/24	1/26	Japan		625.93						625.93
Commercial airfare							3,473.30				3,473.30
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	1/20	1/22	Guam		0.00						0.00
	1/22	1/24	Hong Kong		0.00						0.00
	1/24	1/26	Japan		625.93						625.93
Commercial airfare							8,741.30				8,741.30
Hon. Carol Shea-Porter	1/20	1/22	Guam		0.00						0.00
	1/22	1/24	Hong Kong		0.00						0.00
	1/24	1/26	Japan		625.93						625.93
Commercial airfare							8,741.30				8,741.30
Michele Pierce	1/20	1/22	Guam		0.00						0.00
	1/22	1/24	Hong Kong		0.00						0.00
	1/24	1/26	Japan		625.93						625.93
Commercial airfare							8,175.30				8,175.30
Brian Garrett	1/20	1/22	Guam		0.00						0.00
	1/22	1/24	Hong Kong		0.00						0.00
	1/24	1/26	Japan		625.93						625.93
Commercial airfare							8,741.30				8,741.30
Delegation expenses			Japan				567.45				567.45
Visit to Guatemala, Mexico—January 19–24, 2014:											
Katie Sendak	1/20	1/21	Mexico		354.00						354.00
	1/21	1/23	Guatemala		450.92						450.92
Commercial airfare							1,537.40				1,537.40
Michael Amato	1/20	1/21	Mexico		354.00						354.00
	1/21	1/23	Guatemala		450.92						450.92
Commercial airfare							1,537.40				1,537.40
Delegation expenses			Mexico				84.00				84.00
Visit to Canada—January 29–30, 2014:											
Jesse Tolleson	1/29	1/30	Canada		217.17						217.17
Commercial airfare							440.00				440.00
Douglas Bush	1/29	1/30	Canada		217.17						217.17
Commercial airfare							440.00				440.00
Visit to Germany—January 30–February 2, 2014 with CODEL McCain:											
Hon. Michael Turner	1/31	2/2	Germany		995.41						995.41
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	1/31	2/2	Germany		995.41						995.41
Visit to Colombia, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Panama—February 14–23, 2014:											
Hon. Howard McKeon	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Hon. Austin Scott	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Hon. Vicky Hartzler	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Hon. Doug Lamborn	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Michael Amato	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Cathrine Sendak	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Bob Simmons	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
John Noonan	2/14	2/16	Colombia		739.20						739.20
	2/16	2/18	Chile		576.86						576.86
	2/18	2/22	Brazil		1,705.71						1,705.71
	2/22	2/23	Panama		326.00						326.00
Delegation expenses			Panama						2,319.04		2,319.04
Visit to Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Philippines, Hong Kong—February 15–25, 2014 with CODEL Royce:											
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	2/16	2/17	Japan		433.90						433.90

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2014—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	2/17	2/18	Korea		357.44						357.44
	2/18	2/20	Taiwan		561.81						561.81
	2/20	2/21	Philippines		237.99						237.99
	2/21	2/23	Hong Kong		930.40						930.40
Visit to Germany, Belgium—February 17–21, 2014:											
Kimberly Shaw	2/18	2/19	Germany		307.40						307.40
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		330.00						330.00
Commercial airfare							2,889.40				2,889.40
Ryan Crumpler	2/18	2/19	Germany		307.40						307.40
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		330.00						330.00
Commercial airfare							2,889.40				2,889.40
Jack Schuler	2/18	2/19	Germany		307.40						307.40
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		330.00						330.00
Commercial airfare							2,889.40				2,889.40
Lynn Williams	2/18	2/20	Germany		614.80						614.80
Commercial airfare							1,731.90				1,731.90
Visit to Korea, Cambodia, Thailand—March 15–23, 2014:											
Craig Green	3/16	3/19	Korea		1,022.19						1,022.19
	3/19	3/22	Cambodia		681.00						681.00
	3/22	3/23	Thailand		249.00						249.00
Commercial airfare							13,791.20				13,791.20
Dave Giachetti	3/16	3/19	Korea		1,022.18						1,022.18
	3/19	3/22	Cambodia		539.00						539.00
	3/22	3/23	Thailand		249.00						249.00
Commercial airfare							13,791.20				13,791.20
Paul Arcangeli	3/16	3/19	Korea		1,022.18						1,022.18
	3/19	3/22	Cambodia		539.00						539.00
	3/22	3/23	Thailand		249.00						249.00
Commercial airfare							13,791.20				13,791.20
Debra Wada	3/16	3/19	Korea		1,022.18						1,022.18
	3/19	3/22	Cambodia		539.00						539.00
	3/22	3/23	Thailand		249.00						249.00
Commercial airfare							13,791.20				13,791.20
Delegation expenses			Korea				370.26		602.55		972.81
Delegation expenses			Cambodia				190.00				190.00
Visit to UAE, Afghanistan, Djibouti, Chad, Cameroon, Germany—March 14–23, 2014:											
Hon. Rob Whittman	3/15	3/19	United Arab Emirates		844.13						844.13
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	3/19	3/20	Chad		287.72						287.72
	3/20	3/21	Cameroon		413.12						413.12
	3/21	3/23	Kenya		355.00						355.00
Commercial airfare							20,614.22				20,614.22
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	3/15	3/19	United Arab Emirates		844.13						844.13
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	3/19	3/20	Chad		287.72						287.72
	3/20	3/21	Cameroon		393.13						393.13
	3/21	3/23	Kenya		355.00						355.00
Commercial airfare							14,409.22				14,409.22
Hon. Ron Barber	3/15	3/16	United Arab Emirates		413.82						413.82
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Commercial airfare							10,175.70				10,175.70
Hon. Brad Wenstrup	3/15	3/19	United Arab Emirates		844.13						844.13
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	3/19	3/20	Chad		287.72						287.72
	3/20	3/21	Cameroon		413.12						413.12
	3/21	3/23	Kenya		355.00						355.00
Commercial airfare							14,409.22				14,409.22
Alex Gallo	3/15	3/19	United Arab Emirates		844.13						844.13
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	3/19	3/20	Chad		287.72						287.72
	3/20	3/21	Cameroon		413.12						413.12
	3/21	3/23	Kenya		355.00						355.00
Commercial airfare							9,878.60				9,878.60
Ryan Crumpler	3/15	3/19	United Arab Emirates		844.13						844.13
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	3/19	3/20	Chad		287.72						287.72
	3/20	3/21	Cameroon		413.12						413.12
	3/21	3/23	Kenya		355.00						355.00
Commercial airfare							14,409.22				14,409.22
Brian Garrett	3/15	3/19	United Arab Emirates		844.13						844.13
	3/16	3/18	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
	3/19	3/20	Chad		287.72						287.72
	3/20	3/21	Cameroon		413.12						413.12
	3/21	3/23	Kenya		355.00						355.00
Commercial airfare							14,409.22				14,409.22
Delegation expenses			United Arab Emirates						1,425.62		1,425.62
Delegation expenses			Bahrain						1,129.31		1,129.31
Delegation expenses			Kenya						692.03		692.03
Delegation expenses			Cameroon						4,803.22		4,803.22
Visit to Afghanistan, UAE—March 27–31, 2014:											
Hon. Howard McKeon	3/28	3/31	UAE								
	3/28	3/30	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Hon. Duncan Hunter	3/28	3/31	UAE								
	3/28	3/30	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Hon. Joaquin Castro	3/28	3/31	UAE								
	3/28	3/30	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Hon. Jeff Denham	3/28	3/31	UAE								
	3/28	3/30	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Bob Simmons	3/28	3/31	UAE								
	3/28	3/30	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Kari Bingen	3/28	3/31	UAE								
	3/28	3/30	Afghanistan		56.00						56.00
Committee total					78,512.74		348,820.68		13,282.57		440,615.99

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' McKEON, Chairman, May 1, 2014.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Devin Nunes	11/21	11/25	Europe		706.00						
Commercial airfare							6,780.60				7,486.60
Andy Keiser	11/21	11/25	Europe		706.00						
Commercial airfare							2,351.60				3,057.60
Hon. Mike Rogers	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Hon. C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Hon. Mike Pompeo	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Hon. Terri A. Sewell	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Darren Dick	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Tom Corcoran	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Susan Phalen	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,834.30				2,588.59
Robert Minehart	12/15	12/18	Europe		754.29						
Commercial airfare							1,799.20				2,588.59
Hon. Mike Thompson	12/13	12/19	S. America		1,614.00						
Commercial airfare							11,540.37				13,154.37
Linda Cohen	12/13	12/19	S. America		1,920.00						
Commercial airfare							11,072.37				12,992.37
Hon. Michele Bachmann	12/14	12/16	Middle East		605.75						
	12/16	12/17	Middle East		75.00						
	12/17	12/17	Middle East		0.00						
	12/17	12/19	Middle East		843.00						
	12/19	12/20	Europe		417.00						
	12/20	12/21	Europe		344.42						
Commercial airfare							13,850.40				16,135.57
Committee total											73,500.13

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS, Chairman, May 9, 2014.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5811. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clauses with Alternates-Transportation (DFARS Case 2012-D057) (RIN: 0750-AH90) received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5812. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts (DFARS Case 2013-D055) (RIN: 0750-AH88) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5813. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2011'' and ''Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2012''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5814. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vertical Tandem Lifts [Docket ID: OSHA-2010-0028] (RIN: 1218-AC72) received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5815. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Annual Update of Filing Fees [Docket No.: RM14-6-000] received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5816. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-56, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5817. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2014, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5818. A letter from the Director, Diversity and Inclusion Division, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5819. A letter from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General of the Farm Credit Administration for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5820. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, transmitting the 2013 management report and statement of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5821. A letter from the Senior Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2013 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5822. A letter from the Officer, Equal Employment Opportunity, International Boundary and Water Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5823. A letter from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting the Office's annual report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on House Administration.

5824. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012 as required by section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5825. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-626, Utah [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0094; Airspace Docket No. 14-ANM-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5826. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Holdrege, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0596; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-11] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5827. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Warsaw, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0606; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-12] received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5828. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-35 and V276; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0961; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5829. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification, Revocation, and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Charlotte, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0915; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-41] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5830. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Treatment of Qualified Retirement Plan Payment of Accident or Health Insurance Premiums [TD 9665] (RIN: 1546-BG12) received May 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 604. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4745) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability system; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–465). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 4755. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include recreational therapy among the therapy modalities that constitute an intensive rehabilitation therapy program in an inpatient rehabilitation hospital or unit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 4756. A bill to require reporting of bullying to appropriate authorities and assist with equal protection claims against entities who fail to respond appropriately to bullying, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand certain exceptions to the private activity bond rules for first-time farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4758. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to create a searchable database containing a credentials registry, a skills database, and a jobs bank; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 4759. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which eligible veterans may elect to receive hospital care and medical services at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 4760. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of veterans to receive health care at private medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum nameplate capacity of a small wind turbine qualifying for an energy credit from 100 kilowatts to 20 megawatts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 4762. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover transitional care services to improve the quality and cost effectiveness of care under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4763. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to requirements for domestic industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 4764. A bill to require Federal agencies to provide notice and consideration of evidence before submitting debts to the Secretary of the Treasury for collection through reduction of tax refunds, and to restore the 10-year statute of limitations applicable to collection of debt by administrative offset; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 4765. A bill to address childhood obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Natural Resources, 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. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 4766. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from paying bonuses to certain employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs until the backlog of disability claims is resolved, to establish a commission to evaluate such backlog, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4767. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen Federal-State partnerships in postsecondary education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4768. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financial support for certain high carbon intensity energy projects; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4769. A bill to amend part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize grant funds to be used for the Troops-to-Cops Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4770. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to notices of claim of maritime lien, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4771. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to more effectively regulate anabolic steroids; 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. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. CHU, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 4772. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for the payment of royalties for the performance of sound recordings fixed before February 15, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 4773. A bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4774. A bill to require accountability in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 603. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SMITH

of Washington, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 605. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in May as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the Nation's history; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. POLIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. VEASEY):

H. Res. 606. A resolution recognizing the month of June as Immigrant Heritage Month in honor of the accomplishments and role of immigrants in shaping the history and culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 607. A resolution recognizing the importance of the historic 2014 Indian Elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress 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.)

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 4757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 4758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

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. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 4759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 4760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution, Article I, Section 8, which provides Congress with the power to collect taxes, affirmed by the 16th Amendment thereto.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 4764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 4767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4768.

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, Impost 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.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states that the Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 4771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress shall have the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states. . .''

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 4772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; and, Article I, Section 8, clause 8 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries''

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 4773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14.

''[The Congress shall have Power] To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 270: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 351: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 411: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 482: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 532: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 543: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 563: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 676: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 713: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 755: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 794: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 831: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 920: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1015: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1020: Mr. BARTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1024: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1179: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1252: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1284: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1313: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1362: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1416: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1428: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1518: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1563: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1666: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1728: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1771: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1838: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1852: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1907: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2021: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2036: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2041: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2088: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2315: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 2377: Mr. BARTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 2453: Ms. HANABUSA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 2500: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2504: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2519: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2529: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2536: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2543: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 2549: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2607: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2656: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2663: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 2801: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2807: Mr. FARR, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2852: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2932: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2955: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3121: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 3383: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3418: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 3424: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3461: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3489: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3531: Mr. REED and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3560: Mr. MORAN, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3670: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3708: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3723: Mr. LONG and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3740: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3852: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3858: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARR, Mr. LONG, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3877: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3899: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 3978: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 3988: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3992: Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4035: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4047: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4158: Mr. PETRI, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4162: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 4169: Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 4187: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4188: Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4190: Mr. OLSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 4208: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4284: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4299: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4305: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4317: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4325: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4351: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4365: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4383: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 4385: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4395: Mr. ENYART, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4415: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4436: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 4440: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4449: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 4450: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 4510: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 4515: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4531: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 4574: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4577: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4582: Mr. TONKO, Ms. BASS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4608: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 4619: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4622: Ms. BASS and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4631: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 4640: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 4643: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 4646: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 4653: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4664: Mr. FARR, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4678: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4714: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4715: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4718: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4720: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4731: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. OLSON.
H.J. Res. 20: Ms. TITUS.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.J. Res. 113: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. YOHO.
H. Con. Res. 97: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. ENYART.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H. Res. 30: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 190: Mr. WALZ.
H. Res. 532: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. PETERS of California.
H. Res. 562: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 593: Mr. PETERS of California.

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 Manager's amendment to be offered to H.R. 4681, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015, by Representative Rogers of Michigan, or a designee, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. WALBERG

AMENDMENT NO. 27: 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 for the Investigative and Public Affairs Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation except for the Ten Most Wanted Fugitives, the Most Wanted Terrorists, and missing children programs.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. POE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 541. 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 American Community Survey.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MS. KAPTUR

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 63, line, 8, increase the dollar amount by $85,500,000.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MS. BONAMICI

AMENDMENT NO. 30: 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).

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. HUDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts made available by this Act may be used for any program not authorized by law as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. HUFFMAN

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 to assess or collect the fee established by section 660.115 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 33: 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 negotiate an agreement that includes a waiver of the 'Buy American Act'.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 34: 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 by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (''NIST'') to incorporate any weaknesses known to NIST into encryption standards.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 35: 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 imprison a person if that person has been incarcerated continuously for 15 years or more and if the sole basis for the incarceration is a conviction for a nonviolent crime resulting in a pecuniary gain to the prisoner of less than $1,000,000

and a pecuniary loss to the victim or victims of less than $1,000,000, as stated in the prisoner's sentencing report.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 36: 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 prosecute any person for violations of an online service's user agreement or terms of service.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 37: 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 journalist or reporter to testify about information or sources that the journalist or reporter informs the Attorney General that he has obtained as a journalist or reporter and that he regards as confidential.

H.R. 4660

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT NO. 38: 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 detain, prosecute, or incarcerate a person who is adjudged by the courts of the United States to have disclosed violations of the constitutional rights of 1,000 or more persons for such disclosure or disclosures.